

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

DETERMINATION OF PRIORITY ACTIONS FOR THE FURTHER ELABORATION AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME
FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT

Aldo Manos

March 2003

Evaluation and Oversight Unit

Contents

Acronyms.....	4
Executive summary.....	5
Introduction.....	8
I. BACKGROUND.....	8
II. REVIEW OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.....	9
A. Achievements during the biennium 2001-2002.....	10
1. Project coordination mechanisms.....	10
(a) The Inter-Agency Steering Committee.....	10
(b) The Coordination Committee.....	10
(c) The Ad Hoc Technical Committee.....	10
(d) Coordination mechanisms at country level.....	10
2. Updating of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis.....	11
3. Pollution hotspots and sensitive areas.....	11
4. Regional cooperative actions.....	11
5. Capacity-building.....	12
6. Sustainability of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea.....	13
7. Public participation.....	13
8. National action plans to address pollution from land-based sources.....	13
9. Development of a strategic action plan for biodiversity.....	14
III. EVALUATION.....	15
A. Appropriateness of the project approach.....	15
1. Achievement of project objectives.....	16
2. Scope of project outputs.....	17
3. Assessment of project assumptions.....	18
B. Effectiveness and efficiency.....	19
1. Need to extend the project.....	19
2. The rate of expenditure.....	20
C. The project's institutional capacity.....	20
1. The contribution of Fonds Francais pour l'Environnement Mondial	21
2. Project leadership and backstopping.....	21
3. Need for additional staffing.....	22
4. New monitoring tools.....	22
D. Financial sustainability.....	23
1. Taking into account the procedures of individual donors.....	24
2. Providing cost estimates for recommended measures.....	24
3. The donors' meeting.....	24

E.	An enabling environment.....	25
1.	The national inter-ministerial committees.....	25
2.	Outreach.....	25
3.	Internal linkages.....	25
4.	Use of national languages.....	26
5.	Dissemination of the project's products	26
IV.	LESSONS LEARNED.....	26
V.	RATING OF THE PROJECT.....	27
A.	Overall rating.....	27
B.	Rating of individual items.....	27
1.	Timeliness.....	27
2.	Achievement of results/objectives.....	27
3.	Attainment of outputs.....	27
4.	Completion of activities.....	27
5.	Project executed within the budget.....	27
6.	Impact created by the project.....	27
7.	Sustainability.....	28
VI.	CONCLUSIONS.....	28
VII.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	28
A.	Recommendations at the policy level (in order of priority).....	28
B.	Recommendations at the project level (in order of priority).....	29

Annexes

I.	Terms of reference.....	30
II.	Timetable of the evaluation.....	42
III.	List of officials interviewed.....	43
IV.	List of documents consulted.....	45
V.	Listing of project components in the project documentation.....	47
VI.	Governments and agencies involved in the project.....	49

Acronyms

BOD	biochemical oxygen demand
BREF	BAT Reference Document
CAMPs	Coastal Area Management Programmes
DTIE	Division of Trade, Industry and Economics
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFEM	French Fund for the Global Environment
GAP	Global Action Plan for the Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment against Pollution from Land-based Activities
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
GIWA	Global International Water Assessment
GPPIP	General Pilot Project Implementation Plan
ICS/UNIDO	International Centre for Science and High Technology, Trieste, Italy
IMC	Inter Ministerial Committee
IPTS	Institute for Prospective Technological Studies at Seville, Spain
MCS D	Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development
MEDU	Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan
METAP	Mediterranean Technical Assistance Programme of the World Bank
METAP	Mediterranean Technical Assistance Programme of the World Bank
PAP/RAC	Regional Activity Centre for Priority Action Programmes
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
RAC/CP	Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production
RAC/SPA	Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas
SAP	Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP/DGEF	UNEP Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination
WHO-EURO	European Regional Office of the World Health Organization

Executive summary

1. The twenty Mediterranean coastal States and the European Union are the Parties to the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution (Barcelona Convention) and to the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution that was adopted in 1980 within the framework of that Convention. A revision of the Protocol adopted in 1996 is expected to obtain the required number of ratifications and to enter into force in 2003. The revised Protocol contains more stringent obligations and timetables for the reduction or the elimination of a number of pollutants.
2. The Parties have also adopted a strategic action plan, the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea (SAP), to guide them in the discharge of their obligations through the identification of priorities and the adoption of national action plans detailing key actions that need to be taken urgently.
3. The project was approved by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with the aim of assisting the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), as the secretariat of the Barcelona Convention and its related protocols, in the “determination of priority actions for the further elaboration of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea.”
4. The project comes at a crucial moment in the history of long-term cooperation among Mediterranean coastal States, dating back to the adoption of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) (Barcelona, 1975), one of the longest and most active programmes of intergovernmental cooperation promoted under the sponsorship of UNEP.
5. The project is being implemented by the UNEP Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan (MEDU) and its Pollution Monitoring Programme located in Athens, and through its Programme Activity Centres in Split, Tunis and Barcelona, in cooperation with the European Regional Office of the World Health Organization (WHO/EURO), with the assistance of the Mediterranean Technical Assistance Programme of the World Bank (METAP) and the International Centre for Science and Technology (ICS) of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (ICS/UNIDO). The project comprises nine programme components. There are twelve GEF-eligible Mediterranean coastal States – Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Slovenia, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey but other States have participated in some of the activities, though not at the cost of the project. The complexity of the project is visually presented in annex VI.
6. The staff of the project includes a GEF project manager (L-4), an administrative assistant and a secretary, all located in Athens. Further administrative backstopping is provided by a project-financed fund management officer at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi.
7. The main points raised in the report are outlined below.
8. From a global point of view, the project appears to have been well designed and well timed, providing essential inputs for the implementation of SAP in anticipation of the entry into force of the revised Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution. It is clear that the budget of the Mediterranean Action Plan alone could not have financed the speeding up of activities related to the implementation of the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution that have been made possible by the GEF project. Some assumptions in the GEF project, however, were somewhat too optimistic. They include the expectation that countries would be fully engaged in the preparation of national action plans and pre-investment studies already in the second year of the project or the expectation that economic instruments could be introduced in the region relatively quickly and efficiently with the goal of combating land-based sources of pollution. Also, the assumption that pre-investment studies would be prepared in a manner to satisfy donors’ requirements when the donors had not yet been identified was unrealistic.
9. The institutional set-up of the project (the GEF Project Coordination Committee and the Inter-Agency Steering Committee) has functioned well. The Project Manager has provided low-key but effective leadership and drive.
10. There was an initial six-month delay in the recruitment of the GEF Project Manager, the only full-time professional staff on the project, during which time a temporary project manager was appointed and initial

activities were started. However, the implementation timetable was affected. Such delays have not been fully reflected in the two project revisions carried out so far, the latest dated August 2002. It should be borne in mind that a revision of this project is a massive undertaking involving interrelated changes to a 101–page document.

11. For some project components, the executing agencies play the major role while the countries provide the essential participation and counterpart funding. These are the project coordination component, the updating of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, the identification of hotspots and sensitive areas, regional cooperative actions for the development of guidelines and regional action plans, capacity-building, identification of new economic instruments for the sustainability of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and actions leading to the development of a strategic action plan for biodiversity in the Mediterranean. Most of these activities have been carried out while some, as indicated below, need to be modified.

12. For other project components the countries and donors play the major role and the executing agencies provide support on request. These are the preparation of pre-investment studies and the adoption of national action plans for the implementation of the Protocol on Land-based Source of Pollution under SAP.

13. The project document does not clearly differentiate the two types of activities, which would seem essential if the project is to be correctly judged and appropriate changes suggested. In particular, as the project now concentrates more on the second group of activities, it appears necessary to extend the duration of the project by another year, to the end of 2004, within the present budget, or with marginal modifications. It is further recommended that a second professional officer be appointed to assist the GEF Project Manager in order to increase the frequency of country visits and follow-up.

14. With regard to project components in which the executing agencies play the leading role, the following points have been noted:

(a) Project coordination has been carried out efficiently. The GEF Coordination Committee and the Inter-Agency Steering Committee have been set up and have met regularly and exercise control over the project. There was a risk that the GEF project, with a \$3 million annual budget, grafted on a programme of the Mediterranean Action Plan with a \$7.5 million annual budget, could develop into a separate or competing entity. This was carefully avoided thanks to the good understanding and cooperation between the Mediterranean Action Plan Coordinator and the GEF Project Manager;

(b) Project expenditure has been running below budget projection, mainly because the heavy component for pre-investment studies and national action plans was budgeted in the second year, while preparations for them were not yet completed;

(c) The second largest contribution (\$1.6 million) was expected from the French Fund for the Global Environment (Fonds Francais pour l'Environnement Mondial – FFEM). This contribution has not yet been released, pending detailed agreement on modalities that would satisfy the separate requirements of the French donor and of UNEP rules. FFEM has already identified the end beneficiaries of the large country component (i.e. for capacity-building and pre-investment studies). The agreement on funding terms was delayed as FFEM expected UNEP to advance the cost of the regional training component and seek reimbursement upon completion. UNEP rules, on the contrary, require that the funds be deposited before the corresponding activities can be initiated. However, during a joint visit to Paris by the Mediterranean Action Plan Coordinator and the GEF Project Manager that took place on 24 February 2003 at the invitation of the French authorities, this issue was satisfactorily resolved and the FFEM contribution which represents almost 20 percent of the total cash budget of the project, has now been released;

(d) With regard to the updating of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, there was some misunderstanding as to whether the new Transboundary Data Analysis was to constitute an updated document, or to provide only an update to be read together with the original 1997 Transboundary Data Analysis document. The experts meeting held on 28 and 29 January 2003 clarified the issue and work can be expected to be completed in time for the next Conference of the Parties in November 2003;

(e) Work on the identification of pollution hotspots has been carried out as planned; the criteria for their selection have been developed and applied in eleven of the twelve countries to update national reports

(f) Regional cooperative actions have resulted in the preparation of eight regional draft guidelines and eight draft regional plans by the Pollution Monitoring Programme, WHO/EURO and the Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (RAC/CP). This should be acknowledged as a major success of the project because it provides specific tools for the detailed implementation of the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution;

(g) Capacity-building has taken place through regional and national training courses on the management of wastewater treatment plants, environmental impact assessment, environmental inspections and cleaner production. Several other courses are planned at the national level in the areas of management of wastewater treatment plants and environmental inspections. One regional and several national training courses on river pollution monitoring are planned for 2003. In addition, numerous national experts have been involved in the preparation of the regional guidelines and action plans of national diagnostic exercises and baseline budgets of pollutants. Such national expertise should be utilized in the preparation of national action plans to combat pollution from land-based activities;

(h) The sustainability of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) has been pursued through a baseline pilot project on the tourist resort of Hvar, Croatia, the setting up of a web site on economic instruments and the publication of a brochure. Four additional pilot projects are well under implementation. An analysis of the use of economic instruments in the Mediterranean countries has been prepared. The results so far point to the limited acceptability of an eco-tax on tourists, especially at a time of reduced a reduced number of tourists in many Mediterranean coastal areas. The reduction of pollutants from land-based activities will require very large investments. It is an issue that the Parties and donors will need to address once the priorities within SAP have been adopted and cost estimates are better known;

(i) Public participation is essential for the success of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP). However, the situation in this regard, in the Mediterranean Coastal States varies considerably from one Coastal State to the other in this regard. This remains a sensitive issue for which the project has so far offered no solutions. Two subregional meetings have been held and it is now proposed that a common methodology be developed and that public participation be supported at the national level during the preparation and adoption of national action plans;

(j) National action plans will be prepared in several stages which include the preparation of national diagnostic analyses, a baseline budget and sectoral plans and their integration into the national action plans. To assist the countries in the preparation of national action plans, baseline budgets, guidelines for national diagnostic analyses and baseline budgets were prepared and disseminated and five subregional meetings were organized in order to instruct national experts on how to prepare national action plans and baseline budgets. In addition, guidelines for the preparation of sectoral plans and their integration into national action plans have also been prepared and will be disseminated soon;

(k) The national action plan will be the starting point for national activities and the benchmark against which progress will be measured. The activities on the preparation of national action plans at country level are coordinated by the Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) and seven countries have signed memorandums of understanding for financial support under the project;

(l) With regard to the preparation of the Strategic Action Plan for Biological Diversity, considerable progress has been made in the identification of issues. The more difficult part will be the provision of priorities, to the extent possible, and an estimate of costs.

Rating of the project

15. The evaluation rated the success of the project on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest (most successful) rating and 5 being the lowest (see annex I) as follows:

Overall rating	2	Very good
Timeliness	3	Good
Achievement of results/objectives	2	Very good
Attainment of outputs	1	Excellent
Completion of activities	2	Very good
Project executed within the budget	3	Good
Impact created by the project	2	Very good
Sustainability	4	Satisfactory

Main recommendations

16. At the policy level, the following recommendations are made: that the Project Manager keep in touch with the French authorities to ensure the earliest possible use of the FFEM contribution; that the Project Manager request the countries once again to establish or to strengthen the national coordination mechanism for the project; that the Mediterranean Action Plan Coordinator convene the first donors' meeting prior to the next Conference of the Parties; and that each project component provide provisional cost estimates for the suggested measures.

17. At the project level, the following recommendations are made: that the project duration be extended by one year; that a junior professional be appointed to the project; and that two simple additional project control tools be introduced from the next project revision.

Introduction

18. This midterm review was carried out by a senior consultant. It was based on a desk review of relevant documentation, both in Nairobi and in Athens, interviews with the officials directly responsible for the implementation of the project, participation at the third meeting of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee (Athens, 28 January 2003) and at the expert meeting to review the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (Athens, 29-30 January 2003) and on interviews with agency and national experts attending the two meetings.

19. The evaluation was carried out between 20 January and 2 March 2003. The terms of reference for the evaluation are contained in annex I to the present report. The schedule of the evaluation, the list of persons interviewed and the list of documents consulted are contained in annexes II, III, and IV respectively.

20. The review was carried out under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit of UNEP, and the overall guidance of the Director of the UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination (UNEP/DGEF) in consultation with the Mediterranean Action Plan Coordinator, the GEF Project Manager, the Coordinator of the Pollution Monitoring Programme, the UNEP/DGEF International Waters Senior Programme Officer, relevant staff members of the UNEP/ Mediterranean Action Plan Coordination Unit, the director of the Regional Activity Centre for Priority Action Programmes (PAP/RAC), and project officers of the Programme Activity Centres for Specially Protected Areas (SPA/RAC) and for Cleaner Production (RAC/CP).

21. The project brief approved by the GEF Council did not anticipate a midterm review. It anticipated only a terminal desk evaluation (item 7.2 of the project brief). GEF policy recommends, however, that a midterm review be carried out on all its major projects and, in this case, it was necessary to determine whether the remaining one year in the project duration would be sufficient to complete all the proposed activities.

I. BACKGROUND

22. The Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted the Strategic Action Programme in 1997 to address pollution from land-based activities. The Programme identifies the major pollution problems of the region, indicates the possible control measures, shows the cost of such measures and establishes a work plan and a timetable for their implementation. The immediate objectives of SAP are: to protect the marine environment and coastal zones through the prevention of pollution and by reduction and, as far as possible, elimination of

23. In order to support the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme, a GEF project entitled “Determination of priority actions for the further elaboration and implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea” (GF/ME/6030-00-08), was approved by the GEF Council for a three-year duration starting January 2001 and ending December 2003. The overall objective of the project is to improve the quality of the marine environment in the Mediterranean region by better shared management of land-based pollution, through improved international cooperation in the management of land-based pollution of transboundary and regional significance. The project was directed at the elimination of pollution hotspots, the preparation of regional guidelines and plans for the elimination and control of pollution, capacity-building, the creation of a sustainable financial platform for the continued implementation of the Strategic Action Programme, the preparation of a regional programme for public participation and the preparation, adoption and implementation of national action plans specifically related to the elimination of pollution from land-based activities. The project also aims at the preparation and adoption of a strategic action plan for biodiversity for the Mediterranean, to serve the needs of the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Biodiversity.

24. The following Mediterranean countries are eligible for support from the GEF project: Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Slovenia, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey. UNEP serves as the secretariat for the Barcelona Convention. The Parties to the Barcelona Convention that are not eligible for GEF funding are: Cyprus, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Malta, Monaco and Spain.

25. While GEF funds can only be used for the benefit of the twelve countries eligible for GEF funding in the project, from UNEP’s standpoint, the geographical scope of the project is defined as Region 20 – Inter-regional Europe-Africa-Western Asia, and Subregion 11: Mediterranean Action Plan. This provides the legal basis for involving the remaining eight countries in various activities, as required.

26. Along with these countries, the European Community is also a Party to the Barcelona Convention. Currently, the Commission is not directly involved in the GEF project but is being kept informed along with all other Parties. Given the problem-solving and investment objectives of the GEF project, the Commission and the European Investment Bank should be interested in the outcome of the project and will need to be invited to take an active part in the donors’ meeting and subsequent follow-up actions.

II. REVIEW OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

27. This section reviews all the activities undertaken from project start-up to date and compares them with those anticipated in revision 2 of the project document, including the subprojects. It should be noted that the order in which the project components appear in the various documents is not always consistent. Other inconsistencies were noted in the numbering of the projects in financial documents. They are indicated in annex V.

28. In the absence of a formal decision to the contrary, it would be desirable to keep to the same sequence in all the documentation so as to facilitate comparison and cross referencing between components. The present report follows the sequence of the project components that appears in the latest reports of the GEF Coordination Committee.

29. The wording of the project brief clearly conveys the idea that the development of the Strategic Action Programme will not be completed during the duration of the project, but will be achieved subsequently and on the basis of the results of the project.

30. Project is also expected to “determine priority actions” on the basis of health impacts, environmental impacts and other factors. To this end, the project provides a set of criteria for prioritization which experts can only propose but which Governments must endorse. The project indicates what remedial action is required, i.e. legislative, institutional and financial, proposes measures that are technically feasible (best

31. Thus, maximum government commitment must be maintained throughout the project and must peak at the end of the advisory process when investments have to be made in order to implement the action plan. Conversely, the inputs of the international organizations peak at the beginning of the process, when they provide the necessary financial and advisory inputs, and level off towards the end, when Governments must take over.

32. It is against this background that the progress achieved so far and the further action required within the project should be evaluated. The officials involved in the project are aware that the process of implementation of SAP will continue after the completion of the GEF project and that this project is laying the foundations for an important long-term undertaking on the part of the concerned coastal States.

A. Achievements during the biennium 2001 - 2002

1. Project coordination mechanisms

33. After an initial period under an acting project manager, the core team was constituted only in June 2001 and this delayed recruitment has affected the schedule of activities. The project established mechanisms for coordination at two levels, the project level and the national level.

(a) The Inter-Agency Steering Committee

34. This Committee is made up of the implementing agencies and donor agencies. It is chaired by the leading implementing agency (UNEP) in accordance with the agreed procedures for GEF International Waters Projects and includes representatives of the UNEP/GEF Coordination Unit, UNEP/MEDU, UNEP/Pollution Monitoring Programme, WHO/Pollution Monitoring Programme, GEF, UNDP, the World Bank, METAP, FFEM and (UNIDO-ICS) and other potential donors. The Committee met three times, in March 2001, March 2002 and January 2003. Its responsibility is to oversee the implementation of the project and to decide on the precise modalities for the implementation and coordination of the activities.

(b) The Coordination Committee

35. This Committee is made up of the members of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee and nationally nominated GEF focal points. All Mediterranean countries have nominated their GEF coordinators. The Committee met twice, in March 2001 and in March 2002, and was briefed on the progress of the project's activities.

(c) The Ad Hoc Technical Committee

36. This Committee is made up of representatives from Mediterranean Action Plan/Polluting Monitoring Programme, WHO/Pollution Monitoring Programme, METAP and its partners, GEF, FFEM and UNIDO-ICS. It is responsible for the coordination of the implementation of pre-investment studies. It met twice, in January and March 2002.

(d) Coordination mechanisms at country level

37. In order to coordinate the actions and activities directed at the effective preparation of national action plans and to build a consensus at the national level, the countries were requested to set up inter-ministerial committees. Adequate support to the activities of the inter-ministerial committees was proposed and a related memorandum of understanding was submitted to the countries. Seven countries signed the memorandum of understanding and received the proposed support. The project secretariat has prepared the terms of reference for the activities of national GEF coordinators and the inter-ministerial committees.

38. Separate coordination mechanisms have been set up to support specific project components and will be mentioned under the corresponding headings of the report. They refer to the national focal points for the

39. These two levels of coordination were provided for in the project document. A third level of coordination was also agreed between donors. A donors' meeting was originally scheduled for September 2001 then postponed to 2002. This meeting has not been held and no specific date has been set for it. This represents a significant departure from the original project architecture whose implications for the project will be discussed later.

2. Updating of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis

40. The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis has been updated from the original report published in 1997. At the same time, additional environmental issues have been added to it such as urban runoff and the prospective impacts of the future socio-economic development of the region. It had been expected that the document would be finalized by the end of 2002.

41. When the draft was reviewed by the evaluator on 20 January 2003, the text had not been finalized as several tables were missing and some parts were being translated. The scientific aspect in some cases overshadowed the nature of the document that was directed at policy makers (in one section a complex chemical formula was included) and there were repeated admissions that in certain areas the data available were insufficient or inconclusive. This approach weakened the case for the actions recommended.

42. During the experts meeting convened to review the text, major changes were suggested and agreed on with regard to the general thrust and presentation of the draft in order to stress its role as the main assessment document for SAP.

43. As the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis document repeatedly notes, the Mediterranean community still lacks complete data sets of all land-based sources of pollution. Furthermore, gaps in knowledge and the quality of the available data are sometimes questioned as the basis for undertaking expensive and often unpopular actions. As monitoring techniques and equipment improve, previous data will tend to be reassessed or rejected. There will always be a degree of uncertainty regarding surveys that are based on samples, indicators and extrapolations. This, however, should not be used as an excuse for delaying action indefinitely.

44. For this reason, a great deal of political determination will be necessary to ensure that the activities of the Strategic Action Programme are followed up and implemented and that adequate resources are made available at both the national and the international level. For the expression of such political will, the Conferences of the Parties to the Barcelona Convention would be the natural forum, where a major financial initiative should match the priority actions approved with adequate and dependable resources.

3. Pollution hotspots and sensitive areas

45. The criteria for the selection of hotspots for the preparation of pre-investment studies were recommended at an expert consultative meeting held in April 2001 and were subsequently applied by experts in eleven of the twelve countries eligible for GEF-funding in order to revise their national reports on hotspots and provide data on the transboundary pollution impacts of these hotspots. Slovenia had already carried out a similar exercise. The country reports were considered by the Ad Hoc Technical Committee for the pollution hotspots, in January 2002, and a draft list of selected pollution hotspots for the preparation of pre-investment studies was compiled (doc.WG.198/5 annex III). The second meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Committee adopted a final priority list of pollution hotspots for the preparation of pre-investment studies. With regard to pollution-sensitive areas, criteria for their selection were proposed at a WHO/ Pollution Monitoring Programme meeting in November 2002, sent for comments to national Pollution Monitoring Programme coordinators and finalized.

4. Regional cooperative actions

46. Under regional cooperative actions, the Pollution Monitoring Programme prepared the following draft guidelines and regional plans:

Guidelines

- Development of ecological status and stress reduction indicators.

Regional plans

- (a) Collection and disposal of all polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) wastes, including the regional inventory for pesticides and PCBs;
- (b) Reduction of input of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) from industrial sources by 50 per cent by 2005;
- (c) Management of hazardous wastes, including the inventory of hazardous wastes;
- (d) Regional inventory of quantities and uses of nine pesticides and PCBs as well as of industries which manufacture or condition them;
- (e) Establishment of a regional pollution monitoring reporting and data quality assurance programme for rivers and a river (including estuaries) pollution monitoring programme;
- (f) Establishment of a regional pollution monitoring reporting and data quality assurance programme for the marine environment;
- (g) Collection of information on levels and loads of pollution reaching the Mediterranean Sea.

47. WHO/Pollution Monitoring Programme prepared four draft regional guidelines on the following:

- (a) Sewage treatment and disposal;
- (b) Industrial wastewater;
- (c) Coastal litter;
- (d) Environmental compliance and enforcement.

48. RAC/CP prepared the following drafts:

- (a) Regional guidelines for the application of best environmental practices for the rational use of fertilizers and the reduction of losses of nutrients from agriculture;
- (b) Regional guidelines for the application of best available techniques and best environmental practices in industries;
- (c) Regional guidelines for the application of best available techniques and best environmental practices in industrial installations which are sources of BOD, nutrients and suspended solids;
- (d) Regional plan for the reduction of the generation of hazardous wastes from industrial installations by 20 per cent by 2007.

5. Capacity-building

49. A regional train the trainers course on the operation and management of waste water treatment plants was held in Athens in October 2001, followed by national training courses held in Libya, Croatia (with participation from Slovenia) and Albania.

50. A regional workshop on environmental impact assessment (EIA) was held in June 2002 following the signature of the memorandum of understanding with the World Bank. Two training workshops for trainers at the national level, one in English and one in French, were organized in Tunis in February 2002.

51. A regional training course on cleaner production techniques and practices was held in Barcelona in October 2002. A regional train-the-trainers course on environmental inspections was held in Nicosia in November 2002. The absence of FFEM support caused the postponement of some courses.

52. Several additional courses are planned during the remaining part of the project, including one regional and four national courses on river pollution monitoring, five national courses on environmental inspections and three national courses on the management of wastewater treatment plants.

53. In order to have a complete picture of the capacity-building achieved by the project, it is necessary to add the extensive involvement of national officials and experts in project activities and the focal points and national correspondents in the preparation of the national baseline budget of pollutant releases, the National Diagnostic Analysis, regional guidelines, regional action plans, pre-investment studies and national action plans.

6. Sustainability of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea

54. The sustainability of SAP can only be ensured through the full participation of national and local authorities. If donors are expected to provide financing, they should be involved in the project from the beginning. The following activities have already been carried out:

(a) The baseline pilot project on the introduction of a tourist eco-charge was organized in Hvar, Croatia, in August 2002 and presented at a training course on environmental instruments in Opatija, Croatia;

(b) The national diagnostic analysis was prepared in four countries and three training courses were organized in Croatia, Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina (October-December 2002). Four additional pilot projects are under implementation;

(c) A web site containing data and experiences on economic instruments was prepared by PAP/RAC and questionnaires were sent to countries to obtain data for the site;

(d) A brochure on economic instruments was published in May 2002 and has so far been translated into three national languages - Albanian, Bosnian and Croatian. An Arabic version is under preparation;

(e) A reputed international expert, Mr. A. Markanya, and the University of Bath, are involved in developing the sustainability component for the Strategic Action Programme.

7. Public participation

55. A report on the status of information, awareness and public participation was prepared, covering the East Adriatic countries, Turkey, Malta, Cyprus and Israel and containing proposals for the drafting of a subregional component of the strategy. A meeting was held in Split in May 2002 to review the report.

56. The third meeting of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee decided to modify this action in such that instead of the preparation of a regional strategy for public participation, a common methodology would be prepared and countries would be provided with funds for public involvement in the preparation of national action plans.

57. A publication entitled "*Reducing Pollution from Land*" has been published in English, French, Arabic and Spanish and a leaflet on SAP has been published in English, French and Arabic. Both have been widely distributed.

8. National action plans to address pollution from land-based sources

58. The guidelines for the preparation of the national diagnostic analyses and baseline budgets of pollutant releases were prepared as the first stage for the preparation of national action plans and sectoral plans. They were sent to national experts and Pollution Monitoring Programme and GEF national coordinators in March 2002.

59. To increase the viability of these exercises, the national experts, who are actively involved in the National Diagnostic Analysis and baseline budget process, were called to follow-up meetings at the subregional level to review, case by case, the achievements and bottlenecks faced during the preparation of the national diagnostic analyses and baseline budgets. The meetings were organized in 2002 according to the schedule below:

Participants	Dates	Organizer	Venue
Egypt, Libya, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine	10-11 September	Pollution Monitoring Programme/GEF	Syria
Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria	7-8 October	Pollution Monitoring Programme/GEF	Tunisia
Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia	17-18 September	Pollution Monitoring Programme/GEF	Croatia
Turkey, Malta, Cyprus, Israel	21-22 October	Pollution Monitoring Programme/GEF	Turkey
Greece, France, Italy, Monaco	16-17 October	Pollution Monitoring Programme/GEF	Monaco-Ramoge

60. The guidelines for the preparation of the national diagnostic analyses and the baseline budgets of pollutant releases were approved by country-designated experts at their meeting in Catania, Italy in December 2002. The same meeting approved the guidelines for the preparation of national action plans under the provisions of SAP. The guidelines will be sent to the national Pollution Monitoring Programme and GEF coordinators by the end of January 2003.

9. Development of a Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity

61. A meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity was convened in Tunis in February 2002 to discuss the preparation of the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity. National correspondents were identified in the participating countries and were assisted by RAC/SPA or international consultants to prepare draft national reports on biodiversity. The first meeting of national correspondents was held in Alicante, Spain in July 2001. Fourteen countries have set up national steering committees for the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity. Guidelines for national reports and guidelines on the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity document was finalized with the assistance of consultants at a meeting in Tunis in May 2001. Fifteen national reports have been finalized and four are being finalized. In order to present the reports and promote consensus on them, national workshops have been organized in Croatia, Morocco, Albania, Algeria, Greece, Israel, Libya, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Turkey, Tunisia and Syria.

62. A meeting on the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) on the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity project was held in Tunis in October 2002. The following documents were prepared at the meeting:

- (a) A strategic action plan for the conservation of biological diversity in the Mediterranean region;
- (b) Draft inventory of activities and outputs developed in the Mediterranean region dealing with the Strategic Action Plan on Biodiversity project;
- (c) Effects of fishing in the Mediterranean Sea on the ecosystem – An analysis of the major threats of fishing gear and practices to biodiversity and marine habitats;

- (d) Legal analysis of the measures provided by the Mediterranean coastal States to minimize the impact of fishing activities on marine ecosystems and threatened and non-target species;
- (e) Guidelines for the development of national action plans for the control of fishing practices and gear which are harmful to threatened species and habitats, and for the reduction of ecosystem alteration resulting from fishing pressure;
- (f) Impact of fishing technology in the Mediterranean Sea;
- (g) Guidelines for the development of action plans for the conservation of marine and coastal birds;
- (h) Report on the introduction of marine and brackish species for purposes of aquaculture in the Mediterranean Sea;
- (i) Status of knowledge on marine and coastal biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea;
- (j) White coral community, canyon and seamount fauna of the deep Mediterranean Sea;
- (k) The coralligenous.

63. Forty-two national consultants identified by the national correspondents were recruited along with two international consultants and memorandums of understanding were signed with three national institutions. A workshop was organized by RAC/SPA in cooperation with the Committee on Fisheries in the Mediterranean of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) at Palma de Mallorca in June, 2002 on action plans on fishing. As a result, fifty-two national action plans have been identified, twenty have been finalized and thirty-two are in draft form.

64. With the assistance of ten consultants and following a consultation meeting in Tunis in September 2002, the first draft of the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity has been prepared.

III. EVALUATION

A. Appropriateness of the project approach

65. There can be no doubt that the GEF project, approved soon after the adoption of SAP by the Mediterranean coastal States to address pollution from land-based activities, constitutes a major boost to the capability of the region to achieve its stated objectives. The design and methodology of the project incorporate all the objectives of SAP and appear to have been properly designed in order to introduce a more action-oriented and problem-solving approach to the activities of MEDU. It should be recalled that the Parties to the Barcelona Convention at their tenth ordinary meeting agreed unanimously "to make every effort for the full implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment from Land-based Activities through the adoption of a strategic action programme to address pollution from land-based activities, and the adoption of national programmes of action as envisaged in the amended Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution" (recommendation A.I.2 in document UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.11/10, annex IV).

66. At their twelfth ordinary meeting the Parties unanimously agreed "to give emphasis to the implementation of action-oriented pollution control activities and, to this end, to give priority to the implementation of the activities of the SAP and especially to those included in the GEF Mediterranean project, in particular, activities related to pollution hotspots where the full cooperation and contribution of the countries are indispensable for their success" (recommendation II A. (a)) in document UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.12/9, annex IV).

67. At their thirteenth ordinary meeting, the Parties unanimously agreed to:

- (a) Give priority to the implementation of the activities of the Strategic Action Programme, including those under the GEF project;

- (b) Adopt the Operational Document for the Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme;
- (c) Make the reduction of municipal pollution a priority objective; establish by the year 2003 the national baseline budget for emissions for each of the pollutants identified in the Strategic Action Programme;
- (d) Adopt national action plans to address pollution from land-based sources as part of the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme. The plans should be completed by the year 2003 and be operational by the year 2005 (recommendation 2 A in document UNEP (DEC) MED IG. 13/8 annex IV).

68. The GEF project has been specifically designed to fit the existing programmes and operational structures of the Mediterranean Action Plan which it is intended to strengthen. The project retains its administrative individuality which allows it to be evaluated as a self-contained unit, and on its own merit. At the same time, there is a complementarity with the programme as of the Mediterranean Action Plan as a whole, which allowed some positive overlaps to be pursued. In some training courses, for example, participants from non-GEF-eligible countries were admitted, though not financed from this project, and some studies have included some non-GEF-eligible countries.

69. On a more substantive level, the project outputs are directly influencing several components of the Mediterranean Action Plan, particularly monitoring under the Pollution Monitoring Programme, coastal management under PAP/RAC and the biodiversity programme under RAC/SPA. This relationship cannot be ignored in the longer term and it is not too early to open discussions on how the results of the GEF project will be internalized in MAP.

70. It should be noted that the project document and the project outputs do not refer specifically to the important intellectual contribution that previous programmes of the Mediterranean Action Plan have made to the genesis of the Strategic Action Programme and, indirectly, to this project. While the project outputs were undoubtedly prepared using the information available from all activities of the Mediterranean Action Plan, the project background could have mentioned the Blue Plan exercise that had identified the major impact of refineries, power stations, tourism, maritime transport, tanker loading and unloading terminals and urbanization on the congested and fragile coastal strip, and provided cost estimates of building wastewater treatment plants in coastal cities with a population of 10,000 and above. Another relevant experience that has not been recalled is that of several Coastal Area Management Programmes (CAMPs) carried out in the Mediterranean coastal States by PAP/RAC.

71. One of the most successful aspects of the project is the way it has easily fitted into the programme of the Mediterranean Action Plan. With a yearly budget of close to \$3 million, including the FFEM contribution, compared with the MAP budget of \$7.5 million per year for the current biennium, there was a real danger that such a large new project could develop into a parallel operation, competing with MAP for government attention. It is to the credit of the Mediterranean Action Plan Coordinator and of the GEF Project Manager that this was avoided and that a very cooperative attitude prevailed.

1. Achievement of project objectives

72. It is important to make a preliminary comment on the appropriateness of the institutional framework and of the number and nature of the project components. The institutional framework – with the Inter-Agency Steering Committee, the GEF Project Coordination Committee and the other mechanisms set up at the national level – seems to be appropriate to the requirements of project control and the involvement of the countries in it. Similarly, all the project components are indispensable to the achievement of the objectives of the project.

73. The project has so far accomplished all the verifiable indicators in the matrix with a few exceptions. The criteria for selecting the priority sensitive areas have now been developed. It is not clear, however, what follow-up action will be taken once the sensitive areas are specifically identified on the basis of those criteria. As in the case of the hotspots of land-based pollution, pre-investment studies will follow and sources of financing will be sought for remedial action. In the case of the identified sensitive areas, therefore, some action should follow at the level of national legislation or of the relevant regional planning to

74. With respect to fisheries, this issue does not figure among those mentioned in the project document. It is nevertheless an unavoidable element in the development of a strategic action plan for biodiversity in the Mediterranean. RAC/SPA, under the relevant subproject GF/ME/6030-00-74, has made significant progress in this area by finalizing a regional document on the impact of fishing technology in the Mediterranean and convening a workshop in Palma de Mallorca in June 2002 on the development of national action plans concerning the impact of fishing on marine biodiversity. FAO, within whose mandate fisheries fall, is not participating in the project. Its relevant body, the Committee on Fisheries in the Mediterranean, has contributed to this component.

75. It is also too early to know whether the expected twelve national action plans will materialize although there is every expectation that they will as a result of the project. The project had anticipated the development of the national action plans and the pre-investment studies already in the second year. This was too early, given the need to develop a number of tools such as guidelines and terms of reference that were required for their implementation. This timing should be considered as a flaw in the design of the project and provides a strong argument for extending the project by one more year.

76. There are several references in the project to stakeholders and to the need for their involvement but they are not identified in detail anywhere. The implementation of the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution touches upon many layers of public administration, the business community, labour, the media and environmental non-governmental organizations. The identification of stakeholders could not take place a priori but should emerge through the development of the project and be constantly updated in the subsequent implementation of SAP.

2. Scope of project outputs

77. The outputs achieved by the project have exceeded those stated in the project document. Among the publications should be noted the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, now in the final stages of preparation, and the guidelines and regional action plans. Data collected and provided include the updated priority lists of hotspots and the report-surveys on information, awareness and public information.

78. The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis is a key tool for SAP to combat pollution from land-based sources. It justifies joint approaches and provides data to support the concept of a regional programme. The transboundary concept must not be taken in the limited sense of the physical mobility of pollutants. It is obviously applicable to pollution as pollution generated in one country is transported towards another by prevailing currents and winds and most air-borne pollution should be classified as such. Taken in the limited sense, the concept would leave out many other aspects of SAP which have been accepted components of Mediterranean cooperation for decades.

79. The transboundary concept encompasses the following: accidental oil spills; accidental loss of dangerous cargo; operational oil discharges where the source of pollution, the ship, moves across borders; the health impacts of local pollution when its target, the international tourist, moves across borders; and the effects of fisheries on the ecosystem, where the damage arises because the fishing gear, which is the cause, and pelagic fish, which is the target, both move across borders.

80. There are problems which may be locally circumscribed but are identical in nature and are widely disseminated, such as port pollution, that require a coordinated or transboundary monitoring and study approach as the most efficient and economical way of addressing them. There are local modifications that have impacts on larger ecosystems and affect the biological diversity of the Mediterranean, which is a transboundary concern.

81. Lastly, a literal interpretation of the transboundary concept would unfairly penalize countries with a very short shoreline because in their case all pollution becomes transboundary both in an active and a passive sense with regard to countries with an extended coastline where international borders are far from each other.

82. Among the tools made available to Governments and to MAP as a whole, there are eight guidelines and eight regional plans and the training courses, both regional and national, already conducted. The quality of these outputs as technical documents appears to be guaranteed by the fact that they were produced by a large number of international experts and will all be submitted for review and clearance to meetings of government-designated experts in March and April 2003. Their formal adoption, when required, will take place at the Conference of the Parties in November 2003. These outputs were directly aimed at, and used by, the national authorities in developing their national diagnostic analyses, their national sectoral programmes, and, later on in the project, will be used for pre-investment studies and national action plans. All the outputs are directly related to the project objectives.

83. From conversations with selected national participants, the evaluator got the impression that the documents produced were considered suitable for the purpose for which they were intended. In particular, the initial list of pollution hotspots, through the process of validation and as a result of dialogue with the countries concerned, has resulted in an accepted list of hotspots on which the process of pre-investment studies has been started.

84. It should be pointed out that the project documentation is sometimes difficult to read because of the excessive use of abbreviations and acronyms which is not always justified. Some abbreviations such as BOD for biochemical oxygen demand, EIA for environmental impact assessment and PCB for polychlorinated biphenyl are well known and in common use throughout the environmental literature. Others such as N expert for national expert are clearly useless and most, such as BB, NAP, NDA, IMC, PIS, RFP and others are strictly related to the project itself. They are more than likely to discourage busy government officials, company executives or the representatives of non-governmental organizations. The standard United Nations practice should be adhered to, writing the term in full the first time it is used in a document, followed by the acronym in brackets, and always providing the list of acronyms in an annex to the documents.

3. Assessment of project assumptions

85. Assumptions listed in a project refer to external factors over which the project has no control. Two sets of assumptions stated in the project were reasonable at the time of the drafting of the project. The fact that Governments have adopted the revised Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution and SAP provides a reasonable expectation that they will participate effectively in the project. This cannot be taken as a guarantee that all the recommended actions will be automatically accepted and become part of national action plans or that legislation and investments will support everything that is in the action plans. Each step will require continued political support from the countries and will need to be pushed forward by motivated and informed stakeholders.

86. The assumption that national investment will automatically follow the identification of priority hotspots, accompanied by the identification of technology and the corresponding pre-investment study, is optimistic. The assumption that the pre-investment studies "will satisfy the donors' requirements" is unrealistic since the donors have neither been identified nor convinced to participate in the process, and the requirements of each donor are very particular.

87. Major international and regional non-governmental organizations already play a role in the meetings and in some activities of MAP. However, the assumption that Governments will consequently accept that national non-governmental organizations play a role at the local level in the implementation of the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution cannot be accepted at face value.

88. With regard to the requirement that there should be public participation in all stages of the project, the complexity of this issue in the Mediterranean context has been underestimated. Specific roles and modalities will have to be developed and agreed upon within the framework of SAP to overcome objections relating to possible political and administrative interference by local non-governmental organizations in the national action plans. Non-governmental organizations share the goals of SAP and can influence public opinion more directly than government-sponsored campaigns. They can also mobilize a large volunteer workforce for environment-related initiatives. However, the mechanisms to ensure that Governments involve the non-governmental organizations community in achieving the objectives of SAP still need to be developed. This implies access to information and financial support.

89. Access to information is crucial to the long-term success of SAP. Specific programmes based on the components of SAP (hotspots, sensitive areas, target pollutants) would have to be suggested to non-governmental organizations if they are to play a supportive role in the implementation of national action plans. They cannot be expected to extract such information individually from the GEF and MAP technical documentation, and only if their actions are directly linked to the priorities of SAP, which are approved by Governments, can one be sure that their actions will be acceptable to Governments.

90. Stakeholders need to be made aware of the criteria that they need to meet if they are to play a role in the implementation of SAP. Of all the components of the project, however, public participation is the one where cultural sensitivity is the most important. For this reason, it is recommended that the common methodology for public participation decided upon by the Inter-Agency Steering Committee in January 2003 should be entrusted to a regional non-governmental organization with contacts in the countries, rather than to an individual consultant.

91. Since the non-governmental organizations in the countries covered by the project lack financial resources and technical personnel, a clear definition of what non-governmental organizations can do for SAP and what SAP can provide to the non-governmental organizations in return should be developed as soon as possible in order to mobilize their support for the implementation phase. The public participation aspect is being pursued by MAP and the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSDD) and after the conclusion of the project, it will be possible to rely on the work of these two bodies.

B. Effectiveness and efficiency

92. There were two main reasons why the schedule and the implementation timetable of the original project document were not met on time. The first reason was the late recruitment of the GEF Project Manager, who joined the office six months after the project start-up, during which an acting project manager had been appointed so that some initial activities could be started. This delay was in part compensated for during the subsequent eighteen months. The second reason, which was resolved only at the end of February 2003, was the delay on the part of FFEM to agree on the modalities for the use of its contribution, estimated at \$1,600,000. As this represented a shortfall of roughly 20 per cent of the total budget, it has delayed a significant portion of the project activities. The other activities have been conducted at budget cost and some savings have been realized.

1. Need to extend the project

93. The Inter-Agency Steering Committee, at its meeting in Athens on 27 January 2003, discussed at length the need for an extension of the project beyond its present completion date of 31 December 2003. The evaluator, taking into account the activities conducted so far and the remaining workload, has arrived at the conclusion that an extension of one year is necessary. The reasons for this recommendation, some of which were not raised in the Steering Committee, are the following:

(a) There was a six-month delay in the recruitment of the GEF Project Manager, which affected the timing of most of the activities;

(b) FFEM agreed on the modalities for the release of its co-financing, which represents a quarter of the total cash resources of the project, two years after the start of the project;

(c) The preparation of pre-investment studies and national action plans requires more time than was originally provided for in the project document since they are based on some outputs (guidelines, terms of reference) that were developed during the first two years of the project;

(d) The amount of documentation produced (guidelines, plans and data sets) has exceeded the one originally anticipated and more time is required to ensure that full use is made of it;

(e) Stakeholder participation has not been given sufficient prominence in the activities conducted to date and this weakness can be remedied if more time is made available in the project;

- (f) An extension of the project would allow more time to develop the sustainability aspect further.

2. The rate of expenditure

94. The project is behind schedule with regard to the expenditure of funds. Of the total cash budget for the \$7 million period 2001-2003, excluding the \$1.6 million contribution of FFEM, only approximately \$2 million had been spent by the end of the second year.

Percentage of total budget spent and committed as at December 2002

Project	3-year budget	Expenditure	%	Balance
UMBRELLA	3,275.000	880.726	26.9%	2,394.274
WHO	319.000	158.245	49.6%	160.755
PAP/RAC	331.000	249.160	75.3%	81.840
RAC/CP	135.000	134.071	99.3%	0.929
SPA/RAC	655.000	535.799	81.8%	119.201
TOTAL	4,715.000	1,958.001	41.5%	2,756.999

The Expenditure column includes 2001 actual expenditures and 2002 commitments pending closing of accounts

95. When the budget elements are analyzed in detail, it appears that the shortfall is due to the amount of \$1.936 million that was set aside for pre-investment studies, national action plans and support to inter-ministerial committees during the second year of the project. This was not a reasonable expectation. If these amounts are removed from the calculation, the overall rate of expenditure rises to 64 per cent and that of the umbrella project to 55 per cent. It is on these levels of delivery that the project should be rated. This delayed component should now become the topmost priority and receive maximum support. This is one good reason for recommending an extension of the project in order to allow full programme delivery. In this connection, it is recommended that one more professional officer be hired to deal exclusively with this aspect, by increasing the project's impact through country visits and constant follow-up. It is also recommended that METAP treat pre-investment studies as a matter of urgency. The Project Manager should continue to press this matter and raise it again at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

96. The term "shortfall" is used in the neutral meaning of a deficit below what was expected and represents money needed to finance the delayed activities that need to be rescheduled. A "saving" would refer to money remaining after an activity has been completed, at below the budgeted cost, and can be reprogrammed for other activities.

97. It is further recommended that the Parties, at their forthcoming meeting, be advised in detail about the situation concerning pre-investment studies and national action plans and invited to assign to them a very high priority at the national level. It must be recognized that pre-investment studies involve lengthy and time-consuming procedures designed to ensure maximum transparency in the selection process. The role of the project through the no-objection procedure is a very important one. It should not, however, delay the process unnecessarily.

C. The project's institutional capacity

98. As indicated earlier, coordination with the various agencies and institutions involved in the project is carried out through the Inter-Agency Steering Committee, which appears to be functioning as an open and effective mechanism. The absence of FFEM from two of the meetings of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee reflects the difficulties in the relationship with that partner. With regard to UNEP/MAP and

99. From the documentation provided, no cooperation was noted with the Division of Trade Industry and Economics of UNEP (UNEP/DTIE) in Paris, with the Secretariat of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), although the contents of the Regional Plan on Hazardous Wastes and the Inventory of Hazardous Wastes were based on the work of the Basel Convention and on the METAP/European Union strategy on hazardous wastes. A regular exchange of information with them would be in the interest of the project

100. Collaboration with the three Regional Activity Centres involved, in Split, Tunis and Barcelona, is also very close. Collaboration with the World Bank/METAP and with ICS/UNIDO also appears to have been satisfactory. The presence of the World Bank's METAP in the project is a definite asset. It is perhaps unusual to find that the participation of METAP is financed by the project and not borne by that programme, but the professional value of METAP's expertise in project design and evaluation justifies, in the opinion of the evaluator, such a decision. METAP participates in more than one component - capacity-building, hotspots validation and the preparation of pre-investment studies.

1. The contribution of Fonds Francais pour l'Environnement Mondial

101. The budget in the project document includes a cash contribution of \$1.6 million from FFEM. The project has already been operational for two years and this contribution has not yet been received. A negative signal was conveyed by the non-participation of a representative of FFEM in the second and third meetings of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee. From the exchange of correspondence, it appears that the problem arose from the need to reconcile procedures between UNEP, as the executing agency for the project, and the French authorities that are providing the funds. Under the rules of UNEP, a contribution must be received in cash before any commitments are made and expenditures are authorized against it. The French authorities expected UNEP to incur expenditure from its own funds and to claim reimbursement later. With regard to implementation, UNEP expects to select the countries in which pre-investment studies and capacity-building activities are to be conducted. The Steering Committee of FFEM, in approving the \$1.6 million allocation, had specified the countries and the local institutions through which the funds were to be channelled. The exact nature of the contribution of FFEM does not emerge clearly from the files and the correspondence.

102. On the one hand, it was listed in the project document as an in-kind contribution, which implied that no funds were to be transferred to UNEP for disbursement and that all activities were to be conducted, supervised and financed by FFEM, which would then contribute to the success of the project. The key requirement in this case was that the activities should be well coordinated with similar ones paid for with funds from GEF and the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework and that the same criteria and methodology should be used for the capacity-building and pre-investment studies. On the other hand, the French authorities would like the project to implement part of the activities and have offered to reimburse UNEP for the cost incurred on the basis of supporting documentation.

103. During a visit by the MAP Coordinator and the GEF Project Manager to Paris on 24 February 2003, agreement was finally reached on the use of the funds. FFEM was going to contribute 203,000 Euro in cash which included 100,000 Euro for the organization of three regional training courses, 103,000 Euro for assistance to four designated countries in the selection of consultants for pre-investment studies, the preparation of the terms of reference and monitoring of activities. Both METAP and GEF would be involved in these activities. The remaining 1.6 million Euro would be given directly to four countries for pre-investment studies and three countries for capacity-building.

104. The positive conclusion of this issue is a welcome development and its timing provides a further justification for extending the duration of the project by one year.

2. Project leadership and backstopping

105. The overall scientific leadership is entrusted collectively to the Inter-Agency Steering Committee and to the GEF Coordination Committee, composed of national officials who are technically competent and fully

106. For a project of this size, the staffing component is remarkably low and consists of one full-time professional at L-4 level supported by an administrative assistant and a secretary. Such a low ratio of personnel cost to the cost of activities has been possible because of the close relationship, in many cases amounting to integration, of the project's activities with the activities of the Coordinating Unit in Athens and the Regional Activity Centres.

107. The Project Manager appears to have provided the required leadership and drive as confirmed by the very significant outputs the project has so far produced. His management style is low-key. The responsibilities of the GEF Project Manager, however, are distinct and essential to the eventual success of the project. It may be argued that a more forceful personality would have found it difficult to fit into a project that must operate through officers in MEDU and the Regional Activity Centres who are not exclusively working on the project but have other priorities and schedules to meet.

108. The backstopping provided by the Senior Programme Officer, International Waters, UNEP/GEF, is based on a direct and up-to-date knowledge of the activities of the project.

3. Need for additional staffing

109. If the project is extended by one year as recommended, the pre-investment studies and the national action plans will require an acceleration of the country contacts, visits and follow-up. The project budget does not allow for the recruitment of another professional officer to assist the Project Manager and the desk is always covered during missions and more frequent country visits can be organized. It is recommended that UNEP explore the possibility of a participating country to second a project officer to assist in the implementation of the project.

4. New monitoring tools

110. Project monitoring is carried out by the GEF Project Manager through regular contacts with agencies and national focal points, as required, and the timely submission of half-yearly, annual and other reports.

111. It is too early to speak of indicators in terms of the logical framework matrix appended to the terms of reference in annex I of this report since the work programme will only be completed with the pre-investment studies and the national action plans at the end of the project. This is a very complex project requiring a large number of individual actions that are all duly reported in the half-yearly, yearly or ad hoc reports. The management of such a project, however, would greatly benefit from keeping a "logbook" to provide a permanent record of all events occurring during its life, entered in a chronological order. Appointment and departure of staff, recruitment of consultants, country missions, documents published, meetings and training courses organized add up to numerous individual actions. The proposed "logbook" would provide a constantly updated checklist and serve as a basis for the substantive reports.

112. There are three levels of administrative/financial control - the project administrative assistant, the MEDU finance officer, both located in Athens, and the administrative assistant financed by the project in Nairobi. They are more than adequate.

113. The project document provides the following breakdowns of commitment and expenditure:

- (a) By calendar year;
- (b) By implementing agency (UNEP MAP, WHO/EURO, PAP/RAC, etc);
- (c) By the following categories of expenditure:
 - (i) Project personnel;
 - (ii) Subcontracts;

- (iii) Operating expenses;
- (iv) Equipment and office supplies;
- (v) Miscellaneous (reporting costs, evaluation, etc).

114. The half-yearly progress reports show a further breakdown by output, classified as follows:

- (a) Meetings;
- (b) Printed material;
- (c) Not given;
- (d) Technical cooperation;
- (e) Services;
- (f) Other outputs.

115. While these breakdowns are required for purposes of financial control and should of course be retained, there is no breakdown provided by project component (coordination, Transboundary Data Analysis, hotspots, etc). It is recommended that a new analytical tool be introduced, if possible from the next project revision, allowing commitments and expenditures to be monitored by project component. Such a breakdown can be constructed from the individual budget entries. This exercise, however, should be conducted at the beginning and automatically updated throughout the project implementation. Table 2 shows that this information referred to the end of 2002, based on 2001 expenditure and 2002 budgets from all sources, in order to show how much resources vary from one component to another:

Table 2. Percentage distribution of budget resources by programme component:

Hotspots / sensitive areas	26.8%
Coordination	19.9%
National action plans	14.8%
Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity	14.2%
Sustainability of SAP	7.1%
Regional cooperation	6.9%
Capacity-building	4.2%
Public participation	3.8%
Updated Transboundary Data Analysis	2.3%
TOTAL	100%

116. This breakdown would provide useful information on the substantive project management and of the intergovernmental coordinating bodies. In financial terms, the relative importance of each component would become immediately apparent and any significant delays in meeting expenditure targets could be analyzed given that they may be due to a variety of reasons. Delays may be attributable to lack of interest of Governments in certain components and to an underestimation of the difficulties involved in obtaining data or in finding suitable experts. They may also be due to non-payment of financial or other contributions or to unforeseen circumstances that may have arisen during project implementation. Clearly, the sooner these delays are brought to the fore and their causes identified, the greater the possibility of taking remedial action without upsetting the overall timetable of the project.

D. Financial sustainability

117. The project refers to the sustainability of SAP at two separate levels. The first is the sustainability of the programme after the completion of the current project. This is addressed by the current component on

1. Taking into account the procedures of individual donors

118. Each potential external donor organization/country applies its own methodology and formats for pre-investment studies. It is unlikely that a pre-investment study conducted using a different methodology and in a different format would be considered a sufficient basis for a financing decision. The matching of projects with financial institutions will have to be done before the pre-investment study can be conducted and these decisions, for capital-intensive projects, are normally taken on an agency-to-country basis.

119. The other aspect concerns the local cost-sharing element which is required as a matter of course. Local authorities or national Governments, before they can commit funds, must follow the respective legal and administrative procedures. Member States of the European Union, for example, must apply the procurement and tendering rules of the European Union. As a result, both national authorities and international funding agencies would expect the other side to come to a decision and have its share of co-financing ready before committing itself for the balance.

120. The national and local authorities may proceed with their own project planning and financing and leave room for self-contained added features or upgrades to be financed by the external donor. Alternatively, each donor organization/country may select, on the basis of its own priority criteria, some of the hotspot projects and carry out the pre-investment studies in cooperation with the concerned national and local authorities. Once these studies have led to the earmarking of funds for the capital project, the local authorities can start activating the matching funds.

121. The two approaches present advantages and disadvantages for both sides. They are, however, not incompatible with each other. The donors' meeting should be able to give guidance on this matter because it is unrealistic to assume that once the list of hotspots is approved and some are selected for pre-investment studies, both parties will be committed to the full financing of the projects. In order to advance the process, both sides need to invest in project preparation even before there is absolute certainty that the project will be financed.

2. Providing cost estimates for recommended measures

122. At the present stage of the project, no overall cost estimates are given, but specialists know what a wastewater treatment plant costs and even the general public is aware of the clean-up cost of large oil spills or industrial accidents. It is no use hiding the fact that to move from good intentions to good projects will cost a great deal of money region-wide. The sooner figures are mentioned, the more concrete will be the debate on the implementation of SAP become, concentrating on achievable priorities as opposed to the compilation of wish lists.

123. Only the regional plan for the management of hazardous wastes includes clear references to the cost involved. At the January 2003 meeting of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee, several speakers emphasized the importance of including financial estimates of the investment required in regional plans along the lines of the plan prepared under the auspices of METAP. The participant from RAC/CP noted, however, that this might not be easy for some of the industrial sectors involved.

124. After the assessment of the environmental and health damage and of the availability of technical solutions, cost estimates are the next issue that needs to be tackled. Data can be obtained from the suppliers of clean technologies or through case studies of successful interventions. It will be interesting to await the results of the special session on the financing of MCSD scheduled to meet in Split, Croatia in May 2003.

3. The donors' meeting

125. As the process identifies many hotspots, which are the result of half a century of neglect, the level of investment required is correspondingly high. The accumulated damage of fifty years of inadequate and often

126. The meeting scheduled in the project should ideally precede the Conference of the Parties. If their response proves inadequate to meet the investment portfolio for the implementation of SAP, the Parties would need to consider a major new international initiative, such as a Mediterranean Marshall Plan, or even an ad hoc new structure, such as a Mediterranean development bank, committed exclusively to the sustainable development of the region.

E. An enabling environment

127. Under this heading, the report evaluates the extent to which capacity was stimulated and mechanisms were developed for the more widespread adoption of the integrated approach for management of land-based activities which impact the marine environment in other regions. In addition, the effectiveness of the dissemination of the products of the project is being assessed.

1. The national inter-ministerial committees

128. The inter-ministerial committees, when they are established at the national level, act as clearing houses for information on the implications of the entry into force of the revised Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution for the dissemination of the outputs of the project (guidelines, sectoral action plans) and for requests to provide data. They are as yet untested mechanisms for mobilizing internal resources and for obtaining additional external resources at the level required to meet the land-based sources targets.

2. Outreach

129. As already indicated, a strong partnership has been established with the Governments of the GEF-eligible countries through the GEF focal points, country missions, the presence of government-designated experts at some review meetings and the use of local experts for the preparation of national surveys and studies. Strong partnership has also been established with the participating agencies through the Inter-Agency Steering Committee and through close day-to-day collaboration. Relations with other relevant UNEP-implemented international waters projects are ensured through the Senior Programme Officer, International Waters, at UNEP/GEF in Nairobi. The connection with the private sector is not formalized through their associations, with the possible exception of Eurochlor, which is regularly represented at major UNEP meetings.

130. Relations with non-governmental organizations need to be strengthened. It should be noted that the in-house capability of MAP lies in the field of public information so that nothing equivalent to the well-established capabilities in marine sciences, coastal zone management, biodiversity or oil spills now exists in the field of public participation. It is recommended that additional inputs be sought from a suitable outside structure, possibly through the involvement of an active Mediterranean non-governmental organizations network.

131. The project has generated and will continue to generate a great deal of valuable technical outputs. These are directed at specific end users. The training materials, for example, reach the participants at training courses and the guidelines are distributed to the officials responsible for the identification of hotspots, etc. These materials could also be used to increase the impact made by the project, sustain the interest in the objectives of the project and help to generate pressure for its further implementation. From the wealth of material and information produced, it should be possible to extract material to feed into other project components so as to strengthen internal linkages and to allow repeated use for training.

3. Internal linkages

132. At present, there are good linkages between the coordination component and all other components, between the regional cooperation component (guidelines, sectoral action plans) and pre-investment studies

133. Linkages could be strengthened between the up-dated Transboundary Data Analysis and capacity-building and public participation, between the hotspots component and public participation and between the biodiversity component of SAP and public participation.

134. No drafts should be disseminated before the review and endorsement process by Governments is completed. However, official data such as the status of signatures and ratifications, lists of agreed hotspots and sensitive areas, pre-investment studies underway, agreed regional action plans and approved national action plans should be made easily accessible.

4. Use of national languages

135. The project has shown that for capacity-building at country level, the availability of training and other background materials in the local language is an essential requirement for success since local officials cannot be expected to be fluent in a foreign language. The availability of training materials in the national language, attractively packaged in printed or CD format at a marginal additional cost, will promote a sense of ownership of the training programme by the countries and facilitate its repeated use.

5. Dissemination of the project's products

136. At present, the dissemination of products is on a need-to-know basis, which means that the various guidelines, plans and background documentation are distributed only to the concerned officials. The only public information exercise has involved the preparation of a large poster and of a brochure which was edited in four languages. It should be noted that some institutions, notably tourist boards, local authorities and industries using outdated technologies do not welcome information on the pollution of coastal waters and problems of the coastal zone. In some cases, judiciaries have started legal action against the owners and managers of the polluting industries on the basis of environmental and health damage which has been documented and published years after it has occurred. Yet these data are essential to fuel public debate on the implementation of action on land-based sources in particular and on sustainable development in general. The data must convey the sense of urgency, the economic and health costs involved, the irretrievable loss of some resources and the fact that "not every genie can be put back in the bottle", in the words of an Arab proverb.

137. During the remaining duration of the project, it is recommended that an executive summary be extracted from all documentation for dissemination to other stakeholders, particularly the concerned private sector institutions and non-governmental organizations. The appropriate time for such an initiative would be after the Conference of the Parties.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED

138. The lessons learned in this project include the following:

(a) The integration of the project activities into the existing MAP programme has benefited the recipient countries. In many other cases, new projects devote a considerable amount of energy to establishing their separate identity from ongoing programmes. The integration has kept the overhead costs of the project low;

(b) The project was able to promote a sense of ownership of the project by the participating countries through institutional networking with Governments and agencies;

(c) The practice of conducting country level courses after regional training, together with the regular translation of the training documents into the national languages, has gone a long way in making capacity-building a country-driven activity;

(d) The responsibilities of the project and those of the countries need to be more clearly differentiated: the project is responsible for providing the framework, the technical inputs and the tools for identifying the priorities for action while the national authorities are responsible for taking action at the national level through national action plans, pre-investment studies, legislative changes and the required investments;

(e) The participation of stakeholders in every phase of project implementation needs to be reflected in the project activities and appropriate budgetary provisions should be made for it. It is not sufficient to state it as a desirable objective.

V. RATING OF THE PROJECT

A. Overall rating

139. The project is given an overall rating of 2 = Very good (75-89 per cent achievement).

B. Rating of individual items

140. In rating the project, the items below have been considered as required by the terms of reference for the evaluation.

1. Timeliness

141. Taking into account the delayed recruitment of the Project Manager and the delay of the country-implemented components, which should not have been scheduled in the second year of the project before other inputs and tools had been produced and made available to the countries, this item can be rated between 60 and 70 per cent, that is "good".

2. Achievement of results/objectives

142. The achievement of the objectives in the determination of priority actions for the implementation of MAP is rated between 75 and 89 per cent or 2, that is "very good".

3. Attainment of outputs

143. Attainment of outputs, through the delivery of guidelines, regional action plans and other supporting documentation is rated over 90 per cent or 1, that is "excellent".

4. Completion of activities

144. In view of the number of capacity-building activities falling within the second part of the project, readjustments in Transboundary Data Analysis and public participation, the achievement of the project is between 75 and 89 per cent or 2, that is "very good".

5. Project executed within the budget

145. On the basis of the reallocation of country-related expenditure for the purpose of establishing a correct assessment of expenditure ratio, the achievement is between 60 and 74 per cent. This item is therefore given a rating of 3, that is "good".

6. Impact created by the project

146. On the basis of the speed with which coordinating mechanisms were established and are functioning, the frequency and range of training offered, the achievement is between 75 and 89 per cent. This item is therefore given a rating of 2, that is "very good".

7. Sustainability

147. Given that the environmental instruments have not yet shown their potential and the fact that no donors' meetings have taken place, the achievement is between 50 and 59 per cent. This item is therefore given a rating of 4, that is "satisfactory".

VI. CONCLUSIONS

148. The project under review addresses the core objective of the Barcelona Convention. This common objective has kept the twenty coastal States, very different from each other in many respects, cooperating under the auspices of UNEP for over twenty-five years.

149. The long-standing Pollution Monitoring Programme, stressing common methodologies, upgrading of scientific facilities and expertise for region-wide comparability of data, was developed for the actual combating of pollution from all identified sources. The project brings that goal closer by identifying and prioritizing the main hotspots and asking countries to develop national action plans for addressing pollution from land-based activities.

150. All these steps inevitably raise expectations for outside assistance to meet the high cost of capital-intensive solutions that will be identified by the pre-investment studies. The donors, including the international lending agencies and the richer Mediterranean coastal States, should give positive signals with regard to the expectations raised by this project. The project itself, however, should not be judged by the amount of investment it generates since investment decisions follow entirely different procedures over which UNEP has no control. The MAP secretariat can only monitor and report on the progress made in this field.

151. An added value of the project is that it has not limited itself to end-of-the-pipe solutions but has tried to address other aspects of the complex web of decisions that together result in a degraded sea and coastline, such as clean technologies, the identification of sensitive areas and biological diversity and started to address the difficult issues of sustainable financing and the promotion of public participation.

152. In the time available and with the resources devoted to them, the last two issues cannot be fully developed and both UNEP and GEF should be aware of the need to give them further support in the future. Already, the outputs of this project provide ample material on which to build such additional support.

153. There is no doubt that, given another year to complete its work, the project will have made a substantial contribution towards its stated goal, which is the further elaboration and implementation of SAP.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Recommendations at the policy level (in order of priority)

154. At the policy level, the following recommendations are made that:

(a) The Project Coordinator, assisted if necessary by the MAP Coordinator, keep in touch with the French authorities to ensure the earliest possible use of the FFEM counterpart contribution as a prerequisite for the successful implementation of the project;

(b) The MAP Coordinator convene the first meeting of donors prior to the next Conference of the Parties to MAP as part of the SAP process. At this meeting, the project secretariat should provide information on the actions taken to date to identify pollution hotspots, to initiate pre-investment studies and to obtain available cost estimates and request inputs from the donors concerning financing opportunities. This meeting of donors should not in any way be construed as a pledging conference;

(c) The Project Manager take every opportunity to stress that the role of the project is to assist Governments in the implementation of MAP for combating pollution from land-based sources, but that it is

(d) The Project Manager write again to the countries to stress the need to establish national inter-ministerial committees and to strengthen them where already established, as a key institutional component for the implementation of SAP;

(e) All project components provide, whenever possible, tentative cost estimates for the measures suggested for the reduction or elimination of pollution from land-based sources;

(f) All project components identify the stakeholders for the various elements and stages of the implementation of SAP;

(g) All project components stress the capacity-building element of the project by promoting the involvement of nationals who have received training in the SAP process.

B. Recommendations at the project level (in order of priority)

155. At the project level, the following recommendations are made that:

(a) UNEP extend the project duration by one year within the present budget or with marginal adjustments;

(b) UNEP include an additional professional officer at junior level in order to ensure permanent desk coverage, more frequent country visits and persistent follow-up in the second phase of the project; since the post is not provided for in the budget, UNEP should explore the possibility of a project officer being seconded by a participating country;

(c) The Project Manager entrust the preparation of the document on the promotion of public participation in the preparation of the national action plans to a recognized regional non-governmental organization with contacts in the participating countries;

(d) UNEP introduce from the next project revision two additional project control tools, namely, a "logbook" for the chronological recording of project events and a breakdown of the budget by project components;

(e) The Project Manager strengthen internal linkages between project components by promoting the use of the existing outputs of one another in their respective work programmes;

(f) In future project presentations the Project Coordinator refer to the important role that MAP has played (through the Pollution Monitoring Programme, the Blue Plan and the Coastal Area Management Projects) in the genesis of this project;

(g) The officers responsible for all project components limit the use of acronyms and abbreviations in their documents so as to render them accessible to a wider audience, and include a list of acronyms in every document;

(h) The Project Manager involve in the project other units that are active in closely-related fields, such as UNEP/DTIE, the Secretariat of the Basel Convention, the Global Action Plan for the Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment Against Pollution from Land-based Activities (GPA) office in the Hague and the METAP/European Union strategy on hazardous wastes.

Annex I

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT
"DETERMINATION OF PRIORITY ACTIONS FOR THE FURTHER
ELABORATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC
ACTION PROGRAMME FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA"
(GF/ME/6030-00-08, GF/ME/6030-00-71 - WHO/EURO, GF/ME/6030-00-72 - PAP/RAC, GF/ME/6030-00-73 - RAC/CP, GF/ME/6030-00-74 - SPA/RAC)

1. Introduction

Under the overall supervision of the Officer-in-Charge, Evaluation and Oversight Unit (THE EVALUATION AND OVERSIGHT UNIT) and the overall guidance of the Director of the UNEP/ Division of GEF Coordination UNEP/DGEC in consultation with the Coordinator of the Mediterranean Action Plan, the GEF Project Manager, the Senior Programme Officer, International Waters Programme, UNEP/DGEF and relevant staff members of the UNEP/Mediterranean Action Plan Coordination Units and the directors of the Regional Activity Centre for Priority Action Programmes (PAP/RAC), the Regional Activity Centre for Clean Technologies (CP/RAC) and the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (SPA/RAC), the evaluator shall undertake a midterm evaluation of the project GF/ME/6030-00-08, GF/ME/6030-00-71 - WHO/EURO, GF/ME/6030-00-72 - PAP/RAC, GF/ME/6030-00-73 - RAC/CP, GF/ME/6030-00-74 - SPA/RAC during the period 20 January - 2 March 2003 (three weeks spread over six weeks).

2. Background

In 1997, the Parties to the Barcelona Convention on the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona Convention) adopted a strategic action programme, the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea (SAP) to address pollution from land-based activities. SAP identifies the major pollution problems of the region, indicates the possible control measures, shows the cost of such measures and establishes a work plan and a timetable for their implementation. The immediate objectives of SAP, which have been agreed upon, are: to protect the marine environment and coastal zones through the prevention of pollution and by reduction and, as far as possible, elimination of pollutant inputs, whether chronic or accidental; and to develop and implement national programmes of action for the protection of the marine environment from land-based sources.

A GEF Mediterranean project, "Determination of priority actions for the further elaboration and implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea" (GF/ME/6030-00-08), whose overall objective is to improve the quality of the marine environment in the Mediterranean region by better shared management of land-based pollution, through improved international cooperation in the management of land-based pollution of transboundary and regional significance. The project also aims at the preparation and adoption of a strategic action plan for biodiversity for the Mediterranean to serve the needs of the Specially Protected Areas and the Biodiversity Protocol. The GEF Mediterranean project will support the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme to Address Pollution from Land-Based Activities in the Mediterranean Region.

The project consists of numerous activities which are directed towards the elimination of pollution hotspots, the preparation of regional guidelines and plans for the elimination and control of pollution, capacity-building, the creation of a sustainable financial platform for the continued implementation of SAP, the preparation of a regional public participation programme, the preparation, adoption and implementation of national action plans specifically related to the elimination of pollution from land-based activities and the preparation of the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity.

The total cost of the project is \$12,244,000, to which GEF contributes \$ 6,069,000. Major co-financing agencies include: the Mediterranean Trust Fund, counterpart contribution, FFEM, METAP, WHO/European Regional Office PAP/RAC, and RAC/CP. UNEP is the implementing agency of the project. The executing agency is the secretariat of the Barcelona Convention.

The project is of a three-year duration starting January 2001 and ending December 2003.

3. Legislative mandate

This project meets the objectives of GEF Operational Programme #10 - International Waters Land-based Activities Demonstration Project component (paragraph 10.13). The proposed actions are consistent with the GEF principle of linking project elements with major cross-cutting issues such as land degradation and with the UNEP Environmentally Sound Management of Inland Waters (EMINWA) integrated watershed management planning process and related regional seas programme. The proposed actions are also consistent with UNEP's role under the Global Plan of Action for the Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment against Pollution from Land-Based Activities (GPA). More specifically, since its inception, the project has been supporting UNEP's programme of work and its subprogramme of work related to the sustainable management and use of natural resources caring for freshwater, coastal and marines resources.

4. Objectives

The purpose of the midterm review is to diagnose possible problems in project implementation and suggest necessary corrections and adjustments in the implementation of the project, by evaluating, inter alia, the effectiveness of project management, including delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness.

The findings of the mid-term review will be based on the following:

- (a) Desk review of the project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as half-yearly project reports, GEF programme implementations reports, project status reports) and relevant correspondence;
- (b) Specific products, including datasets, surveys, documents presented at the Inter-Agency Steering Committee meetings, diagnostic analysis reports and other technical information;
- (c) Interviews with the of the MAP Coordinator, the GEF/MAP Coordinator and relevant staff of the UNEP Coordinating Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MEDU), UNEP/DGEF Senior Programme Officer for International Waters and others, who are available during his/her mission to Athens;
- (d) Participation in the third meeting of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee and the experts meeting for review of the Transboundary Data Analysis to be held in Athens.

5. Scope of the midterm evaluation

The scope of the midterm evaluation will cover the following broad concerns:

- (a) Appropriateness of project approaches: Assessment of approaches adopted by the project in realizing its objectives and assessment of the assumptions made during the project design stage, taking into account the project outputs produced to date in relation to the stated project objectives and expected results;
- (b) Effectiveness and efficiency: Assessment of the extent to which expected outputs and results have been achieved, as per the planned budget and time frame and if these were achieved in a cost-effective manner;
- (c) The project's institutional capacity: Evaluation of the efficiency of the project management and institutional arrangements;
- (d) Financial sustainability: Determination of whether or not the project has secured sufficient and reliable funding for the successful delivery of project outputs;
- (e) Project sustainability/enabling environment: Evaluation of the extent to which the project has involved the various stakeholders in the implementation, how effective the resulting networking and collaboration have been utilized by both parties and the level of collaboration with project partners and other stakeholders;

(f) Lessons learned: Identify good practices and lessons learned to date in the implementation of the project.

Guidelines on evaluation indicators are provided in the UNEP Project Manual pp. 13-89 -13/99 and are also available on http://www.unep.org/Project_Manual/

6. Terms of reference

The evaluator shall:

(a) Determine the appropriateness of the project design, methodologies, policy and procedures in achieving the stated project objectives and programme objectives of UNEP;

(b) Determine how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives (goal and purposes) have been met to date, taking into account the “objectively verifiable indicators” as elaborated in the logical framework matrix of the project brief;

(c) Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced or being produced to date, i.e. publications, chapter outlines, data, tools, and indicators, etc., in relation to their expected results;

(d) Identify the changes made in the original project design, i.e. any changes made in the objectives, procedures, target stakeholder groups etc., and determine if these changes were appropriate;

(e) Determine if the assumptions made during the project design stage were realistic;

(f) Determine how the project met the schedule and implementation timetable cited in the project document and later revisions thereof. If the schedule and the implementation timetable were not met, identify causes for the delays;

(g) Determine if the project delivered the outputs within the budget and if this were done cost-effectively. In cases where variances occurred, identify the causes of such variances, i.e. new activities added, activities cancelled, overestimation or underestimation of the original budget, failure to meet financial obligation by co-financiers, etc., and assess the adequacy of the financial management;

(h) Evaluate the project management and the institutional framework with a view to establishing the lessons learned for the future of the project. The evaluation should make specific reference to the following:

- (i) The effectiveness of organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration between the various agencies and institutions, i.e., UNEP/MAP, UNEP/Global International Water Assessment (GIWA), the European Regional Office of the World Health Organization (WHO/EURO), World Bank/METAP) and the various bilateral donors involved in project implementation;
- (ii) Determine the effectiveness of project management in terms of assignment and implementation of project activities by the staff paid through co-financing and the contribution by looking at the effectiveness of the management/execution arrangements at all levels - the Inter-Agency Steering Committee, the GEF Coordination Committee, the Ad Hoc Technical Committee, day-to-day project management - and proposing necessary adjustments as well as appraising the potency of the scientific leadership mechanism of the project, proposing any alternative measures should the need arise. The evaluator will also review the entire project staffing situation and assess the efficiency of the project support/backstopping mechanisms;
- (iii) Determine the effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms, monitoring tools, i.e. impact indicators, and the management system employed throughout the project’s duration;

- (iv) Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that have influenced the effective implementation of the project and make recommendations for operational changes;
- (i) Determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the fund-raising strategy and campaign and the extent to which available funding, both in-kind and cash, will suffice to undertake the project;
- (j) Determine the extent to which capacity has been stimulated and mechanisms have been developed for the more widespread adoption of the integrated approach for management of land-based activities which impact the marine environment in other regions;
- (k) Determine the level, adequacy and success of the engagement and outreach activities of the project, in particular the following:
 - (i) The extent to which the project has forged effective partnerships and linkages with Governments, the private sector, United Nations bodies, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders;
 - (ii) The extent to which the project takes the needs of stakeholders into consideration in all phases of project implementation;
 - (iii) The extent to which awareness and acceptance of the project have been created among identified and targeted stakeholders;
 - (iv) The level of stakeholder involvement in the implementation of the various project activities, the lessons learned and recommendations on how such involvement could be improved in future projects;
 - (v) The effectiveness of dissemination of the products of the project.
- (l) Determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of the capacity-building strategy and activities at all levels to conduct integrated ecosystem assessments and to act on its findings;
- (m) Identify good practices and lessons learned to date in the conduct of the project.

7. Evaluation reporting format

The evaluation report should be composed of a concise summary, not exceeding five pages, including findings and recommendations and a detailed evaluation report. The detailed evaluation report without annexes should not exceed forty pages. The report, together with the annexes, will be written in English and be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

In preparing the report, the consultant should:

- (a) Establish logical linkages between the findings and the recommendations;
- (b) Classify recommendations by order of importance and distinguish between policy-level recommendations and project-level recommendations;
- (c) Make recommendations realistic, understandable and operational;
- (d) Make recommendations from the perspective of maximizing the impact and the sustainability of the results rather than merely from a technical or institutional standpoint.

The evaluator will rate the success of the project on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest rating and 5 being the lowest.

In rating the project, the following items will be considered:

- (a) Timeliness;
- (b) Achievement of results/objectives;
- (c) Attainment of outputs;
- (d) Completion of activities;
- (e) Execution of the project within the budget;
- (f) Impact created by the project;
- (g) Sustainability.

Each of the items should be rated separately. The following rating system shall be applied:

1=Excellent	(90-100% achievement)
2=Very good	(75-89%)
3=Good	(60-74%)
4=Satisfactory	(50-59%)
5=Unsatisfactory	(less than 49%)

8. Outputs of the evaluation

The output of the evaluation will be an evaluation report to UNEP, which will present the report to the GEF Mediterranean project secretariat. An electronic version of the final evaluation report will reach UNEP not later than 2 March 2003 and should be addressed as follows:

Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey, Officer-in-charge, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
UNEP, P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-2) 624181
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

With a copy to:

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaflaf, Director
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: + 254-2-624166
Fax: + 254-2-624041/4042
Email: ahmed.djoghlaflaf@unep.org

and

Mr Vladimir Mamaev
Senior Programme Officer
International Waters
UNEP/DGEF
The Division of GEF
Co-ordination
Tel: (254-2) 62-46-07
Fax: (254-2) 62-40-41
Email: vladimir.mamaev@unep.org

9. Schedule of the evaluation

The evaluation should commence on 20 January 2003 and be completed by 2 March 2003. The evaluator will travel to UNEP/MAP, Athens, to meet with the MAP Coordinator, the GEF Mediterranean Coordinator and relevant staff of MEDU. During the stay in Athens, the evaluator will attend the third meeting of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee (28 January) and the experts meeting for review of the Transboundary Data Analysis (29-30 January). The evaluator will also meet in Athens with the UNEP/DGEF Senior Programme Officer for International Waters to discuss the implementation of the project (31 January).

The evaluator will present a draft of the evaluation report in English by 15 February 2003 to the Officer-in-charge of the Evaluation and Oversight Unit who will relay copies to the UNEP/GEF Coordinating Unit and the GEF Project Manager. These will provide written comments on the draft evaluation report to the evaluator through the Evaluation and Oversight Unit within seven days of receipt of the draft. The evaluator will incorporate these comments and present a final version of the evaluation report to the Evaluation and Oversight Unit in English by 2 March 2003.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the terms of reference and the time frame agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld until such a time as the products are modified to meet UNEP's standards. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute an evaluation report.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

PROJECT PLANNING MATRIX			
SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS
Overall Objectives			
Improved marine environmental quality of the Mediterranean	Reduced pollution load; ¹⁷ Reduced inputs from land-based activities	Measurable reduction in land-based discharges, observed through national and regional monitoring	That Governments will agree to invest the required baseline costs. This assumption presents a low risk given that SAP as already endorsed by the Parties outlines the anticipated costs.
Outcomes			
Improved management of the Mediterranean marine and coastal environment at regional and national levels through the implementation of SAP	Regional: Adoption of the finalized Regional Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis by the Parties to the Barcelona Convention Endorsement by the Parties to the Barcelona Convention of the finalized SAP	Report of the Conference of the Parties Report of the 10th ordinary Conference of the Parties to the Barcelona Convention	The revised Transboundary Data Analysis will be accepted by the Parties. This assumption seems likely to be met since agreement was reached on the value of the Transboundary Data Analysis and the need to revise certain sections. This critical assumption of the PDF-B phase was met through adoption and endorsement of SAP at the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Barcelona Convention held in Tunis November 1997.
	National: Adoption by national Governments of national action plans that include transboundary and regional considerations	Eleven nationally published national action plans	That Governments will develop and adopt national action plan that include regional considerations in their assessment of national priorities for action. This assumption seems likely to be met given existing national commitments to regional action under the Mediterranean Action Plan, the Barcelona Convention and its LBS Protocol. The Strategic Action Plan includes an obligation on states to produce such plans.

¹⁷ The extent and nature of this reduction can only be determined following completion of the pre-investment studies.

Improved integration of fisheries and pollution management in the Mediterranean	Agreement on joint priorities for action between the GFCM and the Mediterranean Action Plan and adoption by the Parties to the Barcelona Convention and participating States in the GFCM of joint goals and objectives relating to fisheries and environment	Meeting reports	That Governments support more integrated approaches at national level to the management of fisheries and environmental issues. This assumption presents a higher risk than those outlined above due to sectoral approaches at the national level, the GFCM has directed FAO to cooperate with the Mediterranean Action Plan, thus reducing this risk.
Improved regional capacity for environmental impact assessment, environmental auditing and management; operation and maintenance of wastewater treatment plants etc.	Numbers of individuals trained	Periodic reports to GEF and the Parties by the Project Coordinator on the implementation of training activities	That Governments will release appropriately qualified staff for purposes of training, an assumption which is likely to be met since such training is envisaged under the endorsed SAP.
Improved participation of the public and non-governmental organizations	Endorsement of the plans of participation of the public and non-governmental organizations by appropriate regional meetings	Meeting reports and publications by MEDU	Already, major non-governmental organizations play a defined role in executing components of the Mediterranean Action Plan, hence it seems likely that the assumption that Government will agree to such involvement will be met.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (Cont.)

Results			
Finalized Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis	Adoption of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis by the Parties to the Barcelona Convention	Publication of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis by MEDU; meeting reports	That the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis can be finalized in a manner acceptable to the Governments. This assumption seems likely to be met since the concerns of Governments have been registered and revision is envisaged in the next quarter.
Criteria for selection and adoption of priority listing of hotspots of regional significance Criteria for selection and adoption of priority sensitive areas of regional and global significance that are at risk from land-based activities	Endorsement of the criteria by regional expert meetings and adoption of the priority listing at national and regional level Endorsement of the criteria by regional expert meetings and adoption of the priority listing at national and regional level	Meeting reports and publication of the criteria by MEDU; Meeting reports and publication of the criteria by MEDU.	Governments will agree and adopt the priority listing at the national and regional level. This assumption will likely be met since the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and SAP identify 103 hotspots of regional importance. Governments will agree on and adopt the priority listing at the national and regional level. This assumption will likely be met since the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and the SAP identify fifty-one sensitive areas of regional importance.
Eight sets of regional guidelines for sewage treatment disposal of urban solid waste, industrial wastewater, application of best available technologies, best environment practices, clean technologies, etc.	Adoption of the guidelines by appropriate expert group and Conferences of the Parties	Meeting reports and publication of the eight sets of guidelines by MEDU	That guidelines that are acceptable to national Governments can be drafted. This assumption is likely to be met since the development of such guidelines was agreed on as a component of SAP.

Eight regional plans for collection and disposal of PCB wastes reduction of BOD loading by 50% by 2007; reduction of hazardous by 20% waste by 2007 etc.	Adoption of the regional plans by the appropriate expert group and meetings of the Parties	Meeting reports and publication of the eight regional plans by MEDU	It is possible to draft regional plans that are acceptable to national Governments. This assumption is likely to be met since the development of such regional plans was agreed on as a component of SAP.
Jointly agreed actions relating to fisheries and the environment	Adoption of priorities by the GFCM and Parties	Meeting reports of MEDU and GFCM	That joint discussion of priorities and agreement can be reached. As noted above, this assumption presents a higher risk than the others given the sectoral approach to fisheries and the environment at the level of the national Government. However, the last meeting of the GFCM directed FAO to collaborate with MEDU on these issues.
Up to 11 national action plans for recipient countries	Adoption and approval of national action plans at country level	Publication of the plans in the National Gazette and other official media	That countries will develop and adopt national action plans in support of SAP. This seems likely to occur since SAP includes agreement on their development and framework elements for inclusion and the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution require development of national action plans.
Establishment of the management framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring of staff; • Meetings of the Inter-Agency Committee; • Two donor consultations. 	Issuance of contracts; Disbursement records;	Meeting reports; donor investments;	That staff can be hired within three months of completion of the internal project document
Regional cooperative actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of eight 	Availability of drafts and convening of expert meetings according to the agreed	Publication of regional guidelines and plans	That regional guidelines and plans will be prepared and adopted at the regional level is an assumption likely to be met since these activities were agreed on

sets of regional guidelines; • Preparation of eight regional plans.	workplan		as a component of SAP.
Hotspots: Development of criteria and impact analysis; Selection of priority hotspots Completion of pre-investment studies of selected hotspots by countries.	Preparation of drafts and convening of regional expert and subsequent meetings of the Parties according to the agreed work plan; Adoption of pre-investment studies at national level.	Publication of criteria and listing of selected priorities; meeting reports; signed agreements.	That countries will agree to select priority hotspots is an assumption likely to be met, since a list of 103 hotspots was identified in the Strategic Programme of Action. That countries will agree to undertake pre-investment studies of selected hotspots. This seems likely to be met since countries were directly involved in the identification of the initial 103 hotspots.
Sensitive areas: Development of criteria and analysis; Selection of priority sensitive areas for investment and action.	Preparation of drafts and convening of regional expert and subsequent meetings of the Parties according to the agreed work plan	Publication of criteria and listing of selected areas of regional priority	That countries will agree to select priority sensitive areas is an assumption likely to be met since a list of fifty-one sensitive areas was identified in SAP.
Fisheries and environment: Detailed analysis of issues and joint resolution of priority areas for action	Preparation of draft analysis and convening of joint expert group meetings according to agreed work plan	Publication of analysis and priority areas for joint action	It is assumed that GFCM and MAP will work jointly on the implementation of this component.
Sustainability of SAP: Development of economic instruments to assist in the sustainability of SAP	Preparation of draft proposals and national level discussions according to the agreed workplan Adoption of the economic instruments at regional and national level	Appropriate action at the national level to implement the proposed actions	The assumption is that national Governments will take action to implement the recommendations. The risk associated with this assumption cannot be evaluated since this will depend on other national development and investment priorities. However, through careful integration of the regional priorities into national action plans, it is hoped that this assumption will be met.
Capacity-building: Conduct eight regional training courses	Disbursement records according to the agreed work plan	Reports on training courses and numbers of individuals trained in implementation of the activities of SAP	It is assumed that Governments will release individuals for training, an assumption that has a high probability of being met.

<p>Public Participation: Prepare and implement the regional programme of action for public participation in the implementation of the SAP MED</p>	<p>Identified role of non-governmental in the execution of SAP</p> <p>Preparation and dissemination of information and public awareness materials</p>	<p>Adoption of the regional programme by the Parties</p>	<p>It is assumed that countries will agree to the development and implementation of the regional plan of public participation since this component was identified in SAP.</p>
<p>National action plans Drafting of up to eleven national action plans</p>	<p>Preparation of drafts according to the agreed work plan and timetable</p>	<p>Publication and adoption of the national action plans</p>	<p>It is assumed that countries will cooperate actively in the development of national action plans since national action plan were identified as important activities in SAP and in the Protocol on Land-based Sources of Pollution</p>

Annex II

TIMETABLE OF THE EVALUTATION

20 January 2003	Nairobi	Evaluation started
20 to 25 January 2003	Nairobi	Desk review of in-house documentation
26 January 2003	Travel	Nairobi-Athens
27 January 2003	Athens	Interviews with Coordinator of the Mediterranean Action Plan and staff GEF Mediterranean Action Plan Coordinator and staff Desk review of documentation
28-29 January 2003	Athens	Attendance at the Inter-Agency Steering Committee Interviews with agency and Regional Activity Centres participants
30 January 2003	Athens	Attendance at the experts meeting for review of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis Interviews with selected participants
31 January 2003	Athens	Concluding review with the Mediterranean Coordinator, UNEP/DGEF Senior Programme Officer and GEF Project Manager
3 to 18 February 2003		Drafting of the report
19 February 2003	Nairobi	Draft report presented to the Office-in-charge, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
3 March 2003	Nairobi	Comments provided by UNEP/GEF Nairobi and GEF/MED, Athens
3 to 10 March 2003	Nairobi	Consultant incorporates comments in draft
10 March 2003	Nairobi	Final version presented to the Evaluation and Oversight Unit

Annex III

LIST OF OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED

Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey, Officer-in-Charge,
Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP,
Nairobi, Kenya

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Director,
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination,
Nairobi, Kenya.

Mr. Vladimir Mamaev, Senior Programme Officer,
International Waters,
UNEP/DGEF,
Nairobi, Kenya. *

Mr. Lucien Chabason, Coordinator,
Mediterranean Action Plan,
Athens, Greece.

Mr. Ante Baric, GEF Project Manager,
UNEP/MAP,
Athens.

Mr. Saverio Civili,
MED POL Coordinator,
MEDU, Athens.

Mr. Fouad Abusamra,
Programme Officer,
MED POL,
MEDU, Athens.

Mr. George Kamizoulis,
WHO/EURO Project Officer,
UNEP/MAP,
Athens.

Ms. Tatjana Hema,
Programme Officer
MEDU, Athens.

* Mr. Mamaev was also present in Athens during the week of the consultant's mission.

Mr. Baher Kamal,
Information Officer,
MEDU, Athens.

Mr. Khaled Ben Salah,
Admin/Fund Officer,
MEDU, Athens.

Ms. Tanya Vaporides,
Administrative Assistant, GEF,
MEDU, Athens.

Mr. Ivica Trumbic, Director,
PAP/RAC, Split.
Athens*

Mr Giovanni Torchia,
SPA/RAC, Tunis.
Athens*

Ms. Mar Santacana,
International technician,
RAC/CP, Barcelona.
Athens*

Mr. Jafaar Friaa,
METAP Consultant,
The World Bank,
Middle East and North Africa Region,
Tunis.
Athens*

Mr. Gennaro Longo,
Director,
Area of Earth, Environmental and Marine
Sciences and Technologies
UNIDO-ICS
Trieste, Italy
Athens*

Ms. Elina Raautalahti-Miettinen,
Coordinator Northern Hemisphere,
Global International Water Assessment (GIWA),
UNEP-GIWA Coordination Office,
University of Kalmar, Sweden
Athens*

Mr. Michael Scoullis,
President, Mediterranean Information Office,
for the Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development,
Athens.

Athens* indicates that the interviews were conducted in Athens

The consultant regrets that he did not have the opportunity to meet with Mr. Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator of the Mediterranean Action Plan, who was away on mission.

Annex IV

LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

GF/ME/6030-00-08

Mid-term review of the project “determination of priority actions for the further elaboration and implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean sea”

GF/ME/6030-00-71 – WHO/EURO

GF/ME/6030-00-72 – PAP/RAC

GF/ME/6030-00-73 – RAC/CP

GF/ME/6030-00-74 – SPA/RAC

The project brief.

The UNEP Project Manual.

HALF-YEARLY AND ANNUAL REPORTS BY THE PROJECT MANAGER

Meeting documentation

GEF COORDINATION COMMITTEE

1 st Meeting,	Athens,	March 2001
2 nd Meeting,	Tirana,	March 2002
3 rd Meeting,	Athens,	January 2003

INTERAGENCY STEERING COMMITTEE

1 st Meeting,	Athens,	March 2001
2 nd Meeting,	Tirana,	March 2002
3 rd Meeting,	Athens,	January 2003.

AD HOC TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

1 st Meeting,	Athens,	January 2002
2 nd Meeting,	Tirana,	March 2002

Report of the eleventh Conference of the Parties to the Barcelona convention, UNEP (OCA)/MED IG.11/10

Report of the twelfth Conference of the Parties to the Barcelona Convention, UNEP (OCA)/MED IG.12/9

Report of the thirteenth Conference of the Parties to the Barcelona Convention, UNEP (DEC) MED IG. 13/8

Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the Mediterranean Sea (TDA MED) 264 page draft,
10 December 2002

Model memorandum of understanding on pre-investment studies

Memorandum of understanding between the World Bank as administrator of “Mediterranean Technical Assistance Programme (METAP)” and UNEP-the Mediterranean Action Plan

Public participation and civil society in the Mediterranean for environment and sustainable development

MCSO strategic review for sustainable development in the Mediterranean region

MED POL Strategic Action Programme to Address Pollution from Land-Based Activities

Hotspots pre-investment studies identification mission to Turkey, May 2002.

Hotspots Pre-investment studies identification mission to Syrian Arab Republic, September 2002.

Regional training course for trainers on municipal wastewater treatment plant operation and management, October 2001

Regional training course for trainers on environmental impact assessment, 2002

Regional training course for trainers on environmental inspection systems, November 2002

National training courses on municipal wastewater treatment plant operation and management, Libya, Croatia, Albania, May-October 2002

Expert consultation meeting to finalize the scientific criteria for Prioritization of Transboundary pollution hotspots, 2001

Expert consultation meeting to finalize the scientific criteria for pollution sensitive areas in the Mediterranean, 2002

Revision of pollution hotspots in the Mediterranean – country reports and hotspots with potential risk of transboundary effect

Brochure entitled “Reducing Pollution from Land”

Annex V

LISTING OF PROJECT COMPONENTS IN PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

In the GEF project brief, thirty-three activities were grouped under the following nine project components:

- (a) Project coordination;
- (b) Regional cooperative actions;
- (c) Hotspots;
- (d) Sensitive areas;
- (e) Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity in the Mediterranean;
- (f) Sustainability of SAP;
- (g) Capacity-building;
- (h) Public participation;
- (i) National action plans.

In the project document and in the subprojects, the components were listed as follows:

- (a) Project coordination;
- (b) Hotspots;
- (c) Regional cooperative actions;
- (d) Capacity-building;
- (e) Public participation;
- (f) National action plans;
- (g) Updating the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis.

In subproject GF/ME/6030-00-72

Sustainability of the Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea

In subproject GF/ME/6030-00-74

Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity

In the Project Implementation Report II, Part II under project objectives rating, the project components are listed as follows:

- (a) Hotspots;
- (b) Principles for priority actions;
- (c) Pre-investment studies;

- (d) Guidelines for national action plans;
- (e) Assistance to countries for national action plans;
- (f) Participation of non-governmental organizations;
- (g) Finalization of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis;
- (h) Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity.

In the same document, in the section on the progress of the implementation, ninety-four activities are grouped under a different sequence of project components as follows:

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| (a) Project coordination | Activities 1 to 4 |
| (b) Hotspots | Activities 5 to 11 |
| (c) Regional cooperation | Activities 12 to 62 |
| (d) Revised Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis | Activity 63 |
| (e) Strategic Action Programme for the Mediterranean Sea | Activities 64 to 73 |
| (f) Capacity-building | Activities 74 to 81 |
| (g) Public participation | Activities 82, 83 |
| (h) National action plans | Activities 84 to 86 |
| (i) Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity | Activities 87 to 94. |

Project numbering also varies in some progress reporting as follows:

GF/ME/6030-00-08	remains unchanged	
GF/ME/6030-00-71	carries the codes	ME/XM/6030-00-05 GFL/2328-2731-4292 MEL/2328-2664-4292
GF/ME/6030-00-72	carries the codes	MEL/2328-2664-4293 GFL/2328-2731-4293
GF/ME/6030-00-73	remains unchanged	
GF/ME/6030-00-74	carries the codes	MEL/2328-2664-4295 QML/2328-2731-4295

Annex VI

GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN THE PROJECT

GEF eligible participating States

Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Lebanon,
Libya, Morocco, Slovenia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey

Other Mediterranean Action Plan States

Cyprus, France, Israel, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Spain

Active centres

UNEP-MEDU-GEF Project Manager, responsible for overall project coordination

Regional Activity Centre for Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC), responsible for subproject GF/ME/6030-00-72

Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (SPA/RAC), responsible for subproject GF/ME/6030-00-73

Regional Activity Centre for Clean Production (RAC/CP) responsible for subproject GF/ME/6030-00-74
WHO/MEDU responsible for subproject GF/ME/6030-00-71

METAP contributes to hotspot validation, pre-investment studies and capacity-building

UNIDO-ICS supports the preparation of one pre-investment study in Croatia

INTERNATIONAL COORDINATING MECHANISMS

The Inter-Agency Steering Committee

The Committee is composed of representatives of the following implementing and donor agencies: UNEP/GEF Coordination Unit, UNEP/MEDU, UNEP/MED POL, WHO/MED POL, GEF, UNDP, the World Bank, METAP, FFEM,, UNIDO-ICS as well other potential donors. It oversees the implementation of the project and decides on modalities for the implementation and coordination of activities.

The Coordination Committee

The Committee is composed of the members of the Inter-Agency Steering Committee and of the nationally nominated GEF coordinators. It is the formal link between the project and the participating countries.

The Ad Hoc Technical Committee

The Committee is composed of representatives from MAP/MED POL, WHO/MED POL, METAP and its partners, GEF, FFEM and UNIDO-ICS. It coordinates the implementation of the pre-investment studies.

The SAP- BIO Advisory Committee

The Committee deals with the development of the Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity component.

COORDINATING MECHANISMS AT THE COUNTRY LEVEL

Inter-ministerial committees

The committees coordinate activities for the effective preparation of the national action plans. Sustainability of the Strategic Action Programme national focal points.

Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity national correspondents.

PROGRAMME COMPONENTS

Coordination of the GEF project covers the staff component and the committee meetings. The updated Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis provides the scientific support for the implementation of SAP.

Hotspots and sensitive areas: This component leads to the agreed determination of the pollution hotspots on which Governments need to take remedial action.

Regional cooperation: This component develops the tools – guidelines and action plans – needed for the determination of hotspots, sensitive areas, pre-investment studies and national action plans.

Capacity-building: This is the training component designed to improve the capacity of Governments to deal with the implementation of SAP.

Sustainability of SAP: This component tries to identify new sources of financing necessary for the implementation of SAP.

National action plans are the final output of the project, the basis for national and donor investment for remedial measures required by the implementation of SAP.

The Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity: This component aims at developing an agreed strategic action plan for biodiversity in the Mediterranean.

Public participation: This component aims at promoting public participation in all phases of SAP.
