* Albania: Mr. Lirim Selfo, Chairman, Committee for Environmental Protection, Ministry of Health/Environment,
* Egypt: Mr. Salah Hafez, CEO, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
* Lebanon: The Minister, Ministry of Environment
* Morocco: Mrs. Bani Layachi, Director, Ministry of Environment
* Palestinian Authority: Mr. Nabeel Sha'ath, Minister of Planning

Tunisia: Mrs. Amel Benzarti, Director, International Cooperation, Ministry of Environment

Albania: Ministry of Health/Environment, Committee for Env Protection
Egypt: Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
Lebanon: Ministry of Environment
Morocco: Ministry of Environment
Palestinian Authority : Palestinian Environment Authority
Tunisia: Ministry of Environment

OTHER PARTICIPATING AGENCIES : Conservatoire du littoral
Tour du Valat biological station
Ramsar Convention Bureau,
MedWet Initiative
Wetlands Inte rnational
Mediterranean Action Plan

ESTIMATED APPROVAL DATE : October 1997

PROJECT DURATION : Five years

GEF PREPARATION COSTS : PDF "B" $ 162,245
French GEF contribution $25 000
Tour du Valat contribution: $35 000
Conservatoire du littoral contribution: $ 55 000
Governments ' contribution: in kind
UNDP Lebanon $4 000

COUNTRY /AUTHORITY AND SECTOR BACKGROUND

Introduction

1. The main objective of this project is to build capacity in the participating countries in the Mediterranean region to conserve threatened, globally significant biodiversity in coastal and wetland eco-systems within the framework of sustainable coastal development. The project therefore aims at “closing the Mediterranean circle”, in terms of wetland and coastal conservation initiatives. The project will ensure that lessons learned and experiences made in the northern rim of the Mediterranean can be effectively transferred and, where applicable, applied and/or adapted to the prevailing circumstances in the participating countries. The regionality of the project provides a greater cost effectiveness and effectiveness for such information and experience transfers both on a north-south basis as well as on a south-south basis.

2. For the purposes of this project, eligible wetlands, primarily of lagoon type, are those whose flows are interconnected with the Mediterranean Sea, while coastal areas are the terrestrial components of the coastal zone in the vicinity, and under the influence of the Mediterranean Sea. The project does therefore not address navigational and marine pollution issues and nor marine biodiversity. These are presently covered by other existing and planned programmes, in particular under MAP/UNEP (GEF PDF B: Formulation of a strategic action programme for the Mediterranean Sea to address pollution from land-based activities).

3. This proposal addresses conservation of globally threatened biodiversity in 16 important wetland and coastal sites in five Mediterranean countries and in the Palestinian Authority. Through a combination of innovative land-use and wetland policies at national level, site protection and management at local level and regional networking and exchange of experience the proposal will provide a biodiversity protection increment to other brown programmes addressing pollution and water resource issues in the beneficiary countries/authority. At site level mechanisms for taking account of local concerns and ensuring local participation and economic returns are built into the project from the outset.

4. The Mediterranean region has seen the rise and fall of many empires over the last 2500 years. Numerous invasions and commercial links, many of them by sea, have seen eastern traders found cities in the western basin, Catalan influence extend as far as Greece, and Arabic culture penetrate well into the Iberian peninsula. These fluxes, together with the enclosed nature of the sea, have led to the establishment of a common Mediterranean identity and culture. This identity is reinforced by the circum-mediterranean climate of hot dry summers and rainy winters, which is also responsible for the development of ecosystems characteristic of the region.

5. The Mediterranean coastline (26,000 km) is an area of high biodiversity, where more than 50% of the 25,000 plant species are endemic to the region. It is also a critical area for migratory birds in the Africa-Palearctic flyway as wetlands in the region provide an essential flyway stepping stone on either side of the Mediterranean Sea and between the sea and the vast expanse of the Sahara desert to the south.

6. The major threats to the exceptional biodiversity of these wetland and coastal ecosystems relate to uncontrolled development, urbanization, increasing national and international tourism, land-based pollution, and unplanned or over-exploitation of natural resources, in particular freshwater.

7. Aware of their common heritage, the Mediterranean States and European Union have developed common programmes and policies for the sustainable development and conservation of the coast since 1975. The Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP Regional Seas Programme), the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, METAP, LIFE, MedWet, Natura 2000 and MEDA (EU) are some of these regional initiatives.

8. The MedWet programme for the conservation of Mediterranean wetlands originated from the Grado Conference (Italy, 1991). The initiative was recently widened (Venice, 1996) where all the riparian States present endorsed a common strategy for the conservation of Mediterranean wetlands. In parallel, the Mediterranean Action Plan, Conservatoire du Littoral (France) and Ramsar Convention secretariat held a joint technical meeting on coastal zone management (Hyères, 1995) where 12 countries agreed on the need to develop land use policies for effective management of the coastal zone.

9. Today, the States of the Mediterranean region are at different stages of economic and institutional development and therefore differ in their capacity to address biodiversity issues within the context of sustainable development. Incremental funding is required to allow them to implement agreed regional policies in the field.

Mediterranean Biodiversity Overview

10. As a result of its geology, varied climate and richness of habitat types, the biological diversity of the Mediterranean region is exceptionally high, and its flora is the fourth richest in the world after Brazil, Columbia and China and richer than other global biodiversity hotspots, such as South Africa[1]. The meeting of three continents, an enclosed sea, climate fluctuations within Europe and Africa over the last 10,000 years and the long-standing impact of man on local ecosystems has created and maintained a wide range of habitats.

---

[1] Quezel P and Médail F, 1995, La région Méditerranéenne, centre mondial majeur de biodiversité végétale. 6eme rencontre de l'Agence Régionale pour l'environnement Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur.

11. The diversity of vascular plants in the Mediterranean exceeds that of other regions of the world.

Region	**Area in km^2**	**No of plant species**	**No of endemic species**	**% endemic species**
Mediterranean	2,300,000	25,000	12,500	50%
Zaire	2,345,000	11,000	2,800 (approx)	30%
India	3,166,000	15,000	5,000	30%
Australia	7,682,000	22,000	7,600	34%

12. Knowledge of the biodiversity of the region is heterogeneous at country/Authority level, sometimes restricted to species lists, occasionally also including spatial distribution. Data is dispersed, and there is no regional summary, nor ***internationally recognised*** baseline for assessing which plants or invertebrates listed as endemic or on national red lists are in fact truly globally threatened. Data in this report are based on the biodiversity overview prepared during the PDF and involving national and international experts (see Annexes 4 and 5).

13. A recent detailed study for the Mediterranean region of Morocco (BCEOM-SECA) shows that it has particularly high species diversity and endemism and holds approximately 3,800 species of plant, of which 829 are endemic. Four of these are in danger of extinction and 238 species are directly threatened. Other countries with high species richness and endemism representative of the region as a whole include Syria (2,600 species, 395 endemic) and Greece (4,000 species, 554 endemic).

14. The biological diversity of the Mediterranean is not limited to plants. Of 62 species of amphibian in the Mediterranean, 35 are endemic (56%), as are 111 of the 179 reptile species (62%). In Morocco, for example, there are 93 reptile species, 20 of which are endemic (21%). Of the 184 mammal species recorded, 25% are endemic and 52 species are threatened (excluding marine mammals).

15. The Mediterranean is also hugely important for its bird populations, being on the migration route of millions of waterfowl. An estimated 2 billion migratory birds of 150 species use Mediterranean wetlands as stopover or seasonal sites. About 50 per cent of the wintering Western Palaearctic populations of ducks and coot occur in the Mediterranean region.

16. However, the number of waterbirds has declined by 46 per cent in the last 15-20 years, from 2.8 million in the early 1970s, to 1.5 million in 1989. Population of the globally threatened Ferruginous duck fell by 93 percent. Twenty globally threatened bird species live in the region. Seven of these breed in Mediterranean wetlands, and wetlands host about seventy other species whose populations are locally threatened.

17. It should be noted that in Mediterranean-type ecosystems, which are seasonally dry, wetlands concentrate disproportionately high fractions of the landscape’s biota, thus underscoring the importance of the “wetlands in drylands” phenomenon. The table below outlines the globally threatened taxa in relation to total taxa in each of the beneficiary countries:

	Albania	**Egypt**	**Lebanon**	**Morocco**	**Tunisia**	**Palestinian Authority**
Mammals	69	102	52	92	80	93*
Birds	320	421	250	408	362	289
Reptiles & amph.	28	89	42	112	68	50*
Flora	3250	2066	2700	6930	2200	2470

Total threatened sp.	215	240	53	365	110	72
Coastal threatened sp.	69	83	23	67	63	45
Proportion of coastal threatened sp. in total threatened sp.	32,10%	34,60%	43,40%	18,40%	57,30%	62.5 %

*: Approximate due to lack of data

Regional Trends Threatening Biodiversity

18. The countries of the region are in different stages of economic development and each has a development model influenced by its history, culture and legal system over the centuries. Trend analysis, and in particular the Blue Plan scenarios for the future of the Mediterranean, shows that the main factors inducing loss of coastal and wetland ecosystems are common to many countries and include:

- inadequate intersectoral planning
- population migration to the coastal strip leading to urban and touristic development
- increasing demand for water
- expansion of agricultural land
- inadequate response to pollution (brown issues)
- tourism pressures

19. The Blue Plan showed that in 1950 two thirds of the population lived on the northern shores of the Mediterranean Sea but by the year 2025 the population living in the southern and eastern shores will have increased fivefold, and the northern shore will only represent one third of the total. 125 million people (35%) of the Mediterranean population already live in the coastal strip and the 14,000 km^2 which were urbanised in 1985 will rise to 30,000 by 2025. In addition, tourism, mostly to beach resorts, is also expected to increase from 116 million in 1985 to 500 million by 2025. Coastal ecosystems are severely impacted by this coastal development especially those parts of the coastline which are accretionary (46%) rather than rocky (54%).

20. The coast lies at the interface between land, river and marine systems and activities within each of these interconnected components affect coastal environments. This requires intersectoral planning and clear land-use policies, especially for the large areas of government-owned land which are typical of the beneficiary countries.

21. Water and water quality is an important preoccupation of many Mediterranean countries subject to unpredictable annual rainfall, the high demands of agriculture and the increasing demand for urban and tourism development. Within the region, over 70% of water is used for irrigation, usually at less than cost price. Some countries are facing severe water stress as the water demand exceeds 80% of the available resources (Tunisia, Libya, Israel, Egypt), others still have considerable leeway (Albania, Greece, Lebanon, Morocco, Turkey) although with local problems due to the geographical distribution of supply and use. Programmes are underway (e.g. METAP) or planned (e.g. 1997 Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Water) in order to tackle some of these problems.

22. The diverse functions and values that wetlands may provide are not fully recognized even though these may provide significant services to local com munities (floodwater storage, increase in water quality, groundwater recharge, fisheries, ...).

23. Many wetlands in the Mediterranean have been lost, mainly by drainage for agriculture, but also for industry, housing and tourist development, or degraded through domestic, agricultural or industrial pollution. Some areas have lost 60 per cent of their wetlands during the 20th century. In Greece, in the five years from 1960 to 1964, 24,600 hectares of wetlands were destroyed, 120,000 hectares of land were drained and flood protection was provided for 108,000 hectares. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has lost 62 per cent of its wetlands since the turn of the century. Tunisia has lost 28 percent of its wetlands in the last 100 years; the most affected area has been the catchment of the Mejerdah river which has lost 84 percent of its wetland area. In Spain, 60 percent of the historical wetland surface has been lost, most of it in the last 40 years, and in Albania more than a third of the country's wetlands have been drained since the 1940s.

24. Albania is emerging into the Mediterranean community after many years of isolation. Its coastline remains largely free of construction, and is currently zoned for tourism investment. Lebanon is rebuilding after internal strife and turbulence, yet its coastline is 95% developed, and only three small natural areas remain. In Egypt, secondary housing and tourism developments are spreading rapidly outwards from coastal agglomerations, while the Palestinian Authority is obliged to address severe environmental problems against great odds, yet parts of its coastline remain of value for globally threatened biodiversity.

25. The lack of clearly-defined land-use policies and inadequate intersectoral planning means that the coastal zone is impacted piecemeal by different sectoral interests. As the biodiversity sector has no champion in these circumstances, or is seen as a brake on development, coastal and wetland ecosystems are not fully taken into consideration. In many cases biodiversity is lost through inadequate knowledge or appreciation of its presence, or value, rather than as a deliberate, thought-out act.

Regional Response to Biodiversity Loss

26. Despite differences between Mediterranean countries, there are common trends which have shown the logic of the Mediterranean region acting in concert to resolve shared problems such as coastal management, marine and coastal pollution and catchment management. Within the framework of regional conventions or regional programmes, the main activities deal with common policies, agreements, concerted actions, funding for pollution legislation, enforcement and monitoring, and listing of protected sites.

27. Charters, declarations, conventions and protocols signed by countries signify the commitment of their government to tackle the region's environmental problems, but the financial and human resources required to implement agreed priority actions, such as the 1996-2005 programme of Mediterranean Action Plan, remain limited.

28. These actions include biodiversity conservation and management which cannot be fully implemented in the less-developed riparian countries. This is due to a lack of finance, of adequate legislation or institutions, of trained staff and of relevant information. If this implementation is difficult at the national level, it is even more problematic at the site level. Consequently the gap continues to grow between the biodiversity conservation efforts developed by the developed countries of the region, with the support of EU Directives and finance, and the efforts of the developing countries of the Mediterranean.

29. The present project is therefore an effort to begin to “close the circle” of the Mediterranean so that the lessons learnt with respect to biodiversity and land use management of wetlands and coastal zones are exchanged and adapted between different countries of the region. Their implementation in national settings in a cost-effective and efficient manner will secure greater global benefits.

30. During the project preparation process, contacts have been made with the relevant programmes listed below, and the analysis of their activities and of results has shown the necessity to increase biodiversity conservation efforts at the site level through the implementation of new tools as included in numerous recommendations (land use and water use policies, integrated coastal zone management).

31. The main actors for coastal zone management and biodiversity conservation in the Mediterranean Region are:

32. The UNEP/Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) and its tools: - legal Barcelona Convention, - financial: Mediterranean Trust Fund, and, - technical the Regional Activity Centres (in particular Special Protected Areas (SPA), Priority Actions Programme (PAP) and Blue Plan) and its new Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development. MAP develops specific action through regional centres such as PAP for integrated coastal zone management, the SPA on biodiversity and Blue Plan for development/environment monitoring in all countries.

33. The UNDP national offices in particular through the development of national policies and project support (in particular for water supply).

34. The Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (1991-2002 - joint programme between UNDP, World Bank, EU and EIB). For Phase III (1997 to 2002) actions include coastal management and intersectoral issues on water and pollution. METAP III will not address green issues, and the complementary and indirect linkages with this GEF proposal are outlined in Annex 6.

35. The European Union (EU) is active as a partner of MAP and METAP, but also with specific programmes under the European Commission (EC). The most relevant programmes for the coastal and wetland ecosystems are CORINE, LIFE, and in the near future MEDA. The EU countries have adopted a concerted approach to biodiversity conservation through the "Habitats Directive "(1992). Over 80% of the species listed under this Directive have a Mediterranean distribution and the EC provides around 50 million ECU per annum to support actions under the Directive, in particular through constitution of the Natura 2000 network.

36. International NGOs activities such as WWF, EEB and the international organisation IUCN (Environmental Law Centre; Species Survival Commission ; World Commission on Protected Areas) seek to develop regional actions, but adequate funds are not always available for fully operational programmes.

37. Another significant project which addresses wetland issues is the GEF funded (Pilot Phase) project for El Kala National Park (Algeria). The present project will link up with the El Kala project team to ensure that lessons learnt from this project can be readily applied to the present project.

38. Finally, the World Bank implemented and GEF funded MedPorts project (Oil Pollution Management Project, operational in Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and now also adding Egypt) is an important complimentary project to the present initiative. The MedPorts project is focusing on the reduction of hydrocarbons entering the international waters of the Mediterranean. While the present MedWet/Coastal project is not addressing marine biodiversity, the project is addressing biodiversity conservation in terrestrial wetlands and coastal eco-systems. The efforts of the MedPorts project to put in place national contingency plans, as well as cooperative plans to combat oil spills, will certainly lead to a reduction of the potential risk of oil pollution in fragile wetland and coastal eco-systems.

39. International environmental conventions with a specific focus on the Mediterranean include the Convention on wetlands (Ramsar, 1971) and the Barcelona Convention. The Ramsar Convention provides small grants for wetland conservation, assists Contracting Parties with the management of designated sites and promotes the establishment of national policy for wise use of wetlands within the framework of the 1997 - 2002 Strategic Plan. Ramsar has established close working links with the Mediterranean Action Plan / Barcelona Convention and with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

40. The MedWet initiative for the conservation of Mediterranean wetlands is an important regional initiative which originated from the Mediterranean Wetland Conference held in Italy in February 1991. A Steering Committee composed

of the five EU Mediterranean states, the Ramsar Bureau, the European Commission and three NGOs (Wetlands International, WWF and the Tour du Valat centre for mediterranean wetland research and conservation) established the basis for the MedWet Initiative. The first phase (1992-1996) concentrated on the development of tools and methodologies to support wetland conservation efforts, especially in the fields of inventory and monitoring, training, management, public awareness and application of research results.

41. The initiative was widened in Venice in June 1996 where riparian states endorsed a common strategy for the conservation of Mediterranean wetlands [2]. In October 1996, the Ramsar Steering Committee gave its formal support to the Ramsar Bureau promoting this activity as a regional initiative under the Ramsar Convention. The initial, European phase, cost 6,6 million ECUs, the extension to 5 non-EU countries (Albania, Croatia, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco) in 1996 a further 1 million ECUs (see Annex 9). The EC has contributed a total of 5,3 million ECU to this programme.

42. At regional level, cooperation and exchange of information on management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation is essential if the region as a whole is to conserve its biodiversity effectively. This regionality fosters cost-effectiveness, increased forum for learning and exchange and facilitates the “closing of the Mediterranean circle”. The existing networks are all relatively recent, but they have shown that inadequate exchange of experience in the past has led many countries to follow similar paths of trial and error, rather than building on the experience available in the region to deal with similar problems. Networks must remain technical (not diplomatic, or constrained by restrictive operating procedures) to be effective, while drawing their mandate from clearly established national and regional policies. This is not to suggest a restrictive involvement of only the respective Ministries of Environment. Indeed, it is considered an integral part of the project that inter-ministerial cooperation will be necessary if the cross-sectoral nature of the root causes is to be successfully addressed. The project will therefore work, through the established inter-ministerial mechanisms (e.g. (i) Egypt’s Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency’s placing within the Cabinet of Ministers; (ii) Morocco’s Committee on the Quality of the National Environment (chaired by the Prime Minister) as well as its Conseil Superieur de l’Eau which addresses all inter-ministerial water planning issues; (iii) Albania’s Council for Territorial Planning (chaired by the Prime Minister) which guides all land and water planning issues; (iv) Lebanon’s Council for Reconstruction and Development which oversees all sectoral development efforts in the country; (v) Tunisia’s Ministry of Environment has an inter-ministerial mandate to address all territorial planning through its Territorial Planning Departments and (vi) in the Palestinian Territories, the Palestinian Environment Authority is established under the Palestinian Authority and is therefore required to guide the PA in its formulation of land and water use policies.).

[2] Venice declaration

Programme Development, threat and site analysis

43. The PDF project was approved in December 1995 under the biodiversity focal area and the French GEF has offered co-funding to include Lebanon in this important initiative.

44. Activities under the PDF focused on an analysis of threats and root causes of the losses of biodiversity of global significance. As can be seen from the tables on the following pages, these threats vary from site specific threats, to threats which are linked to policy and legislative issues. Overlaying sites with the highest number of globally threatened species, with issues such as community, local and national governmental commitment, as well as their flyway importance were considered in the prioritization of the final sites .

45. The priority sites identified in each country/Authority provide the basis for urgent actions to protect threatened biodiversity. They also provide a framework to which further sites can be added in future in order to address coastal and biodiversity issues in the country/Authority in accordance with the requirements of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The experience from site level will feed into the activities for addressing root causes of biodiversity loss at national level and provide case studies necessary for justifying the need for policy change.

46. Activities therefore focused on the definition of agreed lists of globally threatened species at regional level, an analysis of the current activities underway in the Mediterranean region, and the establishment of national working groups to identify priority sites and design project activities coordinated by the national focal point.

47. A regional analysis of the existing institutions, policies and programmes was undertaken in order to assess the present and planned activities focused on the root causes of loss of coastal and wetland biodiversity. Analysis of the activities of each major player in the Mediterranean region allowed identification of gaps and additional needs which are addressed by this proposal.

48. National working groups were established in each beneficiary country/Authority, through UNDP/GEF focal points, to assess biodiversity distribution, to select pilot sites and develop project activities. The methodology applied for the selection of national priorities for conservation is based on the criteria developed by a group of regional experts in the conservation of Mediterranean coastal ecosystems, organised by RAC/SPA and IUCN in 1993.

49. A National Team of Experts carried out this biodiversity evaluation for each country, coordinated by the national biodiversity focal point. The regional and global status of individual species were assessed by an international working group of biodiversity experts, coordinated by MedWet/ Tour du Valat with input from the World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

50. After an analysis of the national institutional and legal framework, priority areas for conservation in the coastal zone were identified, as well as proposals for their protection and management. Documentation was collected from regional sources in particular UNEP/MAP centres such as RAC/SPA, PAP and Blue Plan, METAP, UNDP and from university scientists. Priority sites were selected, taking into account other criteria such as the existence of related programmes and project viability. A full list of reports prepared under the PDF at national and regional level is given in Annex 5 .

51. It should be noted that the sites retained are **the** most important sites in the countries from the global biodiversity significance point of view as up to 57% of known globally-threatened species in each beneficiary country/authority occur in the Mediterranean coastal zone. Moreover, it is of paramount importance to stress that the sites suffer from a range of root causes and threats and thus the project will support a wide variety of accompanying actions to remove these threats. The project, therefore, presents an important opportunity for demonstration. Furthermore, all

participating countries have undertaken to repeat successful actions in other sites (which do not form part of the present proposal), and the replication potential is significant, both in the participating countries and in the region as a whole.

52. The project is not promoting national parks as a whole-sale solution to the constraints at hand. Rather, the project is promoting different sustainable use options, each defined as a response to the specific threats, the biodiversity present and the present land use practices. There are many kinds of incentives which the populations in the project areas have identified as sustainable use options which they would like to pursue further under the project. These options will be further elaborated through the management process and will include better and more sustainably managed fisheries, regulated and sustainable hunting, controlled grazing, controlled wood gathering, leisure areas, and pollution and flood controls due to better wetland management.

53. The proposed five year time-scale for the project is based on an assessment of the considerable groundwork laid by the beneficiary countries over the last three or four years for coastal zone and wetland management; it should be stressed that the project will be building on a firm and existing base, rather than starting from scratch. The discussions held during the 14 months PDF have also served to consolidate a clear policy orientation, and this will continue under the ensuing final project design phase until start-up. When including the PDF preparation time, this additional time means that in fact the project dialogue process will cover a seven year period in total, assuming project start-up in October 1997.

For each country/Authority, the Table below summarizes information on:

- the national, coastal and site biodiversity and its global importance (GTS: globally threatened species),
- the selected sites and the main threats for local biodiversity,
- the proposed activities at the site and at the national levels ,
- the present status of each site is defined with an 0 through 5 rating as follows:

0 = Totally degraded. Restoration improbable.
1 = Degraded; negative trends continue. Restoration possible.
2 = Integrity and ecological function of site damaged. Negative trends continue.
3 = Site relatively intact. Threats beginning to impact on ecological functioning.
4 = Ecological functioning of site intact, but threats increasingly apparent.
5 = Site is pristine. Ecological int egrity intact. No detectable threats.

Insert map 1 here

Insert map 2 here

Table 1. Overview of biodiversity, sites selected, principal threats and project activities
Status at the present time is listed on a scale of 0 (totally lost/degraded) to 5 (pristine)

T U N I S I A **Biodiversity**	**SITES + STATUS**	**EXISTING THREATS**	**PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES**	**INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**	**PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES**
NATIONAL Flora 2200 Mammals 80 Reptiles 60 Amphibians 8 Birds 362 GLOBALLY THREATENED SPECIES (GTS) : 110 On the coastal zone 63 ON THE 3 SITES : 24 7 birds 3 reptiles 2 mammals 8 plants 4 invertebrates	**Dar Chichou Oued Abid** 6350ha GTS 4 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Local, dispersed agric pollution Over- Pumping of water Coastal dune erosion Hunting Over-grazing Tourism	Legal protection Water management Users awareness and training Dune fixation Enforcement and wardening Wardening and awareness Tourism plan	Long term site protection to conserve biodiversity Reduction in pumping and agricultural inputs Stabilise coastal dunes Reduced hunting pressure Grazing regime compatible with biodiv cons. Control of tourist flux Association of local people with conservation programmes	Legislation, regulation land use policies Coordination Participation Training Awareness information Networking

T U N I S I A Biodiversity	SITES + STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
	Korba Kelibia 1500ha GTS 6 Status : 2	Lack of legal protection for biodiversity conservation	Legal protection	Long term site protection	
		Urban development spreading towards sensitive areas	Regulation enforcement; Land use policies; land acquisition; alternative urban plan	Prevent spread of urban areas from Korba and Kelibia and protect shoreline	
		Pollution (solid and liquid waste)	Seek alternative sites for waste dumps Sewage infrastructure and waste treatment	Treat sewage and prevent fly-tipping in sensitive areas	
		Water circulation	Hydrological management	Maintain links with the sea and catchment	
		Coastal dune erosion	Dune fixation	Consolidate coastal dunes	
		Hunting	Regulation enforcement and wardening	Reduce hunting pressure Control tourist access.	
		Tourism	Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Associate local people with conservation programmes	

T U N I S I A Biodiversity	SITES + STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
	El Haouaria Zembra Area1200ha GTS 16 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation (excepted Zembra Park) Over-grazing by sheep and goats Hunting and bird catching Growing visitor pressure	Legal protection Wardening and awareness Regulation enforcement wardening Eco-tourism plan	Ensure long term protection for the site (in addition to Zembra) Organise grazing regime compatible with biodiv conservation Reduce hunting pressure taking account of falconry tradition. Control fluxes to avoid impacts on GTS Associate local people with conservation activities	

A L B A N I A Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL : Flora 3250 Mammals 69 Reptiles/amphibians 28 Birds 320 GLOBALLY THREATENED SPECIES (GTS): National 215 Coastal zone 69 ON THE 2 SITES : 53	**Narta** 10000 ha GTS 18 Status : 2	Lack of legal site protection for biodiversity conservation Water stagnation and sediment accumulation Salt production works pumps water from lagoon Pollution (chemical dump which may in future seep into lagoon) Unplanned tourism	Legal protection Hydrological management to maintain water circulation Integrate saltworks into holistic mgt. process Plan safe disposal (chemical pollutants) Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Long term site protection Maintenance of links with the sea and catchment Ensure compatibility with biodiv. Cons. Remove threat of pollution to lagoon Establish pilot operations with local people.	Legislation, regulation land use policies capacity building Coordination participation Training Awareness information Networking
	Llogara **Kanali** **Orikumi** **Karaburum** Area 25000 ha GTS 44 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Over grazing Wood collection Fire Hunting Drainage of wetland Unplanned tourism	Legal protection following departure of military Regulation enforcement, wardening and awareness to divert threats away from sensitive areas Intersectoral planning Awareness-raising Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Long term site protection Maintain the forest and maquis cover Reduce hunting pressure Maintain key parts of wetland Promote sustainable tourism	

LEBANON Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
National : Flora 2700 Mammals 52 Reptiles 42 Birds 250 GLOBALLY THREATENED SPECIES (GTS) : National 53 Coastal zone 23 On the 3 sites : 12 7 birds 3 reptiles/amphibians 1 mammal, 1 fish	Aammiq Area 3000 ha GTS 12 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Local over-pumping of groundwater Over-Grazing Hunting Fires Agricultural extension and intensification Unplanned future tourism	Legal protection Improve local water management and reduce water consumption by crops Wardening and awareness Sustainable agriculture plan Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Ensure long term site protection (innovative on private land) Reduced pumping, Reduce fires, hunting and grazing where incompatible with biodiv cons. Integrate agriculture and conservation Sustainable agric inputs. Promote visitor's centre, paths, birdwatching and link with GEF Jbel Barouk	legislation, regulation land use policies capacity building Coordination participation Training Awareness information Networking
	Ras Chekaa Area 700 ha GTS 3 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Unplanned urban development spreading into sensitive areas Agricultural extension Industrial pollution Unplanned tourism	Legal protection Regulation enforcement; Land use policies; alternative urban plan Sustainable agriculture development plan Governmental plan for cement factory pollution Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Ensure long term site protection (innovative on private land) Limit urban extension in the North and East Integrate agriculture and conservation Reduce dust and smoke emissions Promote cultural and eco-tourism, birdwatching and channel tourist flux	

LEBANON Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
	Ras El Ain Area 500 ha GTS 3 Status : 2	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Spread of illegal secondary housing into sensitive area Extension of illegal agriculture Water over-use Sand extraction Future tourism growth	Legal protection Land use policy, alternative urban plan Legislation enforcement Wardening Promote sustainable agriculture development plan and wardening Improve water management around the site Wardening and regulation enforcement Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism / visits to artesian wells	Ensure long-term site protection Ensure integrated development Promote sustainable agriculture Reduction of freshwater losses Reduce extraction and consolidate dunes Channel tourist flux and promote visits to natural areas	

EGYPT **Biodiversity**	**SITE STATUS**	**EXISTING THREATS**	**PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES**	**INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**	**PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES**
National Flora 2066 Mammals 102 Reptiles 83 Amphibians 6 Birds 421 GLOBALLY THREATENED SPECIES (GTS) 240 On the coastal zone 83 On the 3 sites : 72 10 birds 9 reptiles / amphib. 8 mammals 19 plants 23 invertebrates 3 fish	Zaranik (Ramsar Site) 60000 ha GTS 25 Status : 3	Land speculation within the reserve boundaries Urban development encroaching on the site Potential future pollution (Agri.) from inflow of drainage water into lagoon Over-grazing Hunting Unplanned tourism	Law enforcement Land use planning Alternative urban plan Influence drainage plans proposed for new agric. area, propose alternatives Grazing plan Wardening, enforcement and awareness Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Long term protection of site Prevent extension of housing within the reserve boundaries Prevent drainage water from reaching the lake Grazing regime compatible with biodiv cons. Eliminate hunting Promote ecotourism to site	legislation, regulation land use policies Coordination-participation Training Awareness information Networking

EGYPT **Biodiversity**	**SITE STATUS**	**EXISTING THREATS**	**PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES**	**INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**	**PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES**
	Burullus (Ramsar Site) 59500 ha GTS 16 Status : 2	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Water freshening due to inflow of drainage water Eutrophication and Pollution (Agri.) Hunting	Legal protection Water quality management Catchment mgt. and reed mgt. Users Awareness and training Intersectoral planning with Agric dept Regulation enforcement, wardening and awareness	Long term site protection Maintain salinity cycle and fluxes Reed filter (short term) Reduce inputs from catchment (long term) Reduce hunting pressure Association of local people.	
	Matrouh sector 150 000 ha GTS 52 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Land conversion to agric Illegal building encroaching on site Hunting and species collection Unplanned tourism	Legal protection Land use policy, seek alternative sites Regulation enforcement, alternative urban plan. Enforcement, wardening and awareness Tourism plan / zoning / ecotourism	Long term protection of the site Avoid sensitive areas Reduce urbanisation Reduce hunting pressure Promote ecotourism Association of local people.	

MOROCCO Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
National : Flora 6930 Mammals 92 Reptiles/amphibians 112 Birds 408 Globally threatened Species (GTS) : 365 On the Med. Coastal zone 67 On the 4 sites : 28 10 birds 4 reptiles 3 mammals 11 plants	Moulouya 3000 ha GTS 18 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Coastal dune erosion Local dispersed pollution (agric) Drainage (agric.) Salt intrusion over-pumping Urban development spreading to site Solid waste Hunting Overgrazing Increasing tourism (road access)	Legal protection Dune fixation Water management Users Awareness and training Regulation enforcement Land use policy Alternative urban plan Seek alternative sites Regulation enforcement and wardening Wardening, awareness Tourism plan / Zoning / Ecotourism /	Long term site protection Soil fixation/ reduction of erosion Minimum flows, sustainable water use, reduced salinity, reduced agricultural inputs Limitation of urban extension to east and west of Moulaya Eliminate fly-tipping Reduced hunting pressure Grazing regime compatible with biodiversity cons. Channeling of tourists, birdwatchers. Association of local people.	legislation, regulation land use policies Coordination participation Training Awareness information Networking

MOROCCO Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
	Beni Snassene 6500 ha GTS 7 Status : 3	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation River pollution (Agri.) Future liquid and solid waste if tourism develops in catchment Hunting Overgrazing Tourism	Legal protection Water management Users Awareness and training Waste management Wardening and enforcement Wardening, awareness Tourism plan / Zoning / Ecotourism /	Long term site protection Reduced pumping, and agric. Inputs Eliminate fly-tipping Reduced hunting pressure Grazing regime compatible with biodiversity cons. Channeling of tourists, birdwatchers. Association of local people.	

MOROCCO Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
	Nador, Sebka Bou Areg, Gourougou 15000 ha GTS 16 Status : 2	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation	Legal protection	Long term site protection	
		Urban development spreading to sensitive areas	Regulation enforcement Land use policy Alternative urban plan	Limit urban extension from Nador and Karie Arkman	
		Illegal campsite	Regulation enforcement ; wardening and sanctions	Removal of illegal campsite	
		Solid / Liquid waste	Waste management and id. of alternative sites	Collect and treatment of sewage, control of fly-tipping	
		Dune erosion	Dune fixation	Consolidation of coastal dunes	
		Lack of water circulation leads to eutrophication	Hydrological management	Maintain water circulation in lagoon and links with sea	
		Aquaculture spreading to sensitive areas	Aquaculture plan	Sustainable economic activity	
		Local pollution (agri.)	Users Awareness and training	Reduced pumping, and agric. Inputs	
		Hunting	Regulation enforcement, wardening	Reduced hunting pressure	
		Unplanned tourism	Tourism plan / Zoning / Ecotourism /	Channeling of tourists, organisation of beach tourists promotion of birdwatching. Association of local people.	

MOROCCO Biodiversity	SITES STATUS	EXISTING THREATS	PROPOSED SITE ACTIVITIES	INTERIM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	PROPOSED SITES & NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
	Trois fourches 8000 ha GTS 13 Status : 4	Lack of site legal protection for biodiversity conservation Illegal secondary housing Hunting Overgrazing Unplanned tourism	Legal protection Regulation enforcement Land use policy Regulation enforcement, wardening Wardening, awareness Tourism plan / Zoning / Ecotourism /	Long term site protection Focus new constructions around existing dwellings Reduce hunting pressure Grazing regime compatible with biodiv cons. Organisation of tourism, Association of local people with conservation activities	

Project Objectives

54. The main objective of this project is to protect wetland and coastal zone biodiversity losses in the Mediterranean by undertaking key demonstration activities which will directly address root causes and threats to globally significant biodiversity.

55. Specific project objectives will therefore be:

(a) Promotion and capacity building for the development of national policies and tools to address the policy related root causes of loss of wetland and coastal biodiversity

(b) Protection and removal of root causes in key demonstration sites selected in view of their global significance and of the variety which they present in terms of threats and accompanying actions.

(c) Contributing to the "closing of the Mediterranean circle" in terms of biodiversity protection and sustainable management of wetlands and coastal zones through cost-effective regional networking for transfer of lessons, interchange and training

56. These actions respond to priorities listed in the Convention on Biological Diversity and form part of the commitments under the Barcelona and Ramsar Conventions and are further in line with the Venice Declaration.

Project Description

57. The long term goal of the project is to build the capacity of the beneficiary countries in the Mediterranean region to conserve threatened biodiversity in coastal and wetland ecosystems within the framework of sustainable coastal development.

58. At the local and national levels, the project will address the main threats to biodiversity identified in the different sites/countries focusing on land use policies, natural resource use and management policies, institutional capacity building, local participation, and support to alternatives for sustainable socio-economic development. All these aspects have also been identified as priorities at the regional level.

59. The project is focused on urgent actions at threatened sites containing globally significant species diversity. These areas are the forerunners of national networks of sites to cover all important areas, and provide pilot sites for building experience in coastal and wetland biodiversity management and institutional capacity to address these issues.

60. The most efficient tools for local biodiversity conservation in coastal and wetland areas are the development of enforceable site management plans - supported by appropriate land use and water use policies. Deficiencies in land use and wetland policies are among the main root causes of loss of this biodiversity at national level and the project will redress this.

61. The project structure consists of a government National Coordinator (funded by the governments/Authority and therefore non-GEF funds) responsible for all national aspects of the project; a Local Coordinator for each project site, supported by a local Site Management Committee; a Regional Facilitator, charged with organising the regional aspects of the programme, supported by an international Advisory Committee made up of donors and governments/Authority (represented by the National Coordinator for each country/authority).

Project component 1: Promotion and capacity building for development of national policies and tools to address policy-related root causes of wetland and coastal biodiversity loss

62. Causes of wetland and coastal ecosystem degradation are similar within each country/Authority and are rooted in tradition and development policies implemented over the last forty years. Changing policy implies a process of information, training and participation, and legal changes must also follow the national strategic planning process.

63. Each participating country/authority gives high significance to biodiversity conservation and sustainable uses in its development effort. Coastal and wetland biodiversity is recognized by each participating country/authority as key components of the national biodiversity heritage. All countries/authority are facing pressures in the wetlands and coastal zones, and all are acutely aware that these rich eco-systems are facing, and will continue to face, the most intense and increasing pressures over the years to come. Therefore, while these countries/authority have not yet completed their full biodiversity strategy and action plan, it is clear that the prioritization of the wetlands and coastal zones are unrivaled, and that the biodiversity strategies will indeed reflect this.

Land use policy:

64. Adapting legislation or regulations in order to react to changes in human behaviour and related impacts on environment is a complex process. In this field, urbanisation can be re-directed away from sensitive sites through the adoption of new legislation, planning, zoning or building regulations, but enforcement is often difficult, even in developed countries. Due to this difficulty, a number of countries have developed new tools addressing institution building and advocacy. Such new tools include the National Trust in Great Britain, Natuur Monumenten in Holland and Conservatoire du Littoral in France whose role is to preserve and manage coastal areas for future generations. Such institutions can equally be created in countries where land tenure is not private but "common" or public. For example, in Tunisia, 65% of the land is public and the Agency for Protection and Management of the Shore (Agence de Protection & d'Aménagement du Littoral - APAL) was created not in order to buy land, but to ensure the long term protection and sustainable development of the coastline. Creation of a similar structure is also envisaged by Morocco and the innovative potential of these tools has been recognized by MAP resolutions in its meetings of Barcelona (1995) and Montpellier (1996). Egypt is pursuing parallel objectives under law 102, by declaring "protected coastlines" where development is coordinated by a single regulatory agency (EEAA). One of the objectives of the project is to facilitate the development of these tools in different countries and to transfer experience between Mediterranean countries.

Water and wetland policy:

65. Water use policies are normally directed at irrigation, flood control and provision of drinking water and the biodiversity dimension is rarely fully taken into account. Changing this situation is a multifaceted process which involves improved awareness, capacity for intersectoral consultation and decision making, as well as including environmental obligations in appropriate legislation. METAP, UNDP and MAP-RAC/PAP and RAC/ Blue Plan are involved in actions dealing with water pricing, cost recovery, pollution and reinforcement of the national capacity to plan water resource use. All these actions tend towards improving the structural policies for managing a finite resource, while seeking to remove uncompetitive practice, improve water quality and make the sector more sensitive to market forces. This is generally good also for wetland conservation as wastage is reduced; however, a clear national wetland policy should make this linkage explicit.

66. Development and implementation of wetland policies is one of the commitments of Contracting Parties under the Ramsar Convention. This process has already begun in Tunisia, Morocco and Albania under the MedWet LIFE project (Annex 9), within the framework of the Ramsar Convention. This project envisages a national overview of wetland issues, sectoral water concerns, and a national seminar to discuss integration of sectoral polices and to lay the groundwork for a national policy. Tunisia already proposes addressing a national wetland policy under its new five-year

plan. In Egypt, wetland management and policies will be administered under the Nature Protection Directorate as part of the restructuring process in EEAA.

67. Throughout the Mediterranean there is no legislation which deals with the coastal zone in its entirety (urban planning, water management, etc.). Legislation concerning protected areas is also directed more towards isolated, people-free areas, rather than the heavily populated coastal zone. Where legislation exists it is often partial and dated. For all areas concerning legislation, there is a lack of comparative information between countries particularly concerning land-use and wetland policies.

68. In addition, the project seeks to ensure replicability in as efficient a manner as possible and will avoid each country/Authority having to start the whole process from scratch. The countries are all confronted with the same basic issues and effective exchange of experience will strengthen their ability to respond to common problems. Finally, it should be noted that the number and variety of sites, combined with the number and variety of threats significantly increases and broadens the learning field and thus creates a greater cost-effectiveness than stand-alone activities would have provided. Moreover, the pairing of countries from the Northern Mediterranean shore through the EU funded (confirmation awaited) MedWet Initiative, will ensure a great amount of cross-fertilization on biodiversity issues throughout the Mediterranean countries.

Specific activities under this component will therefore include, but not be restricted to :

(a) Review and adaptation of existing legislation especially concerning land and water use and drawing lessons from experience elsewhere in the region. Applying this legislation in specific sites.

(b) Promotion of the selected tools (land use and wetland policies, management process) through the creation or reinforcement of appropriate institutions.

(c) Definition of the mechanism for land acquisition in case of threats to biodiversity.

(d) Preparation of guidelines for integrated biodiversity management through intersectoral coordination and cooperation.

(e) Support to the development of a national wetland policy as prescribed under the Ramsar Convention.

Project component 2: Protection and removal of root causes in key demonstration sites selected in view of their global significance and of the variety which they present in terms of threats and accompanying actions.

69. During the project preparation process 16 sites or groups of sites have been identified as priority areas for the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity : 2 in Albania, 3 in Egypt, 3 in Lebanon (funded by French GEF), 1 in the Palestinian Authority, 4 in Morocco and 3 in Tunisia. According to present knowledge, the Globally Threatened Species for each country/Authority, group of sites and site have been identified. They are indicated in Table 1 along with existing threats to biodiversity and the proposed actions.

70. Under current practice in these countries, there is flexibility within the local sectoral programmes led by different line Ministries. For example, choices on the way urbanisation will occur, where waste dumps are situated, what areas are drained can be modified by arguments citing national policy or international commitments for biodiversity conservation. Use of natural areas can therefore be improved when biodiversity conservation and management is recognised as a legitimate objective alongside other sectoral interests. Experience from other countries shows that coherent planning, and the daily activities of local coordinators, can also drain additional funds for addressing local causes of biodiversity loss and promoting sustainability.

71. The activities are intended to support the reinforcement, or creation *ex nihilo*, of a management committee for each site. Accompanying actions seek to strengthen the role of this structure with respect to other, potentially competing, land-uses and to give it the support necessary in order to change attitudes of government staff from other sectors and of local people.

72. During the PDF, broad management objectives were discussed with local communities, local and national authorities and thus defined for each of the selected sites. The first step of implementation of the project is to follow a similar process of broad consultation for the preparation of a detailed management process and concurrent implementation of urgent actions as identified above.

73. At each stage in the process, local administration staff, scientists, NGOs and local users will be involved and a constant exchange of technical knowledge and information developed, fed by regional experience. The appointment of a local coordinator (funded by the governments/Authority in question and thus non-GEF resources) will ensure linkages between site and population, site and local administration, local and national administrations.

74. The priority actions, by site, are already identified and summarized in Table 1 .With some adjustment from site to site, activities will deal with:

(a) Site demarcation and declaration of protected status (IUCN categories). Each country/Authority will designate and demarcate sites and commit themselves to their protection, either according to existing legislation, or in its absence or its inadequacy, improve the legislation to allow effective site protection. In the latter case, project funds for individual sites will be withheld until such commitments are satisfied. Wetlands will be registered as Ramsar sites, if they are not already, and the beneficiaries will provide a long term guarantee of protection for each site.

(b) A Site Management Committee will be created for each project site; this simple structure will be composed of the relevant institutions from the government, the resource users, local NGOs and principal economic actors. The Local Coordinator constitutes the executive arm of this committee.

75. The first activity which the project will support deals with the further elaboration of an Interim Site Management Process. This Process will be developed based on the already accepted Management Objectives and will build from on-going consultations while drawing on experience from other countries of the Mediterranean, including those on the northern shore.

76. Project activities will also include the development, (by the local coordinator through NGOs and community action groups), of innovative activities providing economic benefits from conservation and promotion of awareness of the importance of biodiversity and sustainable resource use.

77. The project will encourage exchange of experience on the management of sites from local to national and regional level and vice versa (National and Local Coordinators). This will be done through exchange of information, preparation and diffusion of guidelines, national workshops and in-country site placements. Upon establishment of the Biodiversity Clearing House Mechanism, information gathered through this process will also be available for the Mechanism.

78. Linkages and technical exchanges between the five countries and Mediterranean protected areas will be promoted. On the basis of the experience of the existing networks (RAC/SPA, IUCN/WCPA, Eurosite, MedPAN...) and of the reinforcement of their activities in the Mediterranean, a network will be established between the project sites in the beneficiary countries and partnership established with other sites sharing common problems in the Mediterranean region.

A project Regional Facilitator will develop a year-on-year action programme to respond to Local Coordinators' needs, and will raise funds locally for continuation of the exchanges where appropriate

79. Once legally declared, site management, supported by the ongoing public participation process, will include the i) development of a site management process, guided by a finalised plan including detailed management objectives which will address all of the following: ii) demarcation and zoning, iii) local water management iv) support to local economic development programmes, v) proposals for an inter-sectoral management structure, vi) management actions to address the specific local threats, vii) design of activities to reinforce populations of threatened species, viii) environmental monitoring, ix) public awareness supported by training activities focused on the Local Coordinator, local administrations, and NGOs.

80. The improvement of the management of pilot areas will serve as a basis for extension to cover all the national coastal and wetland areas of biodiversity importance. Lessons learnt in each site will be distilled and summarised by the Regional Facilitator, in consultation with national coordinators, in such a way as to benefit other sites of the country/Authority or other countries.

Project component 3: Contributing to the "closing of the Mediterranean circle" in terms of biodiversity protection and sustainable management of wetlands and coastal zones through cost-effective regional networking for transfer of lessons, interchange and training.

81. For the short, medium and long term success of the project, it is necessary to reinforce the national capacity for biodiversity conservation. Sustainable development and the importance of biodiversity are relatively new concepts, and despite recent efforts to make them more widely understood, their full integration into the decision-making process is still unfulfilled even in the most advanced countries. Indeed, even in countries where the Ministries of Environment are well established, and where environmental training is fully exploited, the full scale of problems involved in coastal planning has not always been addressed. It is therefore normal that countries with few specialised institutions should lack the mechanisms required for consultation and circulation of information in this field .

82. The training activities proposed here therefore seek not only to transfer the necessary technical knowledge, but above all to assist the different actors in cooperating with one another, and hence help to break the sectoral thinking so constraining for the development of a collective project with commonly agreed objectives. It will also seek to involve local communities in a common process as a means of ensuring sustainability and participation. Training will focus on improving technical knowledge, and on adapting the work culture toward intersectoral activities and team-work. In this respect training will accompany the local site management process by helping to provide technical inputs at critical stages in this process. For example, a course in management planning (from biodiversity identification through fixing of detailed management objectives to defining and costing of operations) might be followed by all members of the multi-sectoral local site management committee so that everyone understands the method being applied. If water management is an issue, then a course on hydrological values and functions of wetlands may be useful in identifying management approaches, and so on. The guiding principle is to give those who sit on the committees the knowledge or know-how to resolve inter-sectoral problems.

83. In this situation we are often dealing with specialist issues, and training is specifically focused at problem-solving. This is different from having to train a corps of, say, 500 environment inspectors where training of trainers is an effective multiplier tool. Needs will vary from site to site, and the numbers of trainees for any specific issue may number only 15 - 20. The national training partner will need the ability to design tailor-made courses, based on material available nationally or regionally, especially under MedWet, and the capacity to mobilise appropriate national experts to deal with particular course components. A further advantage of this method is that experts who intervene during training courses may provide ongoing technical advice to trainees even after the course ends.

84. Site management requires biodiversity managers to gain a range of skills, such as communication, negotiation, organising scientific research, management planning etc. which are not addressed during formal education courses, yet are essential for the successful implementation of a biodiversity conservation strategy at site level. This is complementary to ongoing projects seeking to reinforce capacity for addressing all biodiversity issues at national level as it focuses specifically on root causes and field operations, not on inventory, data-bases and strategic planning(e.g. UNEP/GEF programme: Assistance in building biodiversity data management capacity and networking biodiversity information; National Biodiversity Action Plans).

85. The regional training component will define training needs at national and regional levels and develop transferable products. Transfer will take place in the working languages of English and French, as well as Arabic, where feasible. Implementation will be covered by national programmes. Emphasis will be placed on reinforcing national and local capacity for training in these fields through training institutions in each country/Authority rather than parachuting international courses. Particular actions will include:

(a) training governmental and NGO staff in public participatory mechanisms and design of awareness programmes.

(b) training of national staff in the implementation of intersectoral management techniques.

(c) training in conservation and monitoring techniques for species, habitats and environmental factors (individuals from local communities, managers, researchers).

(d) Organisation of a series of 6 regional technical training meetings (training of trainers). Training will be based on existing course material already prepared under the EU financed MedWet Initiative or developed by Tour de Valat, MAP, the Conservatoire de Littoral and could find co-funding on a one-off basis. The initial needs have been defined as follows: - Design of national wetland strategies; - Coastal zone planning tools; - Integrated management planning for biodiversity conservation; - Organising applied research on biodiversity conservation; - EIA techniques for wetlands; and, - Design of Public awareness programmes.

(e) Development of a network of national management specialists for target species or groups of species, identified as "conservation dependent", linked with the existing international experts networks. These species require specific management operations in particular sites which are not easily identifiable without specialist advice. Both national and international experts from other Mediterranean countries will cooperate in the development of specific management programmes at each of the project sites.

(f) Contributing to a scientific mechanism for constituting lists of internationally threatened species, excluding birds and mammals which are well known, through a legitimate organisation. The Regional Facilitator, using the expert groups (e) and the concerned institutions or programmes (such as Convention secretariats, RAC/SPA and IUCN) will establish and circulate list of threatened species within the Mediterranean region, as a basis for concerted action.

(g) Preparation, publication and dissemination of results and achievements of this project in biodiversity conservation, in both English and French, in order to establish an effective written basis for the transfer of experience within the region. This activity will include:

   (i) Publications to assist the integrated management process (including integrated hydrological management) and the conservation of groups of species of particular concern (for example reptiles and amphibians) in coordination with existing publication programmes (MAP/RAC-SPA, Ramsar, MedWet, IUCN, WWF, etc.).

(ii) Linking of the five Project Coordinators to the Internet system through the programme currently under preparation which will include the Regional Activity Centres of the Mediterranean Action Plan. This initiative will allow users to navigate between multiple web sites using dedicated menus with specifically Mediterranean and wetland-oriented keywords. This activity will be implemented in consistence and in complementarity to the proposed activity for the CBD Clearing House Mechanism.

(iii) Dissemination of other existing MedWet methodologies and publications to all site level managers, and training materials to partner training institutions.

86. In order to achieve the added value from the regional initiative, and to avoid repeating similar errors in each country/Authority, a Regional Facilitator to organise exchange of experience and information flow for all the technical aspects of the national programmes is absolutely essential, backed by an Advisory Committee. The Regional Facilitator requires the freedom to interact freely with all beneficiary countries/authority to create synergy and improve efficiency. The Regional Facilitator will ensure that national participants and institutions gain access to international networks and to the best available expertise within the region on key topics of relevance at the national and local level. The Regional Facilitator will maintain close contact with the MedWet Coordinator and the MedWet Secretariat based in Athens and Thessaloniki respectively (both funded by non-GEF resources).

Programme outputs

(a) The development of relevant national policies and appropriate site level actions to remove threats and root causes so that globally significant biodiversity and its habitat are conserved in a sustainable manner.

(b) Existing institutions strengthened and new institutional tools developed for the long term management of wetlands and coastal biodiversity

(c) Advocacy groups trained and sensitized to the conservation issues pertaining to the particular sites.

(d) Increased recognition that biodiversity conservation is a legitimate an d viable land-use objective

(e) Wetland and coastal management issues fully integrated into national development plans.

(f) Transfer of lessons and experiences from other Mediterranean countries to the GEF project participating countries thereby actively contributing to "closing the circle" in the Mediterranean with regards to biodiversity conservation in wetlands and coastal areas.

(g) A reinforced protected network of 16 key demonstration sites for coastal and wetland biodiversity with integrated management structures, management objectives and a management process in place.

(h) A significant contribution to maintaining wetland stepping stones for migratory birds within the region.

(i) Formulation and adoption of legislation promoting land-use policies for the coastal zone.

(j) Improved access of coastal zone and wetland managers to regional expertise.

(k) Better linkages between the scientific community and those charged with managing natural resources.

(l) Participation of project staff in sustainable regional networks run by permanent institutions.

(m) National wetland policies underway for each participating country/Authority .

(n) Regional lists giving species and wetlands status in order to guide governments/Authority of the region in assessing biodiversity conservation priorities under the CBD.

(o) Improved human resources capacity to address complex intersectoral management issues.

(p) Reinforced training institutions at national level, capable of organising appropriate training courses for national staff.

(q) Documentation on best practice, including guidelines for management planning.

(r) Three applied technical publications in the MedWet series (Conservation and management of Mediterranean amphibians, Conservation and management of Mediterranean reptiles, Integrated wetland management).

(s) Establishment of a body of expertise in the six countries/authority capable of replicating these activities within the country/authority and toward other countries of the region not covered by the present project.

RATIONALE FOR GEF FINANCING

87. The 5 countries have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity: Albania (1994), Egypt (1994), Morocco (1995), Tunisia (1993) and Lebanon (1994). The Palestinian Authority is eligible under paragraph 9 (b) of Instrument (see also CEO's note of 2 August 1996 to Council members). While not a requirement for GEF eligibility, it should be noted that Albania, Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia are all Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention; Lebanon is presently going through a review of necessary steps to become a Contracting Party.

88. The project responds to the Convention on Biological Diversity and in particular the following articles:

7.c identify their biological diversity
8.a establish a network of protected areas
8.d in-situ conservation of ecosystems and habitats
8.f restoration of ecosystems
8.j respect the traditional dependence of local communities on biological resources and involve them in their management
8.l adopt legislation for adverse effects on biological diversity
10 on sustainable use of biological diversity
12 training and research for conservation
17. exchange of information.

89. It should further be noted that freshwater eco-systems are set as a priority concern for the fourth Conference of Parties of the CBD to which Ramsar will contribute. The present project should therefore be seen as an important GEF contribution to upcoming freshwater ecosystem conservation and sustainable use issues.

90. The project is in line with guidelines on biodiversity, with the GEF Operational Strategy and the GEF Operational Programme No.2 on coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems, established in response to the Decisions and ministerial statement from the Second Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD (Jakarta, Indonesia, November 1995)

91. It fits in with global initiatives and brings global benefits. The Mediterranean region includes ecosystems with significant numbers of globally threatened species, in the coastal zone and in wetlands. The EU members of the region are advancing rapidly in these fields, yet other countries do not have the financial resources, or the institutional capacity, to fulfill their existing international commitments. This project is built on the premise that successful, holistic, and sustainable use of the wetlands and coastal areas can only be secured by twinning the northern and southern/eastern parts of the Mediterranean. The project builds on and learns from important investments which have been made in the northern shores by the Mediterranean EU members. Using these as springboards, the project provides a most cost-effective intervention.

92. Within the biodiversity theme, the GEF is particularly concerned with ensuring that the root causes which threaten globally significant biodiversity are removed through the GEF intervention. This project is designed with removal of root causes as being the main emphasis of the project intervention. Table 1 outlines all the identified root causes and threats and lists the actions which will be taken to counteract these. Root causes will thus be addressed at three levels: (i) the site level, (ii) the national level and (iii) the regional level. In this manner, for instance, the site specific threat such as unplanned tourism in a particular site will be addressed through establishment of tourism plans, zoning and encouragement of more ecologically sustainable tourism developments. As an illustration of a national root cause, one can mention the frequent absence of clearly defined land use policies and inadequate sectoral planning which at times mean that the coastal zone is impacted piecemeal by different sector interests. Here, the project will, through inter-ministerial work, address issues pertaining to legislation, regulation, land use policies and coordination. At the regional level, root causes are mainly in the lack of information flows, lack of transfer of experiences and lessons learnt, a constant “reinventing of the wheel” etc. Through active networking and the creation of linkages, transfer of information, experiences, etc. will be possible, which will set in place a much more impactful intervention for global biodiversity conservation in the Mediterranean.

93. While the GEF Operational Strategy specifically states that it will not address population issues in the more traditional sense, this project does indeed address the root cause of population pressures on the coastal zones. The project will do this by introducing to the Governments, options and tools which they can use for better regulating and zoning the coastal areas. Through land and water use planning, urbanisation, tourism, agriculture, will be planned and regulated in such a manner as to prevent unplanned and illegal expansion in areas designated for biodiversity conservation. The activities listed in Table 1 associated population pressures as a root cause, therefore, are legal protection, tourism planning, land use policies and enforcement, zoning, sustainable agriculture planning, etc.

94. The Contracting Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) decided in November 1996 to call on the Ramsar Convention "to act as a lead partner in the implementation of activities under the Convention related to wetlands" and the MedWet initiative including governmental and non-governmental partners, under the auspices of the Ramsar Convention Bureau is an excellent mechanism for assisting Mediterranean Contracting Parties to CBD, Ramsar and Barcelona Conventions in implementing their respective commitments.

95. This project includes both long term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in a national and regional context and seeks successful integration into the wider economic, social and cultural contexts. The regional level of this project involves coordination of international, intersectoral and interagency activities, information exchange, lessons

learned and capitalisation on experience to provide models of success thus avoiding repeating mistakes. It will also strengthen in a sustainable manner regional networks of protected areas, institutions and managers.

96. At the national level, the project develops an innovative, integrated approach to coastal area development using different tools such as policies, legislation, management, research, local participation and training. The selection of priority sites has been made according to the importance of biodiversity and the degree of threats, vulnerability or urgency. The site management intends to have a demonstration value and to be replicable at other sites within the country/Authority and transferable to other Mediterranean countries.

97. In addition, the project proposal is:

- country/Authority driven for national activities and will address issues of regional significance.
- innovative in its development of land use and wetland policies as tools for biodiversity conservation;
- inter-sectoral, as it will work through established inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms, to ensure a broad inter-ministerial impact of policy recommendations.
- putting substantial emphasis on capacity building and on bringing national participants into a regional network which can help them with their problems in future.

98. The leverage of additional funding has been one of the major objectives during project preparation demonstrating inter-agency cooperation, as it has built on the technical and political base of related programme initiatives and in particular those financed by MAP/UNEP, GEF (Maghreb and Lebanon biodiversity), Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme Phase III, EU (MedWet), Ramsar Convention, BAD (system of protected areas in Morocco). Through the leveraging effects, in terms of biodiversity benefits, the project will complement and build on the actions already developed or planned within the region.

Sustainability and participation

Sustainability

99. Project sustainability is based on the long-term orientation of the activities. In particular, the key activities of revising legislation and promoting its enforcement, adopting new national policies (land use and wetland policies), improving species conservation status, supporting the creation or reinforcement of institutions, building local and national capacity, promoting the participatory process and including the project participants into a wider regional support network all take a long-term view. All these activities will provide strong support to the conservation and integrated management of the biodiversity of the coastal zone as well as to sustainable economic development for local people. Moreover, it should be stressed that each of the participating governments/Authority has undertaken to fully finance recurrent costs and other longer term commitments beyond the end of the project period. Moreover, each participating country has undertaken to reproduce the project results in other parts of the coastline, building on national capacities generated by the project.

100. There are a number of other elements which support this sustainability: the Ministries dealing with environment, and their staff in the different countries are currently in a phase of consolidation and development of their activities supported by public opinion which is increasingly sensitive to environmental issues.

101. The different countries/Authority have agreed to contribute in staff time as well as office equipment, telecommunications and utilities. In addition national administrations involved in protected areas, biodiversity conservation and coastal zone management will be deeply involved in the project and trained to specific tasks. During the life of the project, the countries/Authority will secure financial resources to cover recurrent costs in the post-project phase in agreement with UNDP. Progress in achieving this will be assessed in the mid-term review.

Participation

102. This project was developed based on extensive consultations and workshops involving a wide range of national and international partners. It is therefore firmly embedded in regional and national priorities, with major stakeholder input and acceptance including commitment to the stated management goals throughout the project development process. The ongoing commitment of regional organisations and programmes, such as MAP, Ramsar, IUCN, WWF, MedWet, MedPan, Conservatoire du Littoral, Tour du Valat, and Wetlands International, which all have long term programmes on coastal and wetland management or on complementary subjects, and the project's ability to link them to site actions will be a major force for continuation and sustainability.

103. In order to achieve the overall goal of the project, a long-term programme of awareness, institutional development, community participation and training is required. Since 1975, actions have been undertaken by different programmes, both regional and national, including in particular EU, UNEP/MAP, METAP, MedWet and UNDP activities. It is on this basis that the present project is developed. It builds on all the experience and results of the past 20 years. The actions proposed form part of the actions agreed by the States under the MAP Priority Action Plan for its third decade (1996-2005) and this represents a substantial commitment.

104. During the PDF design phase of this project the national and local authorities of the five countries have shown a strong interest in participating, and where this was not the case, sites have not been retained. As the present project is focused on site and local actions, participation is the central activity for sustainable use of natural resources and conservation of biodiversity.

105. Those institutions which provide the National Coordinator will necessarily include other government staff responsible for the management of the coastline who will ensure the long term continuity of the activity. Similarly the extensive consultation, information and negotiation envisaged in the project (management process, public participation, local management committees, local NGOs , etc.) will consolidate the process at local level.

LESSONS LEARNED AND TECHNICAL REVIEW

106. This proposal builds on substantial experience in wetland and coastal management developed not only in Europe and around the Mediterranean basin but also through activities world-wide in the framework of the Ramsar Convention.

107. Within the Mediterranean region the MedWet initiative has been underway since 1992 and has established a range of methodologies in fields relevant to integrated wetland management which are transferable, with adaptation to local context, within the region.

108. As Ramsar Contracting parties are expected to develop management plans for all Ramsar sites within the region, there is a considerable depth of expertise within the network. This proposal's insistence on the need to develop the intersectoral approach to management is a direct reflection of the success of similar initiatives elsewhere.

109. In parallel, the tools and attitudes required to respond to the concerns of local people have also progressed considerably, and the inclusion of a substantial socio-economic component during the management process is included as an integral part of the approach, rather than as an afterthought in response to local pressure which has too often been the case in the past.

110. Over the last ten years or so, much energy has been focused on The Management Plan as a key technical tool for the management of protected areas. While this is undoubtedly still the case, the manner in which such plans have been developed, agreed and implemented has not always been as effective as it might have been. Plans established by external

consultants, often without the time for adequate consultation at local and national level, are often technically excellent, but their complex provisions are frequently difficult to reali ze in the field due to lack of financ e, lack of trained personnel or local political resistance, and in some cases these plans are simply filed.

111. This proposal therefore puts emphasis on management as a process, and less emphasis on the Management Plan as a product. In this way, management objectives can be defined and agreed with other sectoral interests and with local people and implemented gradually; the staff involved do not feel that their work finishes with the publication of the plan, but feel part of an ongoing process which will have to be sustained for many years if the biodiversity conservation objectives are to be reached.

112. For this approach to be effective, it must be accompanied by training initiatives wh ich address not only knowledge, but also know-how and other skills. Experience elsewhere shows the extent to which a local director must have a wide range of skills (e .g. negotiation/ conflict resolution/communication), beyond his/her technical understanding of biodiversity and land-use issues, for the management process to be successful.

113. Training courses are also a vehicle for introducing trainees to the publications, source books and networks which can help them with their problems in future. Access to, and management of, information is an increasingly complex task. Lessons learned under the MedWet programme showed that networks are an effective way of responding to local needs, especially in the Mediterranean region where there is a preference for the oral tradition and personal relationships. The large quantities of specialised information available can therefore be filtered, targeted and accessed more easily than if every local manager had to search for himself. The STAP reviewer's concerns regarding the management of information is indeed a valid one, and as the project gets underway, the specific linkages will be established with existing environmental information data bases to facilitate maximum access and availability of the required information. As has also been mentioned in the proposal, linkages will also be established with the Clearing House mechanism, to ensure that all information gathered can be readily accessed by others.

114. Integrated coastal zone management programmes have been pursued in many countries of the region, often with METAP, WFP or World Bank funding, in order to address the complex issues of coastal zone development and management. Yet in most cases the institutions charged with their implementation have been overcome by the sheer pace of change and an inability to complete the planning cycle while responding to needs in real time.

115. It appears that only through adequate control of land-use, in complementarity with implementation of existing regulations, th at time can be bought to address the local planning issues essential for maintaining natural areas along the coast, fully integrated into a local development programme.

116. The STAP reviewer highlighted in his review the necessity for establishing clearer links in the proposal between biodiversity conservation and local economic activities dealing with the exploitation of natural resources. As sustainable uses is indeed the key to the success of this proposal, the language has been further refined to better reflect this emphasis in the text. Lessons from other conservation activities on the Mediterranean rim have all pointed to the importance of ensuring that the development options are designed in such a way that various levels of sustainable uses are defined by and accepted by the communities who live in the vicinity of the sites and by the local authorities and other key stakeholders. The entire management planning process which this project proposes will be focusing on ensuring that this dialogue will indeed underpin all the activities to be undertaken in the various sites.

117. The technical review also highlighted the need to identify the specific environmental indicators which should be used in order to monitor and assess the impact of the project. This concern is fully in line with the GEF's emphasis on within-project monitoring and evaluation, and carefully designed

indicators and parametres will indeed have to be identified and designed in the operational project document so that full and thorough monitoring of the impact of this project is feasible.

PROJECT FINANCING AND BUDGET

118. The costs of the existing complementary activities, (62,362,000 and 22,680,900 US$) together with the incremental costs of 13,273,200 US$ from GEF and 2,300,000 US$ from the French GEF amount to a total cost of 104,256,100 US$. Details of the incremental cost involved in each project component are listed in the indicative budget.

119. Of the incremental component, 13,273,200 US$ is being requested from the GEF to achieve global biodiversity benefits. The amount requested will support activities in Albania, Egypt, Morocco, the Palestinian Authority and Tunisia, (Lebanon being covered by French GEF), as well as regional technical coordination.

120. Governments/Authority contribution to the project amount to 22,680,000 US$ from national programmes.

121. At the present stage of development, different organisations have indicated their willingness to support or participate in the project such as: French Cooperation, EU, and Canada.

INDICATIVE BUDGET
($$US thousands)

COMPONENT	ACTIVITIES	STAFF COSTS	SUB-CONTRACT	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	MISC.	TOTAL COST
1. Promotion and capacity-building for the development of national policies and tools	a- Policy for coastal land-use	50	128	0	60	45	283
	b- Reinforcing management structures for the coastal zone	50	200	107	90	75	522
	c- Water and wetland policy	50	210	0	100	65	425
GEF contribution *Non-GEF*		**150**	**538**	**107**	**250**	**185**	**1230** *34 289.9
Component sub-total							35 519.9
2. Protection and removal of root causes in key demonstration sites	a1- Management plan preparation	100	400	0	50	50	600
	a2- Urban planning	0	70	0	50	20	140
	a3- Waste management plan	50	0	0	85	15	150
	a4- Water management plan	0	450	0	250	100	800
	b1- Management plan implementation	100	1200	100	250	295	1945
	b2- Human resources	765	0	0	0	135	900
	b3- Operations	150	170	250	0	150	720
	b4- Investment	0	0	900	0	175	1075
	b5- Monitoring and GIS	70	100	100	220	70	560
	b6- Site restoration	0	0	220	200	80	500
	b7- Land acquisition	0	0	440	0	80	520
GEF contribution *Non-GEF*		**1235**	**2390**	**2010**	**1105**	**1170**	**7910** *46 612.652
Component sub-total							54 522.651
3. Contributing to the closing of the Mediterranean circle through regional networking, information exchange and training	a- Participation Training Awareness and information	312	550	500	313	295	1970
	b- Regional, National and local coordination	160	395	287	160	178	1180
GEF contribution *Non-GEF*		**472**	**945**	**787**	**473**	**473**	**3150** *10 080.353
Component sub-total							**13 230.353**
Total GEF contribution		1857	3873	2904	1828	1828	**12 290**

Project Support Services @ 8% of each column		148,56	309,84	232,32	146,24	146,24	**983.2**
Total GEF contribution		2005,56	4182,84	3136,32	1974,24	1974,24	**13 273.2**
Total non-GEF contribution							***90 982.9**
GRAND TOTAL							**104 256.1**

* For details of non-GEF contribution, see Annex 10

SUMMARY COST MATRIX BY COMPONENT AND BY COUNTRY/AUTHORITY
(THOUSANDS US $$)

COMPONENT 1	NATIONAL CONTRIBUTUION	CO-FINANCING	PARALLEL FINANCING	BASELINE	ALTERNATIVE	GEF/ inc	FFEM/ inc
ALBANIA	0	0	0	0	200	200	
PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY	200	0	5850	5850	6050	100	100
EGYPT	5,9	0	4164	4169,9	4319,9	150	0
LEBANON	0	0	1700	1700	1800	0	100
MOROCCO	120	700	3620	4440	4980	240	300
TUNISIA	5100	780	9050	14930	15470	240	300
REGIONAL	0	400	2000	2400	2700	300	0
TOTAL	**5425,9**	**1880**	**26184**	**33489,9**	**35519,9**	**1230**	**800**

COMPONENT 2	NATIONAL	CO	PARA	BASELINE	ALTERNATIVE	GEF/ inc	FFEM/ inc
ALBANIA	250	280	8400	8930	10080	1150	0
PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY	0	0	5690	5690	5990	200	100
EGYPT	1717,651	0	4415	6132,651	8332,651	2200	0
LEBANON	300	680	1800	2780	3205	0	425
MOROCCO	2110	0	1160	3270	5810	2240	300
TUNISIA	12135	0	3600	15735	17855	1820	300
REGIONAL	0	550	2400	2950	3250	300	0
TOTAL	**16512,651**	**1510**	**27465**	**45487,651**	**54522,651**	**7910**	**1125**

COMPONENT 3	NATIONAL	CO	PARA	BASELINE	ALTERNATIVE	GEF/ inc	FFEM/ inc
ALBANIA	100	0	0	100	450	350	0
PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY	280	0	1000	1280	1580	200	100
EGYPT	12,353	0	1113	1125,353	1575,353	450	0
LEBANON	50	20	500	570	645	0	75
MOROCCO	130	0	1100	1230	1640	310	100
TUNISIA	170	0	3000	3170	3710	440	100
REGIONAL	0	730	1500	2230	3630	1400	0
TOTAL	**742,353**	**750**	**8213**	**9705,353**	**13230,353**	**3150**	**375**

	NATIONAL	CO	PARA	BASELINE	ALTERNATIVE	GEF/ inc	FFEM/ inc
TOTAL A	5425,9	1880	26184	33489,9	35519,9	1230	800
TOTAL B	16512,651	1010	27965	45487,6511	54522,651	7910	1125
TOTAL C	742,353	750	8213	9705,353	13230,353	3150	375
Project Support Services					983,2	983,2	
GRAND TOTAL	22,680,904	3640	62362	88682,904 4	104256,104	13273,2	2300

INCREMENTAL COSTS

A full Incremental Cost Analysis is given in Annex 1.

ISSUES , ACTIONS AND RISKS

122. The main issues within the implementation of the project are linked to the specificity of the objectives and in particular the focus on site actions, involvement of local communities, land use and water use policies. The different levels of institutions involved in these four main focus are the first concern. Intersectoral cooperation and coordination is essential for the success of the project.

123. The active involvement of local people and local communities which are the main land users is important for success as some of the threats to biodiversity are of local origin. Through the different processes and in particular management plans, public participation will particularly have to consider zoning of activities and some limitation of resources use but will have to be supported, where necessary, by a local economic development plan. Environmental and social monitoring are necessary to make the process responsive to local conditions. Public awareness and training activities are important for the success of this process. A real coordination between all levels and cooperation between national coordinator, local administrations in order to convey a similar and coherent message towards the population is one of the main prerequisites and therefore constitutes a risk in areas where such coordination is not normal practice. In addition to the interest shown by the countries, the project preparation has improved awareness of regional and local administrations, but this is not enough for the success in each site.

124. For both these issues, the selection, role and functions of the national coordinator is critical. The person responsible for part of the activities is a key person at the national level. Community participation for biodiversity conservation requires an expert with a strong background in both social and biological sciences. The support given to this person by the regional and central administration will have to be as strong as possible.

125. Adapting the legislation or regulations on land use policies is a complex and long term process. In addition, enforcement is not guaranty even in developed countries. Creation of new structures is also a long process and subject to political influence at the site and local level. The facilitation of the development of new tools or new agencies will have to be supported by a strong governmental commitment and an important public awareness and information campaign.

126. Changing water use policies is also a long term, multifaceted process which involves improved awareness, capacity for intersectoral consultation and decision making, as well as including environmental obligations in appropriate legislation. The success of the project is strictly linked to the success of other actions and projects dealing with water, at the national and local levels dealing with evaluation, management, pricing of water resources, pollution and reinforcement of the national capacity. Coordination between the national and regional level, international and national institutions through the Regional and National Focal Points will be another key of the success of the project.

127. Regional coordination and technical support is also an important link for the success of the project. The roles and functions of the Regional Facilitator are to organise exchange of experience, information flow and to act as a clearing house for all the technical aspects of the national programmes. The selection and the definition of roles and functions of the regional coordinator supported by the Regional Facilitator will have to be defined carefully in order to provide an expert able to cover all the facets of the project and in particular with a strong regional knowledge covering biodiversity, wetland and coastal areas, training, collection and dissemination of information, contact with international and national institutions, NGOs and networks.

Institutional Framework and Project Implementation

128. The implementation mechanism will include the following elements: an Advisory Committee, a Regional Facilitator, and five National Coordinators. The Advisory Committee will be composed of representatives of UNDP and other main donors (such as French GEF and EU) and of the 5 National Lead Agencies described above (usually represented by their National Coordinator). The Regional Facilitator will be the representation of the MedWet initiative in Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat. The roles and functions of the Regional Facilitator, to be agreed by the Advisory Committee, will focus on technical coordination and the tasks of the Regional Facilitator will therefore include

organisation and circulation of information and publications, training, identifying experts and competencies, providing technical support and organising exchanges.

129. At the national level, the project will be implemented by the National Focal Point (NFP) agency which will appoint a national coordinator. For each country/Authority, the National Leader Agency is described hereafter.

130. - Albania: Ministry of Health & Environment, Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP). By law CEP is the highest state body after the Prime Minister in the field of environmental protection. The CEP is present in the Council for Territorial Planning (CTP) by its chairman. The direct administrator of protected areas is the General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) through its district branches. In case protected areas have other activities than forestry like fishing (lagoon areas) the water surface is administrated by Directorate of Fisheries (DF).

131. - Egypt: Cabinet of Prime Minister, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA). EEAA is the body for environmental matters. The Chief Executive Officer works closely with the Minister of Public Enterprise Sector and the Minister for Administrative Development and Environment. Created in 1982, the EEAA is now charged with development and implementation of all environmental policies. EEAA coordinates closely with other ministries for the implementation of Law 4 (1994) and has executive responsibility for implementation of Law 102 (Natural Protectorates).

132. - Lebanon: Ministry of Environment. The Ministry of Environment chairs the National Council for Environment, and designates a management committee for each protected area. This Council includes the Ministries of Agriculture, Public Works and Transports and Tourism. The Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for hunting, fisheries, forest and protected areas. It includes a National Hunting Council (NHC). The Ministry of Public Works and Transports includes the General Directorate for Urban Planning) and chairs the Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR). The Ministry of Tourism chairs the National Council for Tourism.

133. - Morocco: Ministry of Environment, Observatoire National Environnement Maroc (ONEM). Recent changes in the governmental organisation have led to the creation in 1995 of the Ministry of Environment, with a role of coordination and preparation of national policies and strategies for environment and development. The National Council for Environment (CNE) is a consultative body presided by the Ministry of Environment. It includes representatives from numerous ministries: Environment, Interior, Agriculture, Public Works, Fisheries and Merchant Navy, Education and Scientific Research, Cultural Affairs, Tourism, Trade and Industry. Inside the Ministry of Environment, the Directorate of Observation, Studies and Coordination is an important actor for biodiversity strategy. It includes the National Observatory for Environment of Morocco (ONEM) and the Office for Biodiversity and Desertification (CBD).

134. - Tunisia: Ministry of Environment and Land Use Planning, Agence Protection et Aménagement du Littoral (APAL). The Ministry of Environment and Land Use Planning, created in 1991 includes the National Office for Anti-Pollution (ONAS), the National Agency for Environmental Protection (ANPE) and the Agency for Seashore Protection and Management (APAL). APAL, recently created, is the focal point for this project and has the following responsibilities: seashore policy, enforcement of the seashore laws, develop seashore land use policy, monitor coastal changes and ecosystems. The Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for the management of protected areas, forest, water resources, soils and fisheries.

135. - Palestinian Authority: The Palestinian Environmental Authority (PEnA) was established in December 1996. It operates under the Palestinian Authority and is the highest central body responsible for environmental issues in the Palestinian Authority. The PEnA will chair the planned Biodiversity Steering Committee, with members from an array of other Palestinian Ministries. The Environmental Planning Directorate, based in Gaza, which is being incorporated into PEnA, will be responsible for the implementation of this project. Many other donors are already supporting Palestinian institution building (US, most European countries, Japan, Canada, UNDP, World Bank and others), and it is strongly anticipated that PEnA will also receive support from these donors to begin to build its institutional capacities. The project therefore intervenes at a very opportune time, as land use planning policies, legislation and other matters are going to be

crystallized within the coming couple of years. By intervening at this juncture, the project is securing that due attention is given to biodiversity conservation and sustainable uses in the planning and policy instruments which are going to be defined.

136. Regional, international and national organisations such as IUCN, MAP-RAC/SPA, other MedWet partners , CELRL will be associated according to needs and synergistic linkages with their future programmes.

ANNEX 1

INCREMENTAL COST ANALYSIS

1. Context and broad development goals

1.1. Pressures on environmental resources are similar all around the Mediterranean basin, and in particular on coastal and wetland ecosystems. Common factors affecting the coastline and the loss of coastal and wetland ecosystems which include inadequate intersectoral planning, population migration to the coastal strip for urban and touristic development, pollution, increasing demand for water and expansion of agricultural land.

1.2. These common issues need global and coordinated actions at both regional and national/local levels. Policy orientation and definition of regional activities occurs at regional level. The national role is to transfer these agreed orientations to national policies, legislation and regulations, and to apply them at the coastal and site level.

1.3. The Mediterranean region has numerous projects with a strong regional component linked to the existence since 1975 of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) (UNEP Regional Seas Programme) involving all the riparian countries. The orientations of the MAP are implemented and reinforced by other programmes such as those developed by METAP and EU (MedWet, Phare and MEDA). All these programmes are mainly orientated towards regional policies for pollution, water and environment complemented by institutional strengthening and training.

1.4. There is in the Mediterranean a common willingness and specific forum for discussions. But this is not enough. There is an urgent need for more concrete action in the field and to extend existing regional expertise to other areas of importance for biodiversity conservation and management. Future trends in the Mediterranean Region in particular for population, tourism, water demand have been identified and show a need to reinforce the actions currently underway. New tools have also been developed and need to be transferred and applied at the national and local level.

1.5. Countries of the region, and in particular the participating countries have developed or are developing national actions such as national biodiversity strategies, national environmental action plans, national plans against desertification, water policies, institutional and legal environmental tools and environmental monitoring. All these activities generate national and local benefits. They directly tackle the structural causes of damage to the environment and to natural resources.

1.6. Nevertheless, there is a need for additional funding to develop and implement urgent actions at the local level and hence generate complementary synergies to reinforce their direct impact on biodiversity conservation in coastal and wetland ecosystems.

2. Baseline Scenario

2.1. Within the baseline scenario, it is evident that the governments/Authority of the concerned countries will not give sufficient priority to the financing of coastal and wetland biodiversity conservation, considering all their other pressing concerns. They have adopted clear environmental policies but their present actions are focused on urgent needs such as water policy (in terms of evaluation of the resource, quality and distribution) and pollution control (with priority for marine pollution and waste management).

2.2. Coastal and wetland areas have so far more often been considered as poles of economic development (fisheries, tourism, agriculture, industrial or free trade zones) than as conservation areas. Within this economic development context and under pressure from developers, it is difficult for national official and civil institutions to arbitrate conflicts of interest and to innovate in organising a real policy for nature conservation in coastal and wetland zones.

2.3.According to this baseline scenario, existing funding, capacity and awareness will not change the *status quo* : coastal and wetland areas will still mainly be considered as areas for economic development. It is worth remembering that this was also the case twenty years ago on the European coasts of the Mediterranean and the recent trend is to protect and rehabilitate the remaining natural areas.

2.4. Existing regional projects develop activities on pollution abatement, rational use of water, tourism development and support to the kind of environmental policies which are included in the baseline scenario. However, their local beneficial effects do not specifically generate synergies for the conservation of Mediterranean biodiversity. At the present time, neither the specificity nor the urgency of actions required for biodiversity conservation will be covered correctly by the existing programmes.

2.5. In addition, the countries concerned by the project have only a small network of protected areas and a more restricted number of areas under real protection and management. There are a small number of Mediterranean coastal and wetland protected areas, however new designation opportunities are often in competition with inland terrestrial areas or sometimes marine areas. The size and the visibility of terrestrial areas (especially desert areas) is often more significant and conflicts of interest for their development are less important, easier to solve and require fewer funds. The biological importance of “wetlands in drylands” can not be understated. As has also been highlighted elsewhere in the text, the these wetlands have a high species richness and are therefore “hotspots” in the drylands.

2.6. It is important to develop national wetland and coastal land-use policies, to take urgent actions, and to apply the appropriate tools in order to cover the basic needs for environmental conservation. But this will not develop the appropriate synergy for integrated coastal and wetland management within a concept of sustainable development. The existing national capacities do not allow efficient management of national and globally threatened biodiversity nor an adequate response to the obligations of the CBD. If the baseline scenario continues, the existing difference between the northern and southern shores of the Mediterranean Sea will continue to grow and the possibility of global, regional and national benefits to recede.

3. Global Environmental Objective

3.1. Through demonstration activities in a selected number of sites, which have the richest biodiversity of global significance in the six countries/authority, the project removes root causes through introduced policy changes, site specific actions and capacity building for the protection of biodiversity of global significance at selected sites. This is essential for sustainable coastal development involving all the actors and partners of each country/Authority. The innovative aspects of this project will allow both a direct and immediate effect on sites identified as being globally important in terms of biodiversity, and the creation of synergy between all the short, medium and long term actions impacting positively on the root causes of biodiversity loss.

3.2. The Mediterranean coastline (26,000 km) is an area of high biodiversity, where more than 50% of the 25,000 plant species are endemic to the region. It is also a critical area for 2 billion migratory birds in the Africa-Palaearctic flyway as wetlands in the region provide an essential flyway stepping stone on either side of the Mediterranean Sea and between the sea and the vast expanse of the Sahara desert to the south. About 50 per cent of the wintering Western Palaearctic populations of ducks and coot occur in the Mediterranean region and twenty globally threatened bird species live in the region. Of 62 species of amphibian, 35 are endemic (56%), as are 111 of the 179 reptile species (62%). 52 of the 184 mammal species recorded are considered threatened (excluding marine mammals).

4. GEF Alternative

4.1. The alternative proposed by the project is to develop activities in a coherent and coordinated way in the five GEF eligible countries. These activities will complete the existing programmes developed in the GEF non-eligible Mediterranean countries, in particular on the northern shore, and will allow a better distribution of the national and global benefits of biodiversity conservation. This alternative, supported by GEF funding, will go significantly further than the expected results of the baseline scenario described above. The complementary activities of this alternative which are proposed for GEF funding are as follows:

Component 1: Promotion and capacity building for the development of national policies and tools to address the policy related root causes of loss of wetland and coastal biodiversity. GEF funding requested: 1,330,000 US$

Component 2: Protection and removal of root causes in key demonstration sites selected in view of their global significance and of the variety which they present in terms of threats and accompanying actions. GEF funding requested: 8,335,000 US$

Component 3: Contributing to “closing the Mediterranean circle” in terms of biodiversity protection and sustainable management of wetlands and coastal zones through cost-effective regional networking for transfer of lessons, interchange and training. GEF funding requested: 3,225000 US$

4.2. The GEF Alternative will reach objectives which were not possible in the baseline scenario and will have a significant impact on the medium and long term conservation of Mediterranean biodiversity based on integrated coastal and wetland areas management. This funding will allow the development of a network of protected areas with all the necessary tools for their long term sustainability (delineation, legal status, management and monitoring structure, trained staff), reinforced at the national level by appropriate policies, institutions and capacity for the management and conservation of coastal and wetland areas. Moreover, the GEF Alternative will provide an important demonstration opportunity for the Mediterranean region and beyond. It should be noted that the participating countries have agreed to replicate, at their cost, the successful experiences of this project in other wetlands and coastal areas. Further, the policy changes which the project will introduce will lay a sustainable basis for such future initiatives. Through its networking with other established organisations (including MedWet, Tour du Valat, RAC/SPA-UNEP, Blue Plan and the Mediterranean Action Plan, the project will be able to transmit lessons learnt far beyond the present project partners. Transfer of lessons learnt will also be facilitated to the project partners through the very same networks, thereby providing for a most cost effective GEF Alternative.

4.3. Finally, it is expected that the GEF participation and the results of this project will have a leverage effect on additional funding, in particular from EU, for the conservation of coastal and wetland areas of the Mediterranean.

5. Systems Boundary and Scope of the Analysis

5.1. The geographical boundary of this project is the coastal rim along the Mediterranean coast. Specifically the project addresses site-relevant activities in wetlands and coastal areas where the numbers of globally threatened biodiversity has been found to be extremely high and where conditions existed through which actual conservation could be put in place through active intervention at both the site specific as well as the policy and macro levels.

5.2. Since the selected sites are representative of many other sites in the Mediterranean coastline and in view of the fact that the participating governments/Authority have already committed themselves to replicate the successful experiences of this project, downstream replication is indeed expected. At the policy levels, it is anticipated that the policy reform which the project will actively encourage and bring about will lead to system adjustments, including both global and domestic benefits. Global benefits are likely to be additional protection of globally threatened biodiversity as replication efforts are intensified both nationally and internationally through the active networking and outreach components of the project, while domestic benefits include esthetic and leisure and lifestyle benefits, which are non monetized in the present proposal.

6. Cost

6.1. The difference between the baseline and the alternative is about 15,573,200 US$ of which 13,273,200 US$ is requested from the GEF and 2,300,000 US$ from the French GEF.

6.2. Incremental cost Matrix (See table)

INCREMENTAL COST CALCULATION
INCREMENTAL COST MATRIX

Project Component	Cost Category	Cost (million USD)	Domestic Benefits	Global Environmental Benefits
(1) Promotion and capacity building for the development of national policies and tools to address the policy related root causes of loss of wetland and coastal biodiversity	Baseline	33489,9	Available financial resources are generally directed at policies addressing urgent issues (waste, treatment, water supply ..) and do not adequately address biodiversity issues, especially in areas with conflicts over resource use (coastal and wetland ecosystems) which are slowly degrading	National protection policies are generally recent and for the time being are mostly good intentions, and do not develop the synergy necessary for the protection of globally threatened species
	Alternative	35519,9	Development of coordinated national policies (environment, territorial planning, economic development, infrastructure, tourism, agriculture, local sustainable development) for highly populated areas of the national territory.	A concerted and similar approach in each country/Authority, development and transfer of planning tools, creation of prototype management structures for coastal management, development of innovative land-use and wetland policies, adoption of legal instruments for site protection and elimination of root causes. Participation of local people and NGOs in the decision-making process.
	Increment (GEF) (FFEM)	2.030 (1.230) (800)		
(2) Protection and removal of root causes in key demonstration sites selected in view of their global significance and of the variety which they present in terms of threats and accompanying actions.	Baseline	45 487 651	Protection of a small number of sites, mostly under strong human pressure. Local management systems undeveloped and underfunded, lack of synergy and difficulty in execution following threat analysis. Important commitment of states to primary problems (treatment, sanitation, waste) but less emphasis on integrated management of natural areas.	Limited protection of global biodiversity, considering the limited means available
	Alternative	54 522 651	Reinforced network of protected areas, in a wider conceptual framework than National Parks. Economies of scale, increased capacity for monitoring, problem analysis and implementation of management objectives. Constitution of management teams allowing transfer of knowledge, establishment of common indicators and procedures; increased public awareness of biodiversity conservation.	Considerable increase in number of coastal protected areas in the Mediterranean, focused on those harbouring globally-important species, and those essential for migratory birds. Application of common tools (management, evaluation, monitoring indicators etc.) transferable to other countries. Reinforcement of regional capacity and the development of human resources network as a tool for technical sustainability. Regional transfer.
	Increment (GEF) (FFEM)	9.035 (7.910) (1.125)		
(3) Contributing to the "closing of the Mediterranean circle" in terms of biodiversity protection and sustainable management of wetlands and coastal zones through cost-effective regional networking for transfer of lessons, interchange and training	Baseline	9 705 353	Recently created institutions are unable to address the relevant issues due to lack of trained staff, inadequate resources and lack of experience. The complexity of coastal and wetland management issues means they receive low priority as staff do not know how to address them. Local people are unaware of biodiversity issues, nor fully associated with the decision-making process.	States will present their ongoing actions in nature protection through existing protected areas networks as their contribution to protecting global biodiversity. This will only cover a small proportion of globally important sites, regional exchange of experience will remain limited, and trial and error at local level will not therefore build on regional experience and expertise.

	Alternative	13 230 353	The reinforcement of institutions (Ministries, Agencies) staffed with competent professionals able to address the range of issues facing coastal and wetland development in a sustainable manner. Improved association of local people in decision-making. Improved synergy between brown and green environment and programmes.	Reinforcement of regional approach to biodiversity conservation, and capacity building throughout the region. Transfer of experience South-South and North-South. Replication of successful approaches to coastal and wetland management. development of networks of protected areas managers. Synergy between
	Increment (GEF) (FFEM)	3.525 (3.150) (375)		
TOTALS	Baseline	88 682 904		
	Alternative	103 272904		
	Increment	14.590 000		
Project support services UNOPS	GEF (8%)	983 000		
	Alternative Total	104 256104		
	Increment (GEF) (FFEM)	15.5732 (13.2732) (2.300)		

SUMMARY COST MATRIX : COUNTRY/AUTHORITY BASELINE AND ALTERNATIVE (X1000 USD)

ALTERNATIVE	Albania	Egypt	Lebanon	Morocco	PalestinianA uthority	Tunisia	Regional	TOTAL
GEF	1700	2800	0	2790	500	2500	2000	12290 (+8%) 13273,2
French GEF	0	0	600	700	300	700	0	2300
National contribution	350	1735,9	350	2360	480	17405	0	22680,9
Co Funding	280	0	200	700	0	780	1680	3640
Parallel Financing	8400	9692	4500	5880	12340	15650	5900	62362
TOTAL	10480	14227,9	5650	12430	13620	37035	9580	**104256,1**

BASELINE	Albania	Egypt	Lebanon	Morocco	PalestinianA uthority	Tunisia	Regional	TOTAL
National contribution	350	1735,9	350	2360	480	17405	0	22680,9
Co Funding	280	0	200	700	0	780	1680	3640
Parallel Financing	8400	9692	4500	5880	12340	15650	5900	62362
TOTAL	9030	11427,9	5050	8940	12820	33835	7580	**88682,9**

7. Process of Agreement

7.1. The technical contents of the project have been negotiated with the Governments/Authority of Albania, Egypt, Lebanon, the Palestinian Authority, Morocco and Tunisia.

ANNEX 2 Government requests

Albania

Egypt

PA

Morocco

Lebanon

Tunisia

ANNEX 3

Technical Review
Conservation of Wetland and Coastal ecosystems in the Mediterranean Region

by

Member of STAP Roster of Experts

1 - Overall impression

This project is the result of a long preparatory phase which lasted more than six years and included extensive consultation. It is part of a more global concern of the conservation of Mediterranean wetlands, as an extension to less developed riparian countries of programmes and actions already developed by the northern countries with the support of EU directives and finance (see para 31-38). As a result it is an effort to “close the circle” of the Mediterranean and to favour exchanges experience and knowledge with respect to biodiversity conservation and land use management in the wetland and coastal zones.

As a whole the project is well prepared and well documented. Its objectives fit adequately the goals of the GEF Operational Strategy.

2 - Relevance

I consider the following points as particularly relevant for the implementation of the project:

- Conservation of freshwater ecosystems is a priority concern for the Conference of the Parties of the CBD.
- High priority is given in the brief project to training and national capacity building in the field of biodiversity conservation, as well as to exchange of information and experience among participant countries.
- a strong connection is established between conservation of biodiversity and the wise management of wetland and coastal ecosystems supporting biodiversity. That fits well with the concept of sustainable development.
- The project identified clearly that the keystone for conservation is legislation promoting land-use policies for the coastal wetlands. I appreciated that the need for more scientific data is not push forward, even if it will be certainly necessary to collect fuller information.
- The project is implemented in a network of other projects in relation with biodiversity conservation in wetlands and coastal ecosystems. It appears as an important activity in an attempt to promote a coordinated and integrated action plan for the conservation of Mediterranean wetlands and coastal ecosystems, involving most of the riparian countries.
- As a transborder project it focuses on the exchange and sharing of information among countries with respect to biodiversity conservation. Experience gained in other projects usually show that such framework stimulates national involvement through emulation between countries.

3 - Background and justification

The background information provided by the project and its annexes is relevant and substantial. It includes an identification of major threats, as well as the conservation status of many vertebrate species. It is clear that biodiversity is a matter of concern in the Mediterranean area and that the project fills a gap in the network of countries concerned with that question.

For each country, the identification of institutions which will be involved in the project is well-done (para124-132). I would suggest to have a more operational list of institutions in the final report, as well as an evaluation of needs.

The following elements are particularly relevant:
- support to regional projects involving international cooperation;
-assistance in designing cohesive programmatic approaches to conservation around the Mediterranean sea.
-the promotion of integrated management of wetlands and coastal ecosystems that are at risk.

Suggestions for improvement *(to consider in the final project)*

The brief focuses mainly on threatened species, which is completely relevant with the goals of GEF Operational Strategy (some interventions may be considered extremely urgent on the basis of known imminent threats to a species or ecosystem (for example, coastal biodiversity) or degree of vulnerability). However the final project should also emphasise the questions of sustainable use of biodiversity as also mentioned in the GEF Operational Strategy. I have the feeling that in many countries it is important to establish more clearly the bonds between conservation of biodiversity and local economic activities dealing with exploitation of natural resources. It is therefore important to demonstrate, for instance, that the conservation of wetlands and coastal ecosystems may result both in preservation of threatened species and in preservation of a local economic resources if local human populations have to be involved in the sustainable management of these ecosystems.

While subjacent in the brief report, and partly developed in the country reports, this aspect of sustainable use of biodiversity of economic importance would deserve to be more specifically addressed in the final report.

4 - Scientific and technical soundness

The project at this stage is scientifically relevant. The identification of biodiversity in each country is heterogeneous but fairly well-known compared to many other areas in the world. Moreover, the information already available in other northern Mediterranean countries will be useful for the southern countries. I therefore consider the background information as good.

I got also the overall impression that the experts associated in the preparation and the implementation of the project are well aware of the technical aspects of the conservation of biodiversity.

Suggestions for Improvement (*to consider in the final project)*

I did not find enough information in the brief report about the **management of information,** which is a key question. So I would suggest to pay attention to this question and to give more details in the final report.

Usually speaking, in many projects on biodiversity conservation, relevant information often does not reach the appropriate users or is unused because the user is not aware of its existence. In other cases, there is duplication of efforts to collect field data, which already exist but are not easily available. The same applied to experience in sustainable management gained in other projects. The storage of environmental information already available, and its easy access, are therefore **strategic options in environmental management.**

The idea expressed (para 86) to link the five Project Coordinators to the Internet system is good. However I would ask the question: is it enough?

- What will be available on Internet relevant for the purposes of the project? Is it necessary to design a special environment information base or is such a base already available?
- How will be managed the relevant information in each country? Such information not only concern threaten species but also any information for sustainable management of ecosystems. Is there any plan to develop environmental information systems?
- Should access to Internet be available only to coordinators, or should it be also available on each site?

- How the information gained in the project will be stored and shared among participants. I understand that reports will be produced and I believe that it is a good way to exchange information. However I doubt on the long term that the amount of information and experience collected could be managed without using information bases.

Certainly these questions have already received much attention. I nevertheless suggest to clarify the topic for the final report. Funding the collection and synthesis of usable information, and ensuring its dissemination among decision makers, scientists and the general public are important parts of the GEF's operational strategy.

5 - Objectives

The three main specific objectives (para 55) are well identified.

One of the goals of the project is to improve and strengthen the planning and management of wetlands in the Mediterranean Basin with a specific focus on biodiversity conservation. It aims to provide various stakeholders with appropriate information on wetlands and coastal areas. As stated above, I suggest to consider the implementation of environmental information systems in order to facilitate exchange and availability of information.

As usual some difficulties will probably arise during the implementation of the project. However, there is no serious reason to imagine that they will jeopardise the project as it is presently devised. Everyone knows that the task is difficult. However that is a realistic project, which will take advantage of a long preparatory phase, and will rely on experience gained in neighbouring countries.

6 - Activities

The priority actions by site are already identified (see table 1). The project will support first the elaboration of an Interim Site Management Process, based on accepted management objectives and built from on-going consultations.

I would suggest during the preparatory phase of the project, to identify what kind of specific environmental indicators should be used in order to monitor and assess the impact of the project on the expected conservation and recovery of the wetlands and their biodiversity.

It is possible to consider a standard set of selected indicators which could be used to monitor the middle and long term changes of biodiversity on the demonstration sites, in relation with conservation activities?

7 - Participatory aspects

The project aims to build on existing institutions rather than creating new ones. It will link national agencies in a network with the assistance of a Regional Facilitator.

The project also built on many experiences and results of the 20 past years, through actions undertaken by different programmes funded by EU, UNEP, UNDP, etc. Community participation is a central activity to achieve the success of the project as stated in para 101-102.

The project relates on the involvement of local communities, as well as the participation of stakeholders and government agencies. However, a brief analysis of causes of failures and/or success of previous programmes in that specific field of participation would be useful.

8 - Global benefits

The proposed activities at the site and at the national levels which are listed in table 1 of the project brief and in the annexes, clearly identified the different uses and the global benefits expected from the sustainable

management of wetlands and coastal ecosystems. Project activities will also include the development of innovative activities providing economic benefits (para 76). I would suggest to summarise shortly all these information in a specific sub chapter of the final report.

9 - GEF strategies and plans

- The countries involved have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as the Ramsar Convention (with the exception at the moment of Lebanon).

- The project fits the goals of the GEF Operational Strategy: sustainable use of biodiversity in coastal, estuaries and freshwater ecosystems; integrated approach of coastal area development and rivers management. It is also particularly relevant for one of the criteria to be consider for operational implementation of cohesive systems of national actions involving coordination of international intersectoral. and interagency activities to achieve agreed global biodiversity benefits.
- The project brief also respond to the objectives of a diverse portfolio listed under the topic "Reduce the risks caused by uncertainty of the Operational Strategy": finance programs and projects that address the underlying causes of global environment deterioration such as economic policy, legal and social issues, institutional weakness and information barriers.

10 - Replicability

Most of the experience and methodological improvements which will be acquired in one site may in principle be transferred to other similar projects all around the Mediterranean. However, I recall here the idea of ensuring the storage and circulation of experiences gained in different sites.

11 - Capacity building

The project gives a high priority to the reinforcement of national capacity for biodiversity conservation. Training activities will improve the technical knowledge while assisting the different actors in cooperating together. The strengthening of local and national institutions to participate in project design and implementation is a clear objective.

The idea introduced in para 82 is important: to break the common sectoral thinking in order to promote an integrated view of management. I appreciated the hierarchical approach of training (para 82 to 85) according to the problems to be solved at the sites, national. and regional levels. The success of the project lies certainly in its capacity to promote an adequate training to the different social actors involved in the management of wetlands. One major issue to capacity building, are deficiencies in national policies and land management planning. These fields should receive high priority.

Training is associated with access to information. The idea of an Internet network is certainly good and I will support it strongly. However, the question in that field is to collect information and to structure its access in order to have quick and easy access to relevant data.

12 - Project funding

As far as I can express an opinion on this topic which is difficult to survey for a non specialist, the level of funding seems appropriate. Actually for a 5 year project including 6 countries, I would say that it is not a costly project.

13 - Time frame

The time period (5 years) is relatively short if we consider the ambitions of the project. However:

- the participating countries really need the implementation of management tools including legislation. Some of the countries are already well aware of the question and are willing to develop as soon as possible their national policies.

- contacts are already effective with ministries of some of the countries;

- the experience gained in the surrounding countries are already well aware of the question and are willing to develop as soon as possible their national policies.

- contacts are already effective with ministries of some of the countries

- the experience gained in the surrounding countries may be quickly adapted to others.

As a result, the situation is rather good to achieve the goals during the time frame if high priority is given at the beginning to topics such as policies, legislation, local participation.

14 - Secondary issues

There are linkages with many other programmes and action plans at regional or subregional levels. The inventory is well done (see annex 5).

The proposal appears as an important brick in a long term and international concern about wetland and coastal ecosystems conservation in the surrounding of the Mediterranean sea. It allows the participation of less developed countries to the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) already implemented by European countries since 1975. The objectives of MAP Phase II focus on nature conservation and a strengthen solidarity among Mediterranean coastal States in managing their common heritage and resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

The MedWet programme is also a regional initiative, supported by EU, which originated in 1991. The first phase (1992-1996) concentrated on methodological developments to support wetland conservation. The project was widened in Venice in June 1996, and received the support of the Ramsar Convention.

15 - Conclusions

At this stage of elaboration, the brief submitted for evaluation identifies very well the main objectives: the integrated wetlands and coastal areas management and the promotion of different sustainable use options through the implementation of national policies and selected tools (land use and wetland policies, management process). The project brief is also supported by well documented annexes and a considerable effort has been devoted to the identification of priority sites in each country which need urgent actions to protect threatened biodiversity, and to the evaluation of the conservation status of wetlands and many vertebrate species. The major threats are identified, the institutional framework is proposed, and other regional programmes with which the project may positively interfere are listed.

I suggested to consider carefully in the final report a few questions which are only partly covered in the present brief, because they have to be discussed when the project will be finalized: storage and access to information's, economic value of the wetland and coastal areas for local communities, indicators for the monitoring of priority sites.

ANNEX 4 Reports produced under PDF

Lebanon :	MedWet protected areas project in Lebanon, Final report, January 1997. Lebanese Environment forum/UNDP.
Egypt :	Biodiversity assessment of the Mediterranean coast of Egypt. Final report, July 1996. Nature protection sector, Egyptian Environment Affairs Agency.
Tunisia :	Proposition Projet GEF Zones humides et écosystèmes côtiers. Nord-est Cap Bon. Sept 1996. Agence de protection et d'aménagement du littoral, Ministère de l'environnement et de l'aménagement du territoire.
Albania :	Conservation of wetlands coastal ecosystems in the Mediterranean region : GEF regional project proposal. Final report, December 1996.
Regional :	An overview of regional actions for conservation of wetland and coastal biodiversity in the Mediterranean region. Final report January 1997. Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat.
	Biodiversity of wetlands and coastal areas in Albania, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia.

The proposals for Morocco are based principally on the analysis and conclusions of the final report "Plan directeur des aires protégées du Maroc, 1996. Administration des Eaux et Forêts et de Conservation des sols, Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la mise en valeur agricole." Which includes the necessary data on biodiversity distribution and priority sites.

The proposals for Gaza draw on the Gaza Environmental Profile prepared 1994 by the Environment Department, MoP; EuroConsult and IWACO through funding from the Netherlands.

ANNEX 5 Overview of regional actions for conservation of Wetland and coastal biodiversity - Summary

Many environmental problems affecting coastal and wetland ecosystems are shared by the countries of the Mediterranean region. However, pressures are particularly acute in many of the countries on the southern and eastern shores, where populations are growing most rapidly, rainfall is lowest, and development needs are greatest. Some problems are transnational, requiring international co-operation for their solution. Marine pollution, the loss of habitat for migratory birds, declines in populations of marine mammals and sea-turtles, and meeting demands for water from rivers and aquifers that cross national boundaries, are among the shared regional problems. They require regional co-operation, communication and sharing of experience and information to find a peaceful and lasting solution. The region has been successful in organising such collaboration over the last 25 years in order to find a common response to common problems.

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

In the mid-1970s there was a growing international awareness of the global extent of environmental problems and of the linkages between environment and development. At the first Mediterranean intergovernmental conference, organised by UNEP in 1975, the Mediterranean countries and the EEC adopted the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP). This called on Mediterranean governments to prepare and adopt a series of legally binding agreements on environmental concerns.

The main objectives of MAP were "to assist the Mediterranean Governments to assess and control marine pollution, to formulate their national environmental policies, to improve the ability of governments to identify options for alternative patterns of development and to make more rational choices for allocation of resources".

In recognition of the linkages between environmental problems and social and economic development, MAP consisted of a number of interdependent components intended to provide a framework for comprehensive action promoting both conservation and development of the Mediterranean region. These include **The Blue Plan**, The **Priority Actions Programme (PAP)**, **MED POL**, and **The Barcelona Convention**.

In 1995, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of MAP, a new Mediterranean Action Plan, **MAP Phase II** was adopted (The Barcelona Resolution). MAP Phase II takes account of the results of developments since the first phase of MAP, such as the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro 1992) and has wider coverage than its predecessor. Its main objectives are:

- (a) to ensure sustainable management of natural marine and land resources and to integrate the environment in social and economic development, and land-use policies;
- (b) to protect the marine environment and coastal zones through prevention of pollution, and by reduction and, as far as possible, elimination of pollutant inputs, whether chronic or accidental;
- (c) to protect nature, and protect and enhance sites and landscapes of ecological or cultural value;
- (d) to strengthen solidarity among Mediterranean coastal States in managing their common heritage and resources for the benefit of present and future generations; and
- (e) to contribute to improvement of the quality of life.

The fields of activities for the phase 1996-2005 include measures to promote the integrated management of water resources (including catchment plans, demand management, and treatment of waste water and sewage); integrated management of coastal areas; and nature conservation (with special attention to the conservation and rational management of Mediterranean wetlands,)

<u>The Barcelona Convention</u>. Soon after adoption of MAP in 1975, **The Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea** was adopted. This comprised five protocols: on dumping; emergency; land-based sources of pollution; offshore exploration and exploitation; and, of most relevance to this report, **The Protocol Concerning Mediterranean Special Protected Areas**, which was adopted in 1982. The protocol concerned the selection, establishment and management of protected areas for their biological, ecological, genetic, scientific, aesthetic, cultural,

archaeological, historical or educational interest. The protocol was revised in 1995 in the form of The **Protocol on Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance**. In June 1995 there were 21 Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, including all five of the GEF eligible countries.

MAP has also served as the basis for Charters, declarations and workshops in associated fields relevant to the conservation of biodiversity and of wetlands in the Mediterranean basin including :

-The Charter on Euromediterranean co-operation for the environment of the Mediterranean basin (Nicosia, 1990).

-Declaration on Euromediterranean co-operation for the environment of the Mediterranean basin (Cairo, 1992).

-The Mediterranean Charter for Water (Rome 1992).

-Med 21 is a Mediterranean initiative in the context of the universal, global approach outlined in Agenda 21. Whilst adopting a similar thematic approach to Agenda 21 (social and economic dimensions, conservation and management of resources, the role of groups and organisations) it attempts to take account of the specific context of the Mediterranean and the spirit of intra-Mediterranean co-operation.
At the regional level, among other priorities, Med 21 calls for Mediterranean States to work collectively to:

ratify the Biodiversity Convention;
reconfirm the commitments made at Nicosia and to establish management plans for the most threatened biotopes;
control illegal trade in endangered species;
increase the number of Biosphere Reserves in the Mediterranean.

-The workshop on 'Making best use of land ownership and land-use policies for the protection of the Mediterranean coastline' (Hyeres, 1995) demonstrated the regional concern with the effects of land use policies on the coastal zone. A priority identified at the meeting was the need to further encourage regional initiatives for the management of wetlands. The workshop concluded "by expressing the wish that a network for collaboration, concerted action and information exchange be maintained".

OTHER RELEVANT REGIONAL INITIATIVES

While the MAP serves as the political and technical basis for collective action in the region, two other technical and financial vehicles are also important within the region.

(a) Four Mediterranean countries are part of the European Union and implement regional actions discussed and co-ordinated through Brussels.

Wild Birds Directive. (1979) For 13 years, the **Directive on the conservation of wild birds** (79/409/EC) provided the most important mechanism for the conservation and management of wetlands in the States of the EU. EU member states are required to protect threatened bird species through designation of a network of Specially Protected Areas (SPAs), and to take appropriate measures to prevent pollution of the habitats or disturbance to the birds within them. Many SPAs are wetlands. Greece has 12 wetland SPAs, Spain 42, France 65, and Italy 34.

Habitats Directive (1992). The EU expanded its scope for nature conservation by adopting the **Council Directive on the Conservation of Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora** (92/43/EEC). This builds on the existing provisions of the Birds Directive. The main aim of the "Habitats" Directive is to promote the maintenance of biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats of wild fauna and flora. This is to be achieved through a coherent European ecological

network of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) which shall be set up under the title Natura 2000. SPAs classified under the Wild Birds Directive shall be included within the Natura 2000 network.

Lagoons and Mediterranean temporary ponds are amongst the habitats highlighted as a conservation priority. Rivers and ponds, which may be essential for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of wild species, are among the features that are singled out.

Of 92 projects funded by the EC under this programme, 59 dealt specifically with wetland conservation, with an EC contribution of 18.143 MECU. At least 30 sites were situated along the coast, reflecting not only the degree of threat experienced, but also the high numbers of species in Annex I of the Birds Directive in these areas. Projects affecting Mediterranean coastal wetlands are shown in the map .

(b) Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (METAP).

METAP was launched in January 1990. It is funded by a range of bilateral and multilateral donors. Together they will "support efforts to integrate environmental concerns into the main stream of economic and social policy and will encourage the adoption of policy measures conducive to the efficient use of natural resources". The METAP III portfolio for the eligible countries/Authority is in Annex 6.

NGO Regional Activities

As well as the actions for biodiversity of governments in the Mediterranean, there are many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that are active in promoting environmental protection, conservation and sustainable development. NGOs provide an important means for involving the general public in environmental concerns, and ensuring consultation, participation and accountability. In total there are 1641 environmental NGOs in Mediterranean countries, including 34 in Albania, 40 in Egypt, 12 in Lebanon, 107 in Morocco and 103 in Tunisia. Most of these are local, but some, including The World Conservation Union and World Wide Fund for Nature, have Mediterranean programmes.

The Mediterranean Programme of IUCN will be implemented in 1997. The WWF Mediterranean Programme (launched in 1996) will conserve, and where necessary restore, freshwater ecosystems and their processes for biodiversity and people in the Mediterranean region. Wetlands International maintains a network of focal points for the annual international waterfowl counts.

The regional MedWet programme on wetlands, which includes the Ramsar Bureau, governments and NGOs is outlined in Annex 9.

REGIONAL NETWORKS

Mediterranean states have shown their commitment to regional action and to reinforcing North-South and South-South exchange of experience. Regional and bilateral cooperation is underway in a range of brown environmental fields, including pollution, water supply and quality which have been identified for priority action.

In the biodiversity field, regional networks are still in their infancy, and to be successful they require a number of characteristics

- a common goal for participants
- a clear mandate from governments
- appropriate funding
- the freedom to operate at technical level without undue political constraint
- they should respond to the needs of the participants

a coordination point to act as a focus for kick-starting the network, disseminating information and responding to needs.

For the time being, no such dedicated network exists to support biodiversity managers in the region, and the current proposal fills this gap.

ANNEX 6 Links with METAP

METAP is an important regional programme which addresses principally brown environmental issues through a programme on pollution hotspots, capacity building and integrated water management. The programme also includes coastal management issues.

The present proposal provides a complementary "green" approach to five of the METAP beneficiary countries. The table below shows the level of linkage with different projects planned under the METAP III portfolio.

METAP project	Principal activities	Link with GEF project
Albania		
Capacity building/NEAP updating	NEAP	***Indirect*** , : site or biodiv information into ill feed into NEAP
Strengthen environmental institutions	Integrated approach to pollution control EIA law and implementation	***Indirect*** : addresses root causes of pollution and reinforces EIA capacity
Investment planning and institutional development for coastal development and environmental protection	Preparation of a coastal action plan and create Albania coastal Development corporation	***Direct and complementary*** : the project sites are those selected for protection in the METAP/UNEP Coastal area study (1996), and are therefore complementary to those selected for development and investment under METAP III.
Restore and improve services for Elbasan, Vlore, Fier, Shkodra	Rehabilitation and restoration of urban environmental services	***Marginal***
Urban environmental management and investment programme for Tirana	Restore basic urban environmental services	***Marginal***

EGYPT

Environmental business centre	Improve access of business community to environmental products`	***Marginal***
Training for environmental monitoring, enforcement and compliance	Creation of a corps of trainees and trainers	***Indirect;*** improved law enforcement will addresses root causes in long term
Industrial hazardous waste management	Apply modern approaches to hazardous waste management in two selected sectors (e.g. textiles and metal finishing)	***Marginal***
Environmental planning and compliance for relocation of tanning industry	Assist in planning relocation of the tanning industry	***Marginal***
Solid waste management strategy and investment plan for four provincial governorates in Upper Egypt	Prepare solid waste strategy, and investment plan	***Marginal***
Sustainable community management of low-cost innovative water and sanitation systems.	Develop sustainable model for integrated water and sanitation services for a rural town (as yet unidentified)	***Marginal,*** (unless test town located around Lake Burullus)

Tunisia

Pilot project for soil and water conservation in Northern Tunisia	Training school for technicians and farmers Analysis of sensitive areas	***Marginal***
Integrated water management	Spatio-temporal analysis of water resources + their management	***Indirect*** (?) Difficult to assess without more detailed content and precise site locations
Sustainable management of soils in Southern Tunisia	Improve ability of local people to sustainably manage marginal areas	***None***
Coastal urban development	Urban planning, especially around Sousse	***Indirect :*** increased ability of APAL to plan coastal urban development.
Management of water demand	More efficient water use in all economic sectors	***Indirect :*** will improve water-use efficiency and may reduce pressure on remaining wetlands
Rehabilitation of industrial sector	Reduce pollution originating from small and middle-sized businesses	***Marginal***

Morocco

Organisation of a corps of environment inspectors	Design and establish corps of inspectors	***Indirect*** : reduced pollution is good for biodiv.
Treatment of waste in Essaouira	Implement municipal environmental plan	***None***
Establishment of environmental observatory in Jadida	Test decentralised environmental monitoring centre	***Marginal*** : could provide model for future equivalent in Mediterranean area
Anti-pollution plan for Safi	Municipal environmental action plan	***None***
Environmental management programme for the Mediterranean coastline	Establish decentralised Management Authority reinforce GIS capacity Recruit and train staff for the Authority Investment plan for pollution monitoring	***Direct and complementary :*** The three pilot sites will form the basis for the protected ecosystem component of the Authority, responsibility will be gradually decentralised from national coordinator as the Authority is progressively staffed and operational.
Reduction of pollution in Casablanca/Mohammedia	Implementation of a pollution control and management system	***None***
Pilot programme for environmental management of Sebou basin	Apply NEAP to Sebou basin	***None***

Lebanon

Institutional arrangements and regulations for the enforcement of environmental legislation	Implementation of environmental legislation and EIA	***Indirect :*** builds long term capacity of Ministry to address root causes
Establish environmental parameters	Generate environmental indicators from data on air emissions, water quality and industrial waste	***None***
Develop environmental management systems for new industrial parks	Relocation of industry outside populated areas : environmental considerations	***None***
Water quality management plan for the upper Litani river and Qaroun Lake	Implement management and investment plan to improve lake and water quality	***Direct and complementary:*** will positively influence water quality in neighbouring Ammiq marshes

Palestinian Authority

Arresting pollution at hot spots (Wadi Gaza and coastal zone)	Preparation of an action plan for the rehabilitation of the Gaza Coastal zone, including Wadi Gaza	***Direct and complementary :*** GEF will focus on green issues.
Developing capacity to manage natural and cultural resources	Protection and conservation of natural and cultural resources	***Indirect*** **:** will improve capacity to manage all natural resources
Capacity building for environmental management	Environmental monitoring and enforcement	***Indirect :*** will address root causes in long term
Environmental assessment and monitoring unit	Strengthen environmental assessment and monitoring (air pollution)	***Marginal :*** will address root causes in long term

ANNEX 7

Acronyms

APAL	Agence de protection et d'aménagement du littoral
BAD	Banque africaine de développement
BEE	Bureau européen de l'environnement
CBD	Convention on biological diversity
CELRL	Conservatoire de l'espace littoral et des rivages lacustres (France)
CEP	Committee for environment protection
CNPPA	Commission on National Parks and protected areas
CORINE	Land classification system used by EC
EC	European Commission
EEB	European Environment Bureau
EEAA	Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
EIB	European Investment Bank
EU	European Union
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IUCN	World Conservation Union
LIFE	Financial instrument for the Environment (EU)
MAP	Mediterranean Action Plan
MEDA	Mediterranean assistance programme of EU
MedPAN	Mediterranean protected areas network
MedWet	see annex
METAP	Mediterranean Technical Assistance Programme
NGO	Non-government organisation
ONEM	Observatoire national environnement du Maroc
PDF	Project development facility
PHARE	East European programme of EU
RAC/PAP	Regional activity centre/Priority action programmes (UNEP)
RAC/SPA	Regional activity centre/Specially protected areas (UNEP)
SSC	Species survival commission
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WWF	World-wide fund for Nature

ANNEX 8 - LIST OF GLOBALLY THREATENED TAXA PRESENT ON PROJECT SITES .

() IUCN status where known. ? presence suspected

FLORA	MAMMALS	BIRDS	REPTILES & AMPHIB.	INVERTEBRATES
Sideritis reaseri	Lutra lutra	Pelecanus crispus (V)	Rana epeirotica	
Corylus colurna	Rupricaria r. balcanica (I)	Oxyura leucocephala ?(V)	Rana shqiperica ?	Gomphus flaviceps (I)
Achillea fraasii	Pitymys felteni (R)	Aquila clanga (VU)	Hyla arborea	Myrmeleon formicarius (K)
Asperula chlorantha	Apodemus mystacinus	Haliaeetus albicilla (V)	Testudo hermanni (V)	Calosoma sycophanta
Athamanta densa (R)	Pitymys thomasi ? (R)	Larus audouinii ?(CD)	Emys orbicularis hellenica	Buprestis splendens (E)
Centaurea nicolai (R)	Rinolophus euryale ? (R)	Phalacrocorax pygmeus ?(nT)	Elaphe situla (K)	Zerynthia polyxena
Cirsium tymphaeum	Taradidae teniotis ?	Gallinago media (near-T)	Cyrtodactylus kotschyi bibroni	Papilio alexanor
Crataegus heldreichii	Crocidura floweri	Crex crex (VU)	Trapelus savignyi	Saga italica
Crepis baldaccii (R)	Gerbillus perpallidus	Glareola nordmanni (nT)	Varanus griseus	Zanitoschema pallidissima
Draba parnassiaca	Jaculus orientalis (R)	Falco naumanni (R)	Testudo kleinmanni (V)	Euzanitis alfierii
Linum spathulatum	Aleactaga tetradactyla (V)	Circus macrourus (nT)	Caretta caretta (V)	Acmaeodera andresi
Pedicularis graeca	Acinonyx jubatus (V)	Marmaronetta angustirostris (VU)	Acanthodactylus pardalis	Acmaeodern pharao
Petteria ramentacea	Gazella dorcas (V)	Chlamydotis undulata	Coluber rogersi	Sphenoptera kasimi
Pterocephalus perennis	Fennecus zerda (K)	Aquila heliaca? (V)	Chamaeleo chamaeleon	Sphenoptera lottei
Silene caesia	Felis margaritta (K)	Aythya nyroca (VU)	Chelonia mydas (E)	Buprestis humeralis
Sinapis pubescens	Rinolophus blasii	Milvus milvus (K)	Bufo kassasii?	Meliboeus latesculptus
Valeriana crinii (R)	Monachus monachus ? (E)	Phalacrocorax aristotelis desmarestii	Testudo graeca (V)	Conophorus aegypticus
Lactuca graeca	Myotis capaccinii (V)	Turnix sylvatica sylvatica ?	Acanthodactylus blanci	Crocidium aegyptiacum
Thymus teucroides	Meriones sacramenti (R)	Porphyrio p. porphyrio		Ulidia fascialis
Hypericum haplophylloides (V)		Numenius tenuirostris ? (Cr)	Emys orbicularis occidentalis	Atylotus farinosus
Lilium chalcedonicum		Tetrax tetrax ? (R)	Chalcides parallelus	Cyrtosia tetragramma
Limonium anfractum		Glareola nordmanni ?(nT)	Chalcides mauritanicus	Cyrtosia separata
Orchis albanica				Empidideicus mariouti
Pinus heldreichii (R)				Cylindrothorax verrucicallis

Allium mareoticum (R)				Chalogenia theryi
Euphorbia punctata (R)				Anisatamia ruficornis

FLORA	INVERTEBRATES	FISHES		
Fumaria microstachys	Unio elongatalus (V)	Aphanius fasciatus		
Ebenus armitagei (R)	Eunicella verrucosa (V)	Hippocampus ramulosus		
Viola scorpiuroides	Pinna nobilis	Hippocampus hippocampus		
Zilla spinsosa biparmata	Patella ferruginea	Cobitis levantina		
Bellevalia salah-eidii (E)	Talitus saltator			
Cynara cornigera	Orchestia sp			
Pancratium sickenbergeri	Thyridantheax unicolor			
Phalomis floccosa	Cytherea nucleorum			
Zygophyllum album	Hirudo medicinalis (K)			
Colchicuum ritchii				
Leopoldia albiflora (E)				
Plantago chamaepsyllium (I)				
Allium crameri (E)				
Sonchus macrocarpus				
Erodium mumbyanum				
Anthyllis barba-jovis				
Silene barrattei				
Scabiosa farinosa				
Isoetes velata dubia				
Isoetes velata adspersa				
Iberis semperflorens (R)				
Limonium clupeanum				
Euphorbia briquetii (R)				
Anthemis mauritiana (E)				
Calycotome chfesta intermedia grosii (I)				
Carthamus rhiphaeus (R)				
Filago bolivari ? (E)				
Linaria virgata riffea ? (E)				
Minuartia senneniana (R)				
Picris pitardiana ? (E)				

Malcolmia arenaria ? (R)
Centaurium barrelieroides (E)
Rumex rothschildianus ? (E)
Echinops taeckholmianus
Helianthemum sphaerocalyx (E)
Zygophyllum aegyptium

(e) Parallel Financing (Associated projects); Programmes underway to address root causes at National / institutional level with direct / indirect positive consequences for the site.

Canada bilateral	Sea Shore management	800
Germany bilateral	Technical Assistance Capacity building, Training ONAS strengthening (drinking water and liquid waste) Ichkeul (p.m). / pgm total cost:70.000	9.000
GEF	national biodiv study // pgm total cost: 280	50
GEF	Oil pollution / pgm total cost:4700	1000
World Bank	Waste and infrastructures / pgm total cost:200.000	2.000

(a) 12,800,000
(b) 7,405,000
(c) 700,000
(d) 780,000
(e) 12,850,000
Total (expect c): 33,835,000

Plus (c) 700,000

Tunisia: Total: 34,535,000

MOROCCO

(a) Programmes underway to address root causes at site level and forming part of the baseline.

SITE	Programmes	Donor or national contribution	Costs	Root cause addressed
Nador	Waste study Nador	European Union	150	Solid and Liquid Waste
Nador	Waste and water management	National Contribution	100	Solid and Liquid Waste
Moulouya	Waste and water management	National Contribution	100	Solid and Liquid Waste

(b) National Contribution.

National Contribution	Land acquisition; running costs; investment; National coordination;	2.160

(c) Co-incremental funding

French GEF	GEF project complement	700

(d) Co Funding.

France bilateral	Institutional and legal assistance	(140/an) 700

(e) Parallel Financing (Associated projects); Programmes underway to address root causes at National / institutional level with direct / indirect positive consequences for the site.

Germany bilateral	Environmental management; National Parks; ONEP strengthening / pgm total cost:9.800	1.000
World Bank	Environmental management project / pgm total cost:10.800	2.000
African Development Bank	Study to establish protected areas network and priorities	250
METAP	Al Hoceima management Plan; Martil Tetouan management plan; EIA capacity strengthening; Med GeoBase.	1.480
European Union	Waste study Al Hoceima; Waste study Chef Chaouen Tétouan;	400

UNDP	P.A.N.E; Catchment basin approach; Sustainable development National network; GEF/ biodiversity study / pgm total cost:1.870	600

(a) 350,000
(b) 2,160,000
(c) 700,000
(d) 700,000
(e) 5,730,000
Total (expect c): 8,940,000

Plus (c) 700,000

Morocco: **Total:** **9,640,000**

LEBANON

(a) Programmes underway to address root causes at site level and forming part of the baseline.

SITE	Programmes	Donor or national contribution	Costs	Root cause addressed
Aammiq	Water resource management	National Contribution	50	Local over-pumping

(b) National Contribution.

National Contribution	Water management plan preparation and implementation; Urban planning; Awareness and information	300

(c) Co-Funding.

UNDP	Capacity strengthening	100
ROCHA Trust	Scientific assistance.	100

(d) Parallel Financing (Associated projects); Programmes underway to address root causes at National / institutional level with direct / indirect positive consequences for the site.

UNEP/GEF	Biodiversity country study / pgm total cost: 300	300
World Bank	Regional coastal assessment; State of environment and strategy	400 400
UNDP	Capacity 21; Environment legal framework;	600
GEF	Protected area project / pgm total cost:2.500	2,500
GEF/UNDP	Biodiversity enabling activity	300
UNDP	Participation; Balbeck Hermel regional development program;	(p.m)
METAP	Water management plan for upper Litani	(p.m)

p.m. pour mémoire

(a) 50,000
(b) 300,000
(c) 200,000
(d) 4,500,000
Lebanon: Total: 5,050,000

EGYPT

(a) Programmes underway to address root causes at site level and forming part of the baseline.

None necessary

(b) National Contribution.

National Contribution	Running costs; investment (visitor centres); National coordination;	1.7359

(c) Parallel Financing (Associated projects); Programmes underway to address root causes at National / institutional level with direct / indirect positive consequences for the site

.

Denmark bilateral	EAA strengthening; / pgm total cost:6.000	530
	Shore protection; / pgm total cost:2.300	924
	Oil pollution accident plan / pgm total cost:1.650	300
	Environment monitoring and information programme / pgm total cost:14.000	1.300
	training / environment / pgm total cost:4.600	410
Canada bilateral	Environmental Information System / pgm total cost:9.000	410
	Environment initiative fund / pgm total cost:16.000	1.500
USA bilateral	Environmental awareness campaign; / pgm total cost:530	53
Germany (GTZ) bilateral	Sustainable Use / pgm total cost:6.700	1.000
Japan bilateral	Monitoring / Laboratories / pgm total cost: 52.200	265
European Union	Natural protectorates management / pgm total cost:20.000	2.000
World Bank	Natural resource management project (agriculture and water use) / pgm total cost:10.000	1.000

(a) 0
(b) 1,735,900
(c) 9,692,000
Egypt: **Total:** **11,427,900**

ALBANIA

(a) Programmes underway to address root causes at site level and forming part of the baseline.

SITE	Programmes	Donor or national contribution	Costs	Root cause addressed
Narta	PHARE Narta	U.E / Co Funding	280	Chemical pollution and water circulation.

(b) National Contribution.

National Contribution	Running costs; investment; National coordination;	350

(c) Parallel Financing (Associated projects); Programmes underway to address root causes at National / institutional level with direct / indirect positive consequences for the site.

METAP + World Bank:	Integrated Coastal Zone Management; Investment planning & institutional development for coastal dvpt and Environment protection;	7.700
European Union	PHARE in Karavasta / pgm total cost:1.350	700

(a) 280,000
(b) 350,000
(c) 8,400,000

Albania: **Total:** **9,030,000**

PALESTINIAN AUTORITY

(a) Programmes underway to address root causes at site level and forming part of the baseline.

SITE	Programmes	Donor or Palestinian Authority Contribution	Costs	Root cause addressed
Wadi Gaza	Arresting pollution at Hot Spot Wadi Gaza	Palestinian Authority Contribution	200	Pollution Liquid and solid waste

(b) National Contribution.

Palestinian Authority	Running costs; investment; National coordination;	280

(c) Co-incremental funding

French GEF	GEF project complement	300

(d)- Parallel Financing (Associated projects); Programmes underway to address root causes at National / institutional level with direct / indirect positive consequences for the site.

METAP	Arresting pollution at Hot spot (Wadi Gaza and coastal Zone); / pgm total cost:2.650 (P.A : 1.500 / METAP 1.150)	2.650
	Developing capacity to manage natural and cultural resources; / pgm total cost:0.250	50
	Capacity building for environmental management; / pgm total cost:3.480 (P.A : 0.780 / METAP : 2.500)	1.000
	Environmental assessment and monitoring unit; / pgm total cost:2.190 (P.A : 0.440 / METAP :1.750)	(p.m)
Japan bilateral	Support for Gaza Solid Waste Sector; / pgm total cost:2.800	1.000
Japan bilateral / UNDP	Upgrading Khan Younis Water supply system; / pgm total cost:0.95	(p.m)
France bilateral	Well digging and network upgrading Gaza Strip; / pgm total cost:8.000	(p.m)

UNDP / USAID / Arab Gulf Fund / Japan bilateral	Sewage disposal / effluent recycling northern region Gaza Strip; / pgm total cost:8.000	(p.m)
UNDP/Canada bilateral	Water resources action programme; / pgm total cost:1.400	0.400
Netherlands, Italy, Germany and Switzerland bilateral	Beach camp sewerage and drainage / pgm total cost:34.000	2.000
Australia bilateral	Deir el Balah sewerage and drainage;	(p.m)

European Union	Middle camps sewerage and drainage; / pgm total cost:49.600	2.000
	Rafah sewerage and drainage / pgm total cost:57.000	1.000
	Jabalia storm drainage / pgm total cost:31.000	1.000
Canada bilateral	Assistance in setting up Environmental Impact Assessment procedures / pgm total cost:0.750	(p.m)
Norway bilateral	Physical Planning of Gaza and West Bank / pgm total cost:10.000	1.000
Denmark bilateral	Institutional support of Environmental management; / pgm total cost:1.200	0.200
World Bank	Parks and protected area management plan; / pgm total cost:0.240	0,040
World Bank / Norway bilateral	Institutional study for Palestinian Water Authority; / pgm total cost:0.29	(p.m)

(a) 200,000
(b) 280,000
(c) 300,000
(d) 12,340,000

Total (expect c): 12,782,000

Plus (c) 300,000

Palestinian Authority: Total: 13,120,000

REGIONAL

(a) Co Funding .

MedWet		1.680

(b) Parallel Funding
.

WWF Med.	Fresh water policies	400
UNEP/MAP	Ratio CAR/PAP; CAR ASP; SD com.; Urban ; CZM; Legal... / pgm total cost: 33.500	5.000
TOTAL environment Fund	MedPan; Biodiversity;	500

Regional: **Grand total:** **7,580,000**

== O==

National contribution, co-funding and parallel funding totals:

1. Country Based Summary ***(except the French GEF (c))*** **:**

Tunisia: **33,835,000**
Morocco: **8,940,000**
Lebanon: **5,050,000**
Egypt: **11,427,900**
Albania: **9,030,000**
PA: **12,820,000**
Regional component: **7,580.000**

Grand total: **88,682,900**

2. Summary by Contribution Type *(except the French GEF (c))* **:**
Total: Associated projects **62,362,000**
Total: Govt. contribution: **22,680,900**
Total: Co-financing: **3,640,000**

Grand total **88,682,900**