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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. Background Information

1. Declining trends in environmental quality of the Mediterranean Sea were evident more than two decades ago, when the countries bordering the Mediterranean convened a meeting in Barcelona to adopt the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) in 1975, and the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (the Barcelona Convention) in 1976. The MAP and the Barcelona Convention are being implemented through a series of Protocols, as well as the programmes carried out by relevant MAP Regional Centres. Among these programmes, the Blue Plan (BP) and the Priority Actions Programme (PAP), being part of MAP’s socio-economic component, and MEDPOL, designed to assess the degree of marine pollution in the Mediterranean, are among the most important.

2. The Environmental Programme for the Mediterranean (EPM) was launched in 1988. Two years later, under this same program, the Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (METAP) was initiated by the World Bank (WB) and the European Investment Bank (EIB) in partnership with the European Union (EU) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). METAP’s mission was to mobilize grant funding to assist Mediterranean countries, particularly those of the southern and eastern rim, to prepare policies, programmes and investment projects that effectively address constraints to environmentally sustainable development in the region. Two phases of METAP have been implemented so far (1990-1995), and the third phase has just recently been launched.

3. The environmentally sustainable development became the basic goal of the majority of interventions in the Mediterranean coastal areas. Integrated planning and management of coastal areas (ICAM) has become a major tool in the implementation of sustainable development. The need for ICAM in the Mediterranean Basin has been an acknowledged priority in nearly all the environmental programmes launched thus far to address environmental degradation in the region. During its first phase (1990-1992), METAP spent US$ 2.8 million of grant funds for ICZM activities, while in its its second phase (1993-1995), it spent US$ 2.6 million. The first generation of MAP CAMPs (Coastal Area Management Programs) in Croatia, Greece, Syria and Turkey was launched in 1989, the second (Tunisia, Egypt, Albania, Algeria and Morocco) in 1991, a third generation of CAMP projects (Israel, Malta, Lebanon) was initiated in 1993, and the CAMP in Slovenia, approved in 1996, could be considered a fourth generation one. During the last 8 years, MAP spent more than US$ 2.5 million for the first 7 projects to be implemented.

II. Methodology

4. To help guide the next round of investments in integrated coastal area management proposed under METAP-III for the period 1996-1999, and under MAP-II until the year 2000, a selective review of ICAM initiatives carried out to date in the region, was deemed necessary. The main objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- to identify those ICAM initiatives which have been successful in meeting project objectives;
- to identify constraints to establishing or advancing ICAM initiatives;
- at the regional level, to assess the contribution of individual initiatives and the larger programmes of which they are a part (particularly METAP and MAP);
- to outline the lessons learned from these initiatives which may be applied in the region;
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- to propose recommendations for replicating successes on a larger scale;
- to propose policy level recommendations regarding the place and importance of ICAM to the parties of the Barcelona Convention; and
- to inform METAP and MAP and sponsors of other pending initiatives in the region of the results of the study.

5. The World Bank nominated Dr. Marea Hatziolos as the Task Manager, while PAP nominated Mr. Ivica Trumbic as Team Leader and Coastal Zone Management Specialist on the Team. They selected a multidisciplinary Core Project Team composed of: Prof. Harry Cocossis, Special Area and Land-Use Planner; Dr. Yves Henocque, Marine Environmental Specialist; Dr. Ljubomir Jeftic, Marine Pollution Specialist; Dr. Ferenc Juhasz, Institutional Specialist and Environmental Economist; and Dr. Bernard Kalaora, Social Scientist. Mr. Danilo Demi, Environmental Planner acted as Programme Assistant.

6. The implementation of the evaluation was envisaged in three phases. In the first, preparatory phase, the analysis of available documentation was performed, as well as a brief overview of all ICAM interventions in the region, terms of reference were prepared, the Core Project Team selected, evaluation methodology developed, case studies to be analyzed in detail selected, and questionnaire for the national focal points for MAP and METAP prepared and distributed. In the second phase, the evaluation was performed, including site visits, three team meetings, preparation of first and second drafts of the joint report and its circulation. During the third phase the dissemination of results is envisaged through meetings and workshops attended by the main stakeholders. The presentation of the documents to METAP and to the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention is envisaged in the second half of 1997.

7. During the evaluation process, as the first step, the expert group identified 30 programmes, plans and projects, either completed or under way, that qualified as coastal management projects. The second step was the selection of a group of nine case studies:
- the Coast of Albania (CAMP and METAP projects);
- the islands of Cres and Losinj in Croatia (METAP);
- the Rhone River Basin - the coastal part of France (other project);
- the Island of Rhodes in Greece (CAMP and METAP);
- the Coast of Israel (other); the Coast of the Liguria Region in Italy (other);
- the Area of Al-Hoceima in Morocco (METAP);
- the Tunisian Coastal Protection Agency (METAP); and
- the Bay of Izmir in Turkey (CAMP).

The questionnaire was developed to be used as the main source of information in intervention areas, but also as a check list during interviews with the relevant authorities, experts and institutions in the case study areas. For case studies only, during the third step, the evaluation framework was developed consisting of a number of key dimensions (performance, integration, and sustainability), against which the case studies will be evaluated. The performance dimension involves two parts. The first is an analysis of the successes and weaknesses of an intervention (programme, plan or project). Second, a distinction is being made between factors which are the result of the intervention itself from those that originate in the wider context where the intervention is carried out, i.e., externalities which may have significantly influenced project outcome. The integration dimension refers to the level of horizontal or vertical interlinkages or interdependencies achieved among sectors, plans or administrative levels in the area concerned. Distinction is being made between sectoral integration, the integration of environmental component in the socio-economic context, the governance integration, and the level of participation. The sustainability dimension deals with the follow up prospects of the initiative. It
shows whether these prospects have been taken into consideration, either in the form of a mechanism directly built into the initiative, or in the form of a context created to allow the long term implementation of the initiative’s proposals. A distinction is made between the financial, institutional and political aspects of sustainability.

III. Analysis and Evaluation

8. A comprehensive analysis and evaluation of ICAM initiatives was carried out at three levels:

- **Classification (typology) of 30 interventions** which were identified by the group as coastal area management initiatives in the region. The analysis was limited, because of the amount of data available.

- **Further analysis of 14 of these initiatives** for which the questionnaires were received.

- **In depth analysis and evaluation of 9 case studies**.

9. The 30 interventions identified at the outset of group’s work were located in 15 Mediterranean countries. Eleven of these initiatives were from the northern, 10 were from the southern, and 9 from the eastern part of the Mediterranean. Although all of the projects were located in coastal areas, eighteen projects did not have specific areal features, 6 of them specifically referred to the wetlands in coastal areas, 3 were related to the bay areas, 2 sites were on islands, and 1 was on a peninsula. Four projects were located in predominantly urban areas, 9 in rural, while 17 were located in the mixed urban/rural areas. Nine projects were designed as national level interventions, 5 were sub national (provinces, regions or districts), and 16 at the local level. Regarding the nature of activities, 16 were of a very comprehensive nature, 9 of them dealt specifically with biodiversity issues, 2 with pollution abatement, 1 with institutional aspects of ICAM, 1 with cultural heritage and biodiversity, and 1 with tourism development. Regarding the intervention source, 5 projects were implemented as MAP CAMPs, 15 were as METAP, 2 were supported both by MAP and METAP, and 8 of them were supported from national sources. From the organizational perspective, 11 interventions were conceived as large scale programmes, 9 were coastal plans, 9 were more detailed projects (preparatory works for big investment projects, or smaller area management plans), and only one of them dealt with wider policy issues. In eleven projects only there was some form of the follow-up implemented, either in the form of direct implementation of project proposals or continuation of the subsequent phase of project preparation.

10. The questionnaires were received from 14 areas in 11 Mediterranean countries. Four of these interventions were carried out by MAP, six by METAP, and the rest were initiated and carried out as national programmes. The interventions analyzed show that METAP ones are clearly aiming at immediate follow up in the form of an investment project. Many of these projects have the objective of improving the sea water quality in the areas concerned. MAP CAMPs and other interventions are more characterized by creation of the coastal area management policy, institutional strengthening, and capacity building. However, the group has been aware of the fact that METAP has also undertaken a number of regionally based policy studies, but they were not evaluated in this project. METAP interventions were more directed towards local levels (indicating the inclination towards solving the problems of “hot spot” areas), while MAP CAMPs and others are more oriented towards planning and policy interventions at sub-national or national levels.

11. From the analysis at this level, some other important conclusions could be made. Overall, the interventions have covered a large number of policy objectives, which is an encouraging sign. Even when they are dealing with the overall policy issues (or “a little bit of everything”), such as large scale national or regional coastal protection and development plans (Israel, Malta, Italy, Tunisia, Turkey), they are also dealing with some “hot” policy issue which require quick solutions,
such as coastal nearshore development (Israel) or tourism development (Malta). The additional specific issues interventions are very often dealing with are coastal land development, water resources, pollution, biodiversity protection and the protection of cultural heritage. In general, METAP interventions are more selective in policy objectives, while CAMP ones have more diverse choice of subjects covered. CAMP interventions always start as a multi objective activity but, for a number of reasons, some of the objectives have not been achieved. Most of the interventions, as policy measures, propose further planning or institutional strengthening activities. A minority are proposing the implementation of policy instruments (regulatory, legal, economic, subsidies, credits, other budget allocations, user fees, etc.) or environmental education. This indicates that in most of the areas the process of coastal area planning and management has just started and that in many cases there is a relatively long way to go before the effects of the policies proposed are in evidence. The METAP originated interventions tend to be more oriented towards the practical level of implementation, on-the-ground.

12. Furthermore, at this level, a large amount of institutional information was analyzed. Roughly half of the countries have created a legal context for coastal zone management, meaning the laws and regulations appropriate for coastal planning and development are in place. The analysis doesn’t show how effective this legal context is, or whether the laws and regulations really are implemented. The administrative context refers to the existence of government institutions specifically related to the management of coastal zones. It is surprising that almost all of the countries have some sort of office (at the national, regional and/or local level) dealing with these issues. Unfortunately, the analysis doesn’t go deeper into uncovering the effectiveness level, or the degree of integration between these levels. Most of the interventions are short to middle-term ones (2-6 years). Most of them were prepared in 1-3 phases (the typical case consists of the preliminary work, preparation of documents, and follow-up/implementation). The documentation in the majority of interventions was completed, and the interventions now are in the implementation period. This demonstrates that projects have not yet matured for a fully efficient assessment. The cost of the intervention is, on average, very modest. The source of finance is mainly from the international community, while the host country contribution is mainly provided “in-kind”. It is the group’s view that this is one of the weaknesses of the whole initiative in the region. The countries are simply not active enough in finding the financial resources internally. This may point to two things. First, it may be that coastal zone management has not yet gained the status it deserves, failing to generate adequate government resources for activities. And second, it may be that international assistance in this field is something that is normally expected, and the countries divert their financial resources to other priority issues. In either case, spectacular results could not be expected given the resources involved. Only in the case when an investment project is expected as a follow up, the positive change in the environmental situation in the area, in a relatively short period, could be expected. There appears to be complementarity between MAP CAMPs and METAP interventions in most cases, however, more effort could have been made at creating explicit linkages between the two.

13. At the third level, every case study is presented in much detail and then thoroughly analyzed within the evaluation framework. The evaluation results are synthesized, first, from the point of view of interventions, and, second, from the point of view of programmes sources involved (METAP, MAP and other). The same is done in this summary.

Project Performance

14. At the intervention level, the performance dimension could be summarised as follows. More than half of the case studies were judged as successful. In those which were considered as partially successful, many of the activities planned were simply not performed (as is the case in some CAMPs). The activity realization rate of CAMPs in Albania, Rhodes and Izmir is 50 - 70%. Besides insufficient financing and withdrawal of some partners (Albania and Izmir), it is obvious
that a number and volume of the activities should have been planned more real (CAMP Albania and CAMP Rhodes). The influences of the projects on the environmental effects in the area concerned were higher than the outside influences (Israel, Albania and Rhodes). In some areas, the very fact that the projects were existing was enough to produce some results. This was felt in the significant improvement of the institutional capacity (Albania, Izmir, Rhodes), or environmental awareness in most of the case study areas, particularly in Israel and Cres-Losinj. This could be considered as one of the best results of the ICAM initiatives in the region so far. Outside support or outside “environment” of the projects has been, in general, rather weak. A possible reason for this could be the insufficient engagement of the civil society (e.g., NGOs, citizen pressure groups, the press, etc).

15. The integration dimension is an objective which is difficult to achieve, since not all the methodological questions have yet been properly answered, and the most appropriate tools and techniques not yet developed. A high level of integration was achieved only in Cres-Losinj, France, Israel and Tunisia. These were almost a single sector interventions. All other interventions have rated only as medium success. These were mainly projects comprised of a larger number of, very often, unrelated or remotely related activities. A partial success was achieved also relative to the question of early inclusion of environmental concerns in the coastal management process. The level of governance and participation may be judged as unsatisfactory, particularly with regard to participation of general public.

16. The sustainability dimension is crucial point of the project’s implementation. The financial sustainability prospects in most of the cases are not bright. Only in a few cases the commitment by the authorities or other decision-makers to support financially the project’s proposals could be identified (France and Rhodes were evaluated favourably, while the weakest prospects are in CAMP Albania, Al Hoceima and Izmir). In some cases the external financial support was expected for the continuation of the project’s efforts (METAP Albania and METAP Rhodes). Another form of the financial security was the prospect of an investment project to follow immediately after the completion of the documentation phase (METAP Rhodes). Institutional and political support was better, indicating the growth in the sense of “ownership” of the projects (high in Cres-Losinj, France, Israel, Tunisia, while in other countries a medium institutional and political support is to be expected). This may be an encouraging sign.

Program Performance

17. At the program level, three MAP CAMP interventions were analyzed (Albania, Rhodes, Izmir). Their performance had a significant impact on the region at the sub-national regional level and the benefits appear to outweigh the costs by several factors (the average cost to MAP of each intervention analyzed is about US$ 240,000). The whole initiative is more successful in its overall catalytic role than with regard to the strict fulfillment of its objectives. On average, only about 50-70 % of the activities was implemented. The feasibility studies are not envisaged, and financial sources (MAP, host government’s and/or other) very often are not secured in advance of programme implementation. In spite of sometimes lacking external support, the overall impacts of the programme itself is surprisingly good, particularly in increased institutional capacity. It is the general judgment, that the capacity of local experts has increased significantly as a result of training and other educational activities (Rhodes, Izmir and Albania). The influence made on the decision makers is also quite significant. The sectoral integration is not rated as very high. There appears to have been little coordination among the various components of MAP involved in implementation of CAMP activities, partially, when integrated planning studies or integrated plans of the areas are being prepared (Albania, Syria and Izmir). Participation has been only moderate. Not enough efforts have been employed to involve all the stakeholders, particularly NGOs or the general public. It is true, however, that the governance contexts are not always favorable towards the inclusion of the wider public in environmental management. CAMP projects’ longer term
sustainability is not secure enough. Although pledged, there has been no evidence that the actual financial resources have been secured for the follow-up proposals. Only where there was an investment project envisaged, have activities continued (Rhodes and Kastela Bay, with EIB and EBRD/WB projects on water treatment). Sufficient institutional and political support exists, but since the necessary domestic financial support has not materialized, the overall rate in most of the projects could not be more than medium. This is one of the biggest problems of the CAMP initiative. Even if good results in preparing the proposals are achieved, they are left hanging in the air because of low financial sustainability.

18. The performance of five METAP projects analysed as case studies left a strong mark in the region. Most of the projects were limited in scope, project-driven, and concentrated in “hot spot” areas. The average cost of the project analyzed was approx. US$ 360,000. Most of the projects evaluated were assessed as successful, internally quite coherent, which helped them succeed even without external help. However, a large share of METAP projects was performed by international consultants, reducing the potential benefits for capacity building relative to CAMPs. By and large, METAP project recommendations have been or are being followed up through preparation for direct investments. In developed countries of the region, there are good prospects that investment projects will follow (e.g., in Rhodes). In some developing countries (Albania), project follow up was promising but subsequently thwarted by political events which have stalled investments. In some other countries, the future is financially less secure (Al-Hoceima), because the investment projects were not clearly identified. Political support given to the projects is very high, but the institutional structure necessary to back these proposals is often lacking. With regard to integration, METAP projects demonstrated high sectoral integration within projects, although the number of different sectors involved in these projects was relatively limited relative to CAMPs. in general, environmental concerns were incorporated early in the coastal management process and local and national government were adequately represented throughout the project preparation process. Direct public participation and involvement of the civil society, however, was not pursued.

19. Three initiatives labeled as other were analysed as case studies. The average cost of an intervention was more than US$ 900,000, which by far outweighs MAP or METAP ones. Most of these were large scale national projects with full support of the national authorities and institutions. Their success rate was judged as high. Some of them have presented very innovative methodological approaches, which could be utilized elsewhere in the region. The interventions were highly focused, with a smaller number of activities than in CAMPs, or in METAP projects. None of the case studies addressed the socio-economic dimension (population, economic development issues, tourism projections) in any prominent way. However, the interventions were highly successful in integrating the issue of coastal development with environmental protection, particularly on the terrestrial side of the coastal area (Liguria, Israel). One of the projects was quite successful in guiding national coastal development (Israel). In all three, the governance level was relatively high, and in France, vertical or intra-governmental integration in program development and implementation was especially good. A large number of national and local institutions was involved, as well NGOs, but not the general public. The case studies analyzed demonstrated a relatively high level of financial sustainability. The interventions were supported by the adequate institutional arrangements as well as by the strong political support.

IV. Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

Conclusions

20. On the basis of the above evaluation, the following general conclusions related to the ICAM interventions could be made:

- a majority of case studies are still at a pre-implementation phase;
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- the geographic area of intervention varies, and the usual delineation criteria are administrative boundaries;
- population issues are not always adequately taken into consideration;
- human activities have been treated in an adequate way in most cases although the emphasis has been primarily on tourism;
- urbanization and land-use conflicts are present in most cases but fail to be satisfactorily integrated into management policies;
- human impacts on natural ecosystems have been treated in a satisfactory way from the point of view of identifying conflicts but economic analyses of environmental impacts are lacking in general;
- future dimensions of human activities and environmental impacts are not always adequately treated except in the cases of integrated planning studies; there has been little feedback from such cases to national development plans;
- except in CAMP activities, little exposure to specific tools of ICAM is evident, and even there the emphasis is on the use of such tools for data management and simple suitability analyses;
- in administratively highly centralized countries coastal area management features prominently in national development and national land-use planning or in environmental strategies at the national level.
- the results of ICAM are being used increasingly in policy making and managerial decisions (at least at the local level), but the international donors should help ensure that ICAM generates results (studies, policy proposals, etc.) which are more “user friendly” for policy makers and managers;
- in a few Mediterranean countries, notably the EU members, certain tools important for coastal area management have been institutionalized, such as EIA, pollution monitoring, information systems etc., as well as economic and legal/regulatory instruments developed both at the national and international levels; these are lacking, however, in most non-EU member countries.

21. Among factors in the wider context (“system” factors) contributing to ICAM program success, the following could be mentioned: international assistance, planning tradition, efficient public service, political factors, policy framework, institutional support and leadership, high degree of state ownership of land, and public awareness. Among project related factors, the following could be mentioned: the adequate methodological approach to the implementation of initiatives, financial and human resources made available to project teams, and governance arrangements envisaged by the project design.

22. In spite of all the efforts and positive developments, there are still a number of areas of concern: lack of high level horizontal integration, lack of vertical integration, lack of effective involvement of the private sector and participation of the general public, practical use of implementation tools for ICAM, lack of replicatation or transfer of the experiences and successes to other locations, existing pollution monitoring programmes are still not used as a management tool, the improvements in water and environmental quality were difficult to assess (quantify), compliance with existing legal instruments is still not adequate and appropriate, end-users of the results of the activities were not clearly identified and they were not involved with design of the programmes, coordination among the various components was not adequate, and the capacity of the administration to prepare follow-up investment proposals to be submitted to international financial institutions or other donors was weak.
Lessons Learned

23. Several important lessons could be learned from this evaluation. With regard to the performance dimension the following could be said:

- an evaluation mechanism has to be built in right from the beginning, while programme monitoring must be linked to evaluation throughout project implementation;
- fulfillment of project level objectives in the planning phase does not automatically lead to implementation of the plan;
- fulfillment of project level objectives does not ensure impact beyond the immediate project area, unless results are widely disseminated and replicate elsewhere.

With regard to the integration dimension the following could be learned:

- environmental concerns must be integrated into the design and implementation of an initiative from the very beginning;
- a programme could be issue-oriented at the outset, but will have to become more comprehensive at a later stages in order to deal with all complex linkages and provide integrated solutions;
- Programs should be client driven, with the interested national institutions identified at an early stage;
- policy interventions must be closely linked to the objectives of the ICAM initiative;
- without undermining the importance of technical capacities, it is advisable to ensure that the solutions to technical problems relevant to coastal environments be adapted to the local customs and cultural context.

For the sustainability dimension the following is important:

- strong political commitment at all levels is essential to the preparation and implementation of initiatives;
- participation of stakeholders and end-users from the design phase through project implementation should be encouraged;
- a longer-term sustainability of the project should be secured, while greater importance should be accorded to an easier utilization of project results.

Recommendations

24. As overall policy recommendations, riparians in the region are urged to consider the following:

- Develop country CZM strategies and integrate their implementation into national development strategies and plans.
- Integrate water resources management and coastal zone management.
- Explore opportunities for appropriate use of economic instruments related to project financing.
- Establish new or enhance existing systems for enforcement of laws and regulations.
- Invest in capacity building and institutional strengthening using national and regional expertise available in the field of coastal management.


• Establish appropriate institutional mechanisms to achieve vertical and horizontal integration in ICAM.
• Strive for full harmonization of coastal area management policies between local and national administration and support their implementation.

25. For **METAP, specific recommendations** are:

• Support the implementation of national, regional (sub-national) and local coastal area management plans through preparation of investment projects and strengthening institutional capacity to implement them.
• Build capacity for environmental assessment and the use of economic planning tools which allow internalisation of environmental costs in determining cost/benefit ratio of proposed development activities in the coastal zone.
• Continue support for adoption and use of implementation tools and techniques, including preparation of indicators (including those on sustainable development) on the progress of specific policies, programmes, plans and projects.
• Collection, treatment and disposal of municipal and industrial waste waters is the major problem in the Mediterranean coastal zone, requiring considerable investments. Such investments should be given high priority for project preparation. Whenever possible municipal and industrial waste waters should be separated to facilitate treatment.
• Funding institutions should consider the establishment of enabling legislation and appropriate institutional arrangements for major investments in coastal management programs; institutional linkages should include interministerial committees, intergovernmental bodies, and broad stakeholder representation outside the public sector.
• Countries should be assisted in their institutional capacity for project identification and preparation. The METAP regional project preparation facility and UNDP’s Capacity 21 capacity building unit should be utilised to the fullest possible extent.
• METAP activities should be linked with those of MAP as well as with other international programmes in the region in order to increase sustainability of the effort, expand scope and increase cumulative impact of related interventions.
• METAP should be encouraged to prepare a detailed study assessing use of economic instruments in the region, e.g., where they are used, why they do or do not work, what are constraints to their adoption, etc. Use of economic instruments should be phased in project design where there is potential in countries to adopt them (as a demonstration project initially).

26. For **MAP, specific recommendations** are:

• Local level programmes (CAMPs) should be more focused on sustainable development, and potential end-users should be involved early in the coastal management process. ICAM should become a standard approach in achieving the sustainable development and management of the coastal regions. In applying ICAM particular emphasis should be given to coordination among different sectors and levels of administration to ensure broad-based support for the effort.
• Design and development of CAMPs should be encouraged and strengthened. Projects should be preceded by a feasibility study to assess absorptive capacity of institutions involved and the financing implications of proposed interventions. In the development of new CAMPs particular emphasis should be given to realistic planning of CAMPs, and to proposing a viable number of activities to be implemented.
Countries which have already developed CAMPs should be encouraged to utilize accumulated knowledge and to replicate the approach in other localities and regions within their territories. Within this activity, a maximum of national resources should be mobilized. Also, direct exchange of experience and know-how between CAMPs should be encouraged and assisted. Possibility of publishing a CAMP newsletter as well as opening a www site should be examined.

Contracting Parties should encourage wider involvement and participation of private sector and general public in the development and implementation of CAMPs.

Link CAMP activities with those of METAP as well as with other international programmes in the region in order to increase sustainability of the effort, expand scope and increase cumulative impact of related interventions.
I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background Information

1. Declining trends in environmental quality of the Mediterranean Sea were evident more than two decades ago, when the countries bordering the Mediterranean convened a meeting in Barcelona to call attention to these issues and to mobilize regional commitment to reversing these declines. With the adoption of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) in 1975, and the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (the Barcelona Convention) in 1976, the groundwork was laid for the world’s first Regional Seas Programme, calling for regional cooperation and coordination among the 18 member states in the resolution of common environmental problems.

2. The Mediterranean Action Plan and the Barcelona Convention are being implemented through a series of Protocols, as well as the programmes carried out by relevant MAP Regional Centres. Among these programmes, the Blue Plan (BP) and the Priority Actions Programme (PAP) are among the most important, being part of MAP’s socio-economic component. Their objective is research into the long-term evolution of the environment-development relationship (BP), and implementation of practical actions which are expected to yield immediate results in the economic development of coastal areas and relief from associated environmental problems (PAP). Their role has become increasingly important since Earth Summit in Rio (1992), and follow-up meetings in Tunis (1994) and Barcelona (1995), when the Barcelona Convention and MAP were revised in accordance with the prescriptions for sustainable development in the Mediterranean Region. MEDPOL is another important component of MAP, designed to assess the degree of marine pollution in the Mediterranean, to evaluate the effectiveness of the abatement measures implemented under MAP, and to develop standards for the control of land-based sources of marine pollution.

3. More than a decade after the Barcelona Convention, the Environmental Programme for the Mediterranean (EPM) was launched (1988). Two years later, under this same program, the Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (METAP) was initiated by the World Bank (WB) and the European Investment Bank (EIB) in partnership with the European Union (EU) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). METAP’s mission was to mobilize grant funding to assist Mediterranean countries, particularly those of the southern and eastern rim, to prepare policies, programmes and investment projects that effectively address constraints to environmentally sustainable development in the region. Two phases of METAP have been implemented so far (1990-1995), and the third phase has just recently been launched.

4. In addition to MAP and METAP, there are a number of other initiatives in the Mediterranean region which are focused on the achievement of sustainable development in coastal areas. These initiatives range from national programmes and projects to bilateral and multilateral actions (European Union, various international programmes as assistance to different countries, NGOs, other international organizations, etc.). In conclusion, significant levels of resources have been mobilized in the last twenty years from the international donor community and the nations bordering the Mediterranean to shed light on the underlying nature of environmental problems in the region, and to develop strategies at both the national and regional levels to combat these problems.

5. Clearly discernible are two general phases in the implementation of METAP, MAP, and other national and international programmes in the Mediterranean. At the outset, the bulk of these programmes were diagnostic in nature, mostly in the form of background studies, coastal profiles, monitoring programmes, and scientific research aimed at defining major issues and problems - both at the regional level and at smaller areas and localities, and particularly in “hot-spots”. For
example, during the first decade of MAP (1976-85), MEDPOL carried out a comprehensive programme of scientific research and monitoring of the state of pollution in the Mediterranean and established a system of permanent monitoring of marine pollution (in some countries, for the first time). At the end of that period, it was determined that the problems were mostly land-based, and that the field of action should be broadened to include the landward portion of the coastal zone as areas of influence. Another important step forward was the recognition of the need to harmonize coastal area development with the carrying capacity of the environment. Also recognized was the need to secure development for the present as well as for future generations. In a nutshell, environmentally sustainable development of coastal areas became the basic goal of the majority of interventions during the second decade of organized efforts towards the management of Mediterranean coastal areas.

6. Integrated planning and management of coastal areas (ICAM) has become a major tool in the implementation of sustainable development in Mediterranean, as “...a permanent process of achieving goals and objectives for environmentally sustainable development (ESD) within the constraints of physical, social and economic conditions and within the constraints of legal, financial and administrative systems and institutions. It is a process which is not against, but encourages linkages between sectoral planning activities to achieve more comprehensive goals.” (UNEP, 1995). This is just one of a series of definitions of ICAM which emerged from active efforts to create a rational framework for management of the coastal resources of the region. As a consequence of such a “proactive” approach, a number of coastal area management plans, coastal pollution control plans, contingency plans, studies and projects were produced in the second phase as concrete interventions aiming to eliminate or alleviate environmental problems in the areas identified as “hot-spots”.

7. In spite of these efforts, the increasingly intractable problems of rapid population growth, urbanization and industrialization along the coastal margins of the Mediterranean have kept ahead of measures to control pollution and curb environmental degradation. Echoing worldwide trends toward urbanization of coastal areas, population centres along the Mediterranean coast, particularly along the southern and eastern rims are being fueled by high economic growth and a growing influx of rural immigrants and environmental refugees moving from the hinterland to the coast. Pollution from inadequate management of municipal wastewater and solid waste is exacerbated by effluent from industries growing alongside urban populations. Compounding this urbanization process is the rapid expansion of tourism, increasing pressures on natural habitats and causing changes in social structures, particularly diluting the traditional population. Declines in fisheries productivity, as well as non-sustainable use of other natural resources, especially coastal land, have undesirably transformed a large part of the Mediterranean environment within a comparatively short period of time.

8. The need for ICAM in the Mediterranean Basin has been an acknowledged priority in all the environmental programmes launched thus far to address environmental degradation in the region. The EPM has financed quite a few programmes and projects of that kind. Information used in the next paragraphs refer only to “explicit” ICAM programmes and projects, although there are a large number of other projects which contain, to a greater or lesser degree, the coastal area management component. During its first phase (1990-1992), METAP financed 9 programmes in 5 countries with a total of US$ 2.8 million of grant money, which amounted to 16% of activities and 20% of total METAP funds. In its second phase (1993-1995), METAP spent US$ 2.6 million on 9 ICAM activities in 7 countries of the region (14% of the total funds reserved for that phase). This means, that in the last 5 years METAP implemented a total of 18 ICAM activities in 10

---

1 ICAM is one of the acronyms used in conjunction with the coastal management (the other two most frequently used are ICZM - Integrated Coastal Zone Management, and ICM - Integrated Coastal Management), and there is a continuing debate which one is the most appropriate. Since that debate is not the subject of this document, the authors opt for ICAM which has been used by UNCED, and subsequently has become well known around the Mediterranean.
Mediterranean countries at a cost of US$ 5.4 million. It should be pointed out that the counterpart contribution of host countries has not been counted in. The amount spent in that period on various national and other international multilateral and bilateral programmes is unknown, but it certainly largely exceeds the above mentioned sum.

9. Following PAP's initial implementation of four Country Pilot Projects (1986-89) in Croatia, Greece, Syria and Turkey (for a detailed list of, largely PAP related, activities in each of these four projects see Trumbic, 1991), the Sixth Ordinary Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (Athens, 1989) decided that those projects be continued and that other MAP components and their activities be included in them. The projects were renamed Coastal Area Management Programmes (CAMPs). In addition to the first four - initially named Country Pilot - projects (the so-called first generation of CAMPs), at the same meeting a second generation was launched (Tunisia, Egypt, Albania, Algeria and Morocco). At the meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention in Antalya (1993), a third generation of CAMP projects (Israel, Malta, Lebanon) was approved. The CAMP “Slovenia”, approved in 1996 in Montpellier, could be considered a fourth generation CAMP. Although the role of MAP and its components in these projects was primarily catalytic, MAP and PAP supported the preparation of coastal area management plans in the majority of the above mentioned programmes. During the last 8 years, MAP spent more than US$ 2.5 million for the first 7 projects to be implemented. The exact amount of counterpart contribution of the host countries is difficult to calculate (it was primarily “in kind”), but it is likely to be close to that of MAP's contribution.

10. Taking into account some of the industrialized countries, ICAM appears to be stalled in the planning phase in the Mediterranean, with little evidence of effective implementation. At the same time, protocols and other legally binding resolutions have had little documentable effect in reversing undesirable trends observed in the Mediterranean marine and coastal environments. This, despite considerable means invested in the region. A turning point has yet to be reached. As efforts to achieve this and the related goal of sustainable development in the Mediterranean enter their third decade since the signing of the Barcelona Convention, it is essential to find out what is the best mode of investing the new resources planned for the forthcoming period.

B. Objectives

11. To help guide the next round of investments in integrated coastal area management proposed under METAP-III for the period 1996-1999, and under MAP-II until the year 2000, a selective review of ICAM initiatives carried out to date in the region, was deemed necessary.

12. The main objectives of the evaluation are the following:

- to identify those ICAM initiatives which have been successful in meeting project objectives and to document the basis for success in each case;
- to identify constraints to establishing or advancing ICAM initiatives in countries which have attempted to do so;
- at the regional level, to assess the contribution of individual initiatives and the larger programmes of which they are a part (particularly METAP and MAP), to a departure

---

2 The word “generation” is used primarily to distinguish between periods of the approval of a particular CAMP, and not necessarily a significant change in their structure, contents or the mode of implementation. It is true, however, that not much has changed in the approval procedure of the CAMPs.

3 The implementation of 10 activities in 8 countries was envisaged at the cost of about US$ 13.0 million, which is 21% of the total funds.

4 The implementation of 5 CAMPs, in Israel, Malta, Lebanon, Algeria, Morocco, and Slovenia respectively, was envisaged at a tentative cost of US$ 2.0 million, while the agreements for several of these projects have been already signed.
from the status quo in demonstrating significant improvements in environmental conditions;

• to outline the lessons learned from these initiatives which may be applied in the region and possibly outside the region;
• to propose recommendations for replicating successes on a larger scale;
• to propose policy level recommendations regarding the place and importance of ICAM to the parties of the Barcelona Convention; and
• to inform METAP and MAP and sponsors of other pending initiatives in the region of the results of the study with the aim of focusing resources in the next generation of projects on those activities which are most likely to have an impact.

C. Structure of the Report

13. The report contains four chapters. The first chapter discusses the actual Mediterranean context and the situation concerning the implementation of ICAM in the region, as well as the rationale and objectives behind this activity. The second chapter refers to the methodological approach to the task. In addition to a brief review of other assessment and evaluation efforts accessible to the authors of the study, and analyses of experiences arrived at through these efforts, this chapter presents the selected method, procedure and criteria of evaluation, and describes the case studies chosen for in-depth analysis, their typology and how the selection was made. The third chapter provides an analysis of the state and impact of ICAM in the region, primarily based on the analysis of initiatives in the case study areas. In the closing chapter, lessons learned are summed up and recommendations for decision makers are given. The main body of the report addresses the major data and findings. Additional information will be contained in an annex to the report.
II METHODOLOGY

A. General Issues

14. An increasing number of ICAM programmes and projects (estimated to exceed 140 in Fall of 1993, see Sorensen, 1993) have been or are being implemented in the entire world. In parallel, there is a growing number of guidelines, handbooks, and specialized international journals containing a large number of articles on the subject, such as capacity building, institutional strengthening for ICAM, etc. However, only a few attempts have been recorded on the evaluation of these initiatives and their successes and limitations, the incentives and disincentives which would make a more successful application of ICAM possible in the future. This is best summarized in the conclusion of an informal Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO meeting held in 1996 which reads: “There is an urgent need for an accepted evaluation methodology for assessing the changes identified and implemented. When an evaluative framework is in place it will be possible to document trends, identify their likely causes and objectively estimate the relative contributions of ICAM programs to observed social and environmental change.” (IOC, 1996)

15. In the broad literature on evaluation the term assessment often appears. While the two terms are frequently interchanged, assessment refers to quantitative and qualitative measurement or estimate while evaluation includes also an additional element of significance (value). One of the definitions which seems widely acceptable, states that evaluation is “....a process that attempts to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, effectiveness and impact of activities in the light of their objectives. It is an organizational process for improving both activities still in progress, and future planning, programming and decision-making.” (UNEP, 1994)

16. Although the need was recognized for a consistent methodological approach to the evaluation of ICAM initiatives, only recently have the elements of a coherent and more widely accepted approach been discussed. While in the past some institutions have carried out or organized evaluations of their own projects and programmes, these attempts have by and large been separate and mutually unrelated.

17. There are few who question the need for evaluation. The evaluation procedure is always incorporated in the methodological approach to the ICAM process, usually in that part of the process which refers to the implementation and monitoring of the planning solutions. However, although the need for evaluation is generally acknowledged, there are few evaluation procedures carried out in practice. Some crucial questions still remain unresolved. The majority of evaluation procedures carried out have used a methodology for evaluating projects, which means they focused on individual interventions. It appears that the evaluation of complex ICAM programmes cannot be limited to an evaluation procedure typical for project evaluation.

18. There are two aspects in evaluation: “outcome” evaluations and “organizational process” evaluations (Jacobson, 1995). The first refers to a measurement of results or outputs of different projects and programmes, such as decline in pollution, improved state of key ecosystems, increased populations of rare species, etc. In this context, one has to note that in environmental management it may take years before measurable outcomes can be observed. In terms of evaluating “organizational process”, success of an intervention is judged on the basis of whether appropriate preparations have been made, and whether or not the programme activities have been carried into effect (e.g. what was the amount of human and financial resources pooled for the intervention; have the programme goals been accepted by relevant authorities and other stakeholders; have the relevant laws and other regulations been formulated and accepted, etc.).

19. In evaluation there are several additional issues to be taken into consideration. The first refers to the difficulty to attribute the improvement of the state of the environment in a particular
area only to the intervention which is being evaluated. The second issue is the question of who makes the evaluation, and what constitutes a completely objective evaluation?

20. The evaluation of ICAM initiatives in the Mediterranean started from the assumption that all interventions (projects) to be evaluated must be completed up to the level of documentation. However, a certain number of questions regarding the real effects of individual interventions will remain unanswered, because it is possible that in some cases the evaluation started too early.

B. Evaluation Experience

21. So far, only a very few comprehensive evaluations of ICAM initiatives have been performed throughout the world, either at programme or project levels. There are several reasons for this. First, we can say that it is a comparatively young discipline, so there has not been enough time to formulate a widely applicable evaluation methodology. This conclusion applies primarily to the programme level of ICAM initiatives, since we know that at the project level more evaluations have been made to satisfy internal needs of donors. The second reason behind the small number of evaluations could be the insufficiently developed system of indicators for monitoring the outcomes and establishment of ICAM processes in an area. The question of systematic evaluation of ICAM initiatives was raised perhaps for the first time in the workshop held in May 1996 in Xiamen (China), and among the difficulties mentioned were reliance on qualitative perception, accuracy of baseline information and causal-relationship uncertainties (Chua, 1996). Although these are rather recent issues in the implementation of ICAM, we should mention several evaluations already performed. USAID evaluated its projects in Ecuador (URI, 1995) and Sri Lanka, initiatives that went on for almost ten years. The evaluation showed mixed success of those ICAM initiatives. Of interest in this context is the study which reviews and examines the national Coastal Zone Management Programme of the U.S., prepared by the University of North Carolina (1990). Although the study was based primarily on the evaluation of the economic component, the results are interesting and show that ICAM makes the difference in the areas in which it is implemented, at least as far as the general growth in economic welfare of an area is concerned.

22. In the Mediterranean, there has not been much experience in evaluating ICAM initiatives. An evaluation of MAP has not been performed so far, in spite of repeated invitations to do so. However, a number of authors published their views on the successes and failures of MAP in various journals (Haas, 1990; Broadus et al., 1993; Sorensen, 1993; Jacobson, 1995; Miller, 1996). These attempts, generally, show insufficient familiarity by the authors with the functioning of the MAP structure. It has to be noted that MAP is an inter-governmental organization which works within the UN system and is obliged to follow UN rules. Such a position brings some positive factors, as well as some negative ones. Financial difficulties, for example, which frequently brought CAMPs to a halt, were a factor which the authors failed to sufficiently appreciate. A more rigorous evaluation of the MEDPOL programme of MAP was performed by an independent group of experts, upon request of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention. The general position was that the programme had been successful, and that the problems encountered were similar to those experienced by other international organizations, such as lack of funds, insufficient staff at the MAP Coordinating Unit, etc. (MAP, 1993).

23. The METAP programme paid special attention to evaluation of the entire first cycle of the programme (evaluation was performed twice during 1995). The evaluations found that the programme enjoyed a broad support in the region, that it had innovative and catalytic qualities, and that it had considerable influence on creating a framework for sustainable development and environmental management in the region. However, the reports do not recognize the ICAM component separately, but rather treat the programme as a whole (METAP, 1995a; METAP, 1995b).
24. It can be said that past evaluations of ICAM initiatives in the Mediterranean had rather limited scopes, and did not attempt to compare the degrees of success of various programmes. Most of them were inward oriented, i.e. intended to meet the needs of internal evaluation. Also, some evaluation groups were entirely composed of the experts very much familiar with the programmes they were evaluating (“the insiders”), other groups were mixed (composed of both outside experts as well as the “insiders”), while very rarely were these groups entirely independent, i.e. composed of the experts which have not had previous contacts with the programme they were evaluating (the “outsiders”). It is very difficult to judge the success and benefit of those evaluations. It is, however, clear that in the Mediterranean region there is not a widely applicable or a commonly accepted evaluation methodology, that a system of indicators for monitoring initiatives’ success has not been developed (either on programme or on project levels), and that, therefore, it is not a simple task to perform a rigorous evaluation. Such evaluation will be possible only after a practical system of indicators will be developed to monitor individual initiatives, and after the obligation has been imposed to include it into the ICAM process. It is hoped that the forthcoming METAP/Blue Plan activity on the elaboration of indicators for monitoring sustainable development will pay particular attention to this problem. Also, new initiatives by UNDP and University of Rhode Island to create a widely accepted evaluation methodology will make future attempts much easier. That the initiatives evaluated in this project are not accompanied by a certain number of success indicators is the principal limiting factor of this evaluation. Therefore, it must rely on the qualitative analysis of success, i.e. on the qualitative assessment of the realization of objectives of each initiative.

C. Team Composition and Method of Work

25. The World Bank, as a METAP partner and sponsor of the evaluation, nominated the Task Manager for the evaluation (Dr. Marea Hatziolos, Coastal Marine Resources Management Specialist, Land, Water and Natural Habitats Division, Environment Department), while the Priority Actions Programme of the Mediterranean Action Plan, as cooperating agency, nominated Mr. Ivica Trumbic, Deputy Director of PAP, to act as Team Leader and Coastal Zone Management Specialist on the Team. Their task was to select a multidisciplinary Core Project Team. After consultation in both organizations, the Core Project Team was composed of the following experts:

- Prof. Harry Cocossis, Special Area and Land-Use Planner, Greece;
- Dr. Yves Henocque, Marine Environmental Specialist, France;
- Dr. Ljubomir Jeftic, Marine Pollution Specialist, Croatia/Greece;
- Dr. Ferenc Juhasz, Institutional Specialist and Environmental Economist, Australia/France; and
- Dr. Bernard Kalaora, Social Scientist, France.

Mr. Danilo Demi, Environmental Planner (Italy) acted as Programme Assistant.

26. Due to the size and complexity of the evaluation process, its implementation was envisaged in three phases. In the first, preparatory phase, the analysis of available documentation was performed, as well as a brief overview of all ICAM interventions in the region, terms of reference were prepared, the Core Project Team selected, evaluation methodology developed, case studies to be analyzed in detail selected, and questionnaire for the national focal points for MAP and METAP prepared and distributed. In the second phase, the evaluation was performed, including the following tasks:

- a multidisciplinary team was consolidated (initial meeting was organized in Split);
- site visits were performed (the Core Team was divided in two multidisciplinary groups: English and French speaking - each group spent 3-4 days in each area);
the projects were evaluated (during the field visits together with the local and national counterparts the questionnaires were filled out; the groups performed first on-site evaluations);

three team meetings were organized (Rhodes, Marseilles, Athens) in which the methodology was harmonized, evaluations jointly made, and first draft case study reports prepared;

first and second drafts of the joint report were prepared in English, to be translated in French.

the second draft of the joint report was circulated to the national focal points for METAP and MAP for comment, before being finalized.

During the third phase the dissemination of results is envisaged through meetings and workshops attended by the main stakeholders. The presentation of the documents to METAP and to the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention is envisaged in a meeting scheduled for the second half of 1997 in Tunisia.

D. Project Typology

27. As the first step in its work the expert group identified, on the basis of project documents compiled from METAP, MAP, or other sources, 30 programmes, plans and projects, either completed or under way, that qualified as coastal management projects under evaluation. Those included only those initiatives that, by their territorial elements and contents, clearly fell under the category of integrated coastal area management. The basic typological distinction of initiatives was made according to the geographic position (northern, eastern or southern parts of the region), the programme source (MAP, METAP, and other), spatial level (national, subnational or local), area type (coast, bay or wetland), character of the area (urban and/or rural), type of programme activity (comprehensive, biodiversity, pollution, institutional and/or heritage) and programme level (project, plan or programme). The full list of projects is presented in Table 1 (see Chapter III).

28. The initiatives fell within the following three programme source groups: MAP Coastal Area Management Programmes (CAMP); METAP projects, plans and programmes; and other nationally sponsored initiatives. They are presented in greater detail below.

29. CAMPs were introduced in the second decade of MAP (after 1985), as activities with an area-specific focus based on the integration of knowledge and experience obtained in all MAP components (MAP, 1992). During the period 1988-1989, four area-specific projects were launched by PAP (originally called: Country Pilot Projects - CPP). These were: the Bay of Izmir (Turkey), the Island of Rhodes (Greece), the Kastela Bay (Croatia), and the Syrian Coastal Region pilot projects. The Sixth Ordinary Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (Athens, 1989) commended the results arrived at during this phase of MAP, and decided that it be continued and that the name of the pilot projects be changed into “Coastal Area Management Programmes” (CAMPs) which suggested a certain level of “maturity” of that activity of MAP. Within the CAMP programme, a number of new areas were selected in interested Mediterranean countries. Thus, in addition to Croatia, Syria, Greece and Turkey, new sites were selected in Albania, Egypt and Tunisia. To qualify, the selected areas had to be specific in terms of development problems and their impact on the environment, and a need for short- and long-term solutions to these problems had to have been expressed by national and local authorities. At the same time, these areas and their problems had to be typical of the Mediterranean coastal zone so that the experience was transferable to the broader region. In carrying out the CAMP programme, the role of MAP and its various components on each location was intended to be primarily catalytic with the objectives of:
ASSESSMENT OF INTEGRATED COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

- galvanizing interest of local as well as national authorities, institutions and experts in cooperation;
- transferring international knowledge and technologies;
- procuring necessary support for expertise, training and minimum equipment especially for the southern countries of the Mediterranean;
- introducing techniques and tools for environmentally sound management;
- cooperating with international funding institutions;
- accentuating problems of a selected area by placing them in a wider national, regional and international context (MAP, 1992).

30. CAMPs were envisaged as four-year projects, divided into three essential phases:

- a preliminary phase including fact-finding, collection of essential data, training and building of local and national capacities, definition of options and formulation of a programme proposal;
- phase involving completion of activities related to understanding the ecosystem, specific activities related to pollution prevention and/or control, introduction of integrated planning, preparation of feasibility studies for project proposals (to be implemented in the follow-up phase) in addition to those identified in the preliminary phase;
- a follow-up phase, wherein additional resources external to the project are brought in for the second phase proposals to be implemented.

31. METAP is a comprehensive programme, financed jointly by the World Bank, UNDP, EU and EIB, which just entered its third phase of implementation in July 1997. Basically, there are three METAP activity types: project identification and preparation; policy studies; and institutional development activities. Launched in the late 1980s, the programme passed through several periods of various priorities reflected in the types of projects prepared. Coastal zone management has had a prominent place in all phases of the programme, and has been implemented in all three activity types, but most through project identification and preparation. Another subject of particular interest for METAP’s donor institutions is water, both as a resource and as recipient of human activity residues. This subject was dealt with primarily in the project identification and preparation activity type. Within this evaluation, the interventions in coastal zone management and water related issues were singled out especially, since up to the present in METAP programmes they have been linked. It has to be pointed out here that over the last few years, both METAP and MAP intervened in a number of the same sites in the Mediterranean. In almost all cases, the complementarity of those interventions was recognized and will be specially treated within this evaluation.

32. MAP’s and METAP’s were not the only ICAM related interventions in the Mediterranean. Most of those interventions were aimed at developing countries around the Mediterranean, and very seldom at EU countries. Since the latter have highly developed systems of coastal planning and management, it was decided to select a number of case studies from them as well. It is very difficult to make a typology of this group of projects since they vary between project interventions aimed at resolving individual environmental problems (e.g. coastal erosion, coastal tourism development, etc.), and highly complex regional plans and programmes. Behind those interventions there are often very large funds and highly developed administrative and institutional structures which represent some guarantee of success of such interventions. Although it is sometimes difficult to transfer such experience into the contexts of less developed countries, it was not appropriate to exclude them from the evaluation.
E. Selection of Case Studies

33. The next step in the group’s work was the selection of a smaller group of projects, from the original pool of 30, to be considered as case studies. The criteria used were: (1) representativeness, (2) policy focus, and (3) organization of intervention. The objective of this phase of evaluation was to examine these initiatives in greater detail. Under the representativeness criterion was understood a balanced presence of the case studies with regard to: (i) geographic position of the site in the Mediterranean (north, south, east); (ii) programme source (CAMP, METAP, other); (iii) spatial level of intervention (local, sub-national, national, regional); and (iv) type of site (island, bay, urban agglomeration, pristine coast, national coast). Under the policy focus criterion was understood: (i) the policy objectives; and (ii) the policy measures planned or implemented. Finally, the organization criterion refers to the country context, time and money spent, and other organizational matters.

34. The experts’ group also developed a questionnaire for use as an evaluation tool. Its purpose was to be used as a source of information for as many projects as possible, and as a check list during interviews with the relevant authorities, experts and institutions in the case study areas. The questionnaire has been divided into a number of chapters. The full text of the questionnaire appears in the annex to this document. Here, only the major issues raised and questions asked are presented:

A. Basic information on the programme/plan/project (pr/pl/pj).

B. General assessment of the pr/pl/pj (conflicts, assessment of success, constraints, integration of economic, environmental and governance issues, financial mechanisms, institutional issues, prospects for the follow-up, monitoring, indicators).

C. Assessment of specific issues:
   a. institutional issues (administrative framework, legal framework, economic/financing framework)
   b. environmental issues
   c. human activity issues
   d. urbanization and land/sea use issues
   e. tools for integrated management
   f. participation, public awareness and public attitudes.

35. Among the 30 projects that fell into the global category of ICAM interventions in the Mediterranean, the expert team selected 9 case studies. That number was deemed realistic, as the experts would be able to visit those areas, analyze them thoroughly, contact the relevant stakeholders, as well as fill out and evaluate the prepared questionnaires. Using the three criteria described above, the following case studies were selected:

- the Coast of Albania (CAMP and METAP projects);
- the islands of Cres and Losinj in Croatia (METAP);
- the Rhone River Basin - the coastal part of France (other project);
- the Island of Rhodes in Greece (CAMP and METAP);
- the Coast of Israel (other);
- the Coast of the Liguria Region in Italy (other);
- the Area of Al-Hoceima in Morocco (METAP);
- the Tunisian Coastal Protection Agency (METAP); and
- the City and Bay of Izmir in Turkey (CAMP).
36. In addition to the above, the questionnaires were sent to relevant authorities through the national focal points for MAP and METAP, for the remaining 21 sites. In addition to 9 questionnaires filled during the field visits, five additional questionnaires were received. All 14 questionnaires were analyzed (see Tables 2, 3 and 4 in Chapter III) before the thorough analysis and evaluation of 9 case studies was carried out and presented here.

F. Evaluation Procedure

37. The evaluation procedure presented below refers to the procedure applied to case studies only. Evaluation is a process that attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, effectiveness and impacts of programme, plan, or project activities in the light of their objectives. In order to realize an evaluation procedure as rigorously as possible we have to determine the evaluation framework. The evaluation framework is important because it helps us deal with all the subsequent methodological steps, such as the definition of evaluation criteria, preparation of the questionnaire, performing the interviews during the field visits, the assessment of results of the evaluation procedure, etc. The evaluation framework contains a number of key dimensions. These are the “boundary lines” within which an evaluation procedure is being carried out. We have in mind three key dimensions: performance, integration, and sustainability.

38. A distinction between the successes and weaknesses within a programme, plan or a project is the performance dimension. It concerns, first, the perception of the extent to which the intervention has fulfilled its objectives. Such objectives might include establishment of regulatory systems in a certain area as a result of the programme, plan or project; or creation of a marine park; training completed; or creation of a management agency, etc. The extent of success or failure could be measured in multiple terms: in measurable outcomes (like for example, the number of water connections, km of roads, etc.), and in less quantifiable terms (in changes such as in attitudes, awareness, strengthening of institutions, etc.). Second, in the analysis of the performance it is important to distinguish between factors which are the result of the intervention itself (which might depend, for example, on the internal consistency of the goals and objectives of the initiative, or a scope of the project relative to the problems in the area concerned, or the adequacy of the resources employed for the initiative, etc.), from those that originate in the wider context where the programme, plan or project operates, i.e., externalities, which might affect the performance of the initiative (for example, inadequate inter ministerial coordination, lack of plan implementation mechanisms, etc.).

39. The dimension of integration refers to the level of horizontal or vertical inter linkages or interdependencies achieved among sectors, planning interventions or administrative levels in the area concerned. Distinction is being made between sectoral integration (level of coordination among the sector-specific concerns), the integration of environmental component in the socio-economic context (adequate concern for the interaction of human activity and natural ecosystem, and their mutual impacts), the governance integration (ensuring that all the actors involved are coordinated among the various administrative levels concerned), and the level of participation (among government institutions, private sector, NGOs, general public etc.)

40. The sustainability dimension deals with the follow up prospects of the initiative. It shows whether these prospects have been taken into consideration, either in the form of a mechanism directly built into the initiative, or in the form of a context created to allow the long term implementation of the initiative’s proposals, i.e. beyond the original life of project funding. A distinction can be made between: the financial aspects (whether an adequate financial system has been put in place, or whether the linkages have been established with other policies, programmes, or investments beyond the immediate scope of the initiative), the institutional aspects (whether adequate institutional system exists to implement the initiative’s proposals), and political aspects (whether there is enough political commitment for implementation).
III. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

41. This chapter provides a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of ICAM initiatives in the region. First, all the projects known to the experts’ group will be analyzed. This analysis will be carried out at three levels:

- The analysis of 30 projects which have been identified by the group as the integrated coastal area management initiatives in the region. The analysis is not very profound, since the amount of data available was quite limited (for wider explanation see par. 27). Table 1 presents the available information on these projects.

- The analysis of the initiatives for which the questionnaires were received. In total, the group received 14 responses, out of which 9 refer to the case study areas (see par. 36). Tables 2, 3 and 4 present the information for this analytical level.

- The analysis and evaluation of 9 case studies (see par. 37-40). For each case study, the current situation is presented, and the evaluation performed. The synthesis of the results is given in Table 5. Some of the information used at this level of evaluation could be found in Tables 1-4.

Major findings of this - project level - analysis will be summarized in the form of conclusions. The second part of this chapter will take the closer look at the programme sources (MAP-CAMP, METAP, and others) and their overall impact. It will practically be a re-grouping of the results with the objective of identifying trends in ICAM in the region.

A. Brief Analysis of ICAM Initiatives - Project Identification

42. The Table 1. presents 30 projects that the experts’ group identified at the outset of its work. These interventions were located in 15 Mediterranean countries, although the inquiry was made with all Mediterranean countries (four countries did not respond). Eleven of these initiatives were from the northern part of the Mediterranean, 10 were from the southern, and 9 from the eastern part of the region. Although all of the projects were located in coastal areas, eighteen projects did not have specific areal features, 6 of them specifically referred to the wetlands in coastal areas, 3 were related to the bay areas, 2 sites were on islands, and 1 was on a peninsula. Four projects were located in predominantly urban areas, 9 in rural, while 17 were located in the mixed urban/rural areas. From the projects considered, 9 were designed as national level interventions (for example, the entire national coast), 5 were at sub national levels (provinces, regions or districts), and 16 at the local level (like urban agglomerations). Regarding the nature of activities, 16 were of a very comprehensive nature (consisting of a large number of activities, or sectors), 9 of them dealt specifically with biodiversity issues, 2 with pollution abatement, 1 with institutional aspects of ICAM, 1 with cultural heritage and biodiversity, and 1 with tourism development. Regarding the intervention source, 5 projects were implemented through the Coastal Area Management Programme of MAP, 15 were implemented through METAP, 2 were supported both by MAP and METAP, and 8 of them were supported from other national or international sources. With regard to the organizational level of the interventions, 11 were conceived as programmes (consisting of a larger number of sometimes vaguely interrelated coastal area oriented activities or projects), 9 were plans (mainly coastal plans), 9 were more detailed projects (preparatory works for big investment projects, or smaller area management plans), and only one of them dealt with wider policy issues (large but single sector policy proposals, such as tourism, infrastructure, etc.). In eleven projects analysed there was some form of the follow-up implemented, either in the form of direct implementation of project proposals or continuation of the subsequent phase of project preparation. In other projects, no follow up implementation was either recorded or the project was still in the preparation phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GEOGR. POSITION</th>
<th>PROGR. SOURCE</th>
<th>SPATIAL LEVEL</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>URB. / RUR.</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM. LEVEL</th>
<th>FOLLOW UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>CAMP Albania</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>ICZM Albania</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karavasta Wetland Management Project</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALGERIA</td>
<td>Tiemcen C2M</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EL-Kala Management Plan</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CROATIA</td>
<td>CAMP Kastela Bay</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>MAP / METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Comprehensive Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cres-Losinj Archipelago</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Sub - Nat.</td>
<td>Islands</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CYPRUS</td>
<td>Conservation of Akamas Peninsula</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>CAMP Fuka - Matrouh</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>Rhone-Mediterranean-Corsica Water Quality Management Plan (SDAGE)</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Pollution Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Plan for Thau Lagoon (SMVM)</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>CAMP Rhodos</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>MAP / METAP</td>
<td>Sub. - Nat.</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amvrakikos Bay</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>National Coastal Master Plan</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Water in Haifa Bay</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Pollution Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Liguria Coastal Master Plan</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sub - Nat.</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice Lagoon</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td>Regional Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>Structure Plan of Malta</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>Al Hoceima National Park</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matril Coastal Zone Management</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Strategy</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>CAMP Syria</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TUNISIA</td>
<td>Agence de protection du littoral (APAL)</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Institutional Programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection of Coastal Lagoons &amp; Wetlands in the Hammamet Gulf</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAMP Sfax</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>CAMP Izmir Bay</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Sub. - Nat.</td>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Comprehensive Programme</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest Coast Environment</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Sub. - Nat.</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Tourism Policy and plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Plan for Belek Beach</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>U / R</td>
<td>Comprehensive Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patara Cultural / National Heritage</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>METAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Biodiversity &amp; Heritage Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Analysis of Questionnaires

The questionnaires were received from 14 areas in 11 Mediterranean countries (there are 16 entries in tables 2, 3 and 4, because for Albania and Rhodes MAP/METAP interventions two questionnaires were filled). The majority of those who filled the questionnaires are part of or are connected with the National Focal Points for MAP and METAP, and, therefore, are the users of the intervention results. Some of them participated also in the preparation of documents within those interventions. They came also from the national and local level, and the majority of them came from the public sector and academic institutions. The Tables 2, 3 and 4 present a relatively large amount of information which provide a more thorough insight into almost half of the interventions that were initially listed, and allow for another level of analysis. Four of these interventions were carried out by MAP as part of its CAMP programme, six were part of METAP, and the rest were initiated and carried out by other national or international programme sources. From the typological point of view (see Table 2), the interventions analyzed are roughly equally split between the general and comprehensive policy or programme oriented type, and others which are more direct, or project, type of intervention. Therefore, the priority in these latter interventions is on project identification in the areas concerned. This is typical for METAP interventions, which are clearly aiming at immediate follow up in the form of an investment project. Most of these projects have the objective of improving the sea water quality in the areas concerned. MAP CAMPs and other interventions are more characterized by creation of the coastal area management policy, institutional strengthening, and capacity building. METAP interventions are not excluded from these types of interventions either, and many had a national character. The group has been aware of the fact that METAP has also undertaken a number of regionally based policy studies, but they were not evaluated in this project. From the spatial perspective, the interventions analyzed are generally aimed at national or lower spatial levels. Most of them are local types of interventions covering smaller parts of the national coast. However, a number of interventions were judged as national level ones, because they have covered the entire national coast, although the length of the coast is rather small (like in Israel, Malta or Syria where it was less than 200 km), and actually smaller than some local ones (the length of the island of Rhodes coast is more than 200 km). METAP interventions in coastal management can be judged as being more of a local nature (indicating the inclination towards solving the problems of “hot spot” areas), while CAMPs and others are more oriented towards planning and policy interventions at sub-national or national levels.

Table 3 concentrates on two main policy features: objectives and measures. The first feature refers to main subjects the interventions are concentrated upon, while the second one deals with the character of the intervention, or the measures which the intervention suggests to be implemented in order the stated policy objectives to be realized. Overall, the interventions have covered a large number of policy objectives. It is an encouraging sign that there are no single policy interventions. Even when they are dealing with the overall policy issues (or a little bit of everything), such as large scale national or regional coastal protection and development plans (Israel, Malta, Italy, Tunisia, Turkey), they are also dealing with another “hot” policy issue, such as coastal nearshore development in Israel or tourism development in Malta. In the cases mentioned, the interventions are mainly considered with the coastal land development as an additional issue. Another important issue is the question of water resources, showing the responsibility of all the programme sources in the Mediterranean for this really “hot” regional problem. Pollution, biodiversity protection and tourism development are important in roughly half of the interventions considered, while the issue of the protection of cultural heritage is a specific one and touched upon by the minority of interventions. In general, METAP interventions are more selective in policy objectives, while CAMP ones have more diverse choice of subjects covered. That doesn’t say which interventions are more successful. However, it is a fact that CAMP interventions always start as a multi objective activity, but for a number of reasons, none of the policy objectives have been achieved. The analysis doesn’t say what is the level of integration among sectors either. This
question is being analyzed in the subsequent paragraphs, and on a more limited sample of case studies. Most of the interventions are, as policy measures, proposing further planning or institutional strengthening activities. A minority are proposing more activities such as the implementation of policy instruments (regulatory, legal, economic, subsidies, credits, other budget allocations, user fees, etc.) or environmental education. This indicates that in most of the areas the process of the coastal area planning and management has just started and that in many cases there is relatively a long way before we could witness the practical implementation of the policies proposed. The METAP originated interventions are slightly more oriented towards the practical level of implementation.

45. Table 4 presents a large number of institutional information relevant to the evaluation. Roughly half of the countries have created a legal context for coastal zone management, meaning the laws and regulations appropriate for coastal planning and development are in place. The analysis doesn’t show how effective this legal context is, or whether the laws and regulations really are implemented. The administrative context refers to the existence of the government institutions specifically related to the management of coastal zones. It is surprising that almost all of the countries have some sort of office (at the national, regional and/or local level) dealing with these issues. Unfortunately, the analysis doesn’t go deeper into uncovering the ineffectiveness or the degree of integration between these levels. The countries analyzed are roughly divided between developed and developing (upper, middle or lower income), showing a good mix of cases. Most of the interventions are short to middle-term ones (2-6 years). The exception is the Israeli case, where the plan took many years to be prepared and adopted prior to being implemented. Most of the interventions were prepared in 1-3 phases. The typical case consists of the following phases: preliminary (introductory) work, preparation of documents (programmes, plans, projects, studies, etc.) and follow-up/implementation. The majority of interventions were completed (the documentation preparation phase) and are now in the implementation period. This demonstrates that projects have not yet matured. The cost of the intervention is, on average, very modest. The source of capital is mainly from the international community, while the host country contribution has been mainly “in-kind”. It is the team’s view that this is one of the weaknesses of the whole initiative in the region. The countries are not active enough in finding the financial resources internally. This may point to two things. First, it may be that coastal zone management has not yet gained the status it deserves, failing to generate adequate government resources for activities. And second, it may be that international assistance in this field is something that is normally expected, and the countries divert their financial resources to other priority issues. In either case, spectacular results could not be expected given the resources involved. Only in the case when an investment project is expected as a follow up, the positive change in the environmental situation in the area, in a relatively short period, could be expected. There is a relatively good linkage between MAP CAMPs and METAP interventions. In most of the cases they are complementary rather than competing. This is mainly due to the fact that in most of the countries the focal points for MAP and METAP are very close, or even the same ones. This secures that the activities in ICAM are not being duplicated. One good example in this respect is the case of Albania.
Table 2. LIST OF INTERVENTIONS FOR WHICH THE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RECEIVED: PROJECT TYPOLOGY, PRIORITIES AND SPATIAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>PRIORITY AREA</th>
<th>SPATIAL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Progra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Pro m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>--Coastal Areas Management Programme (MAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Coastal Zone Management Plan (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Karavasta Lagoon PHARE Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIA</td>
<td>--Environmental Management Plan for the Cres-Losinj Archipelago (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>--Schéma Directeur d’Aminagement et de Gestion des Eaux (SDAGE) - Littoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>--Coastal Area Management Programme for Rhodes (MAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Rhodes Coastal Area Management (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>--Masterplan for the Mediterranean Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Study on improving the quality of water in Haifa Bay and Kishon River (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>--Territorial Coordination Plan of the Coast (PTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>--Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>--Parc National d’AI Hoceima (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Plan Directeur d’Aminagement et de Gestion (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>--Coastal Area Management Programme for the Syrian Coastal region (MAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNISIA</td>
<td>--Agence pour la Protection et l’Aminagement du Littoral (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>--Coastal Area Management Programme for Izmir (MAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Southwestern Coast Environment - Turkey (METAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 3. LIST OF INTERVENTIONS FOR WHICH THE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RECEIVED:
## MAIN POLICY FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>POLICY OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>POLICY MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Policy</td>
<td>Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>Coastal Areas Management Programme (MAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Plan (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karavasta Lagoon PHARE Project</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIA</td>
<td>Environmental Management Plan for the Cres-Losinj Archipelago (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>Schéma Directeur d'Aménagement et de Gestion des Eaux (SDAGE) - Littoral</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>Coastal Area Management Programme for Rhodes (MAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodes Coastal Area Management (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>Masterplan for the Mediterranean Coast</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study on improving the quality of water in Haifa Bay and Kishon River (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Territorial Coordination Plan of the Coast (PTC)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>Parc National d'AI Hoceima (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>Coastal Area Management Programme for the Syrian Coastal region (MAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNISIA</td>
<td>Agence pour la Protection et l'Aménagement du Littoral (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>Coastal Area Management Programme for Izmir (MAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwestern Coast Environment - Turkey (METAP)</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* regulatory, economic, budget allocation, and other instruments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>COUNTRY CONTEXT</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>Coastal Areas Management Programme (MAP)</td>
<td>developing (low income)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Plan (METAP)</td>
<td>developing (low income)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karavasta Lagoon PHARE Project (other)</td>
<td>developing low income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIA</td>
<td>Environmental Management Plan for the Cres-Losinj Archipelago (METAP)</td>
<td>developing (middle income)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>Schéma Directeur d’Aménagement et de Gestion des Eaux (SDAGE) -Littoral</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>Coastal Area Management Programme for Rhodes (MAP)</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodes Coastal Area Management (METAP)</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>Masterplan for the Mediterranean Coast</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study on improving the quality of water in Haifa Bay and Kishon River (METAP)</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Territorial Coordination Plan of the Ligurian Coast (PTC)</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>Coastal Area Management Programme for the Syrian Coastal region (MAP)</td>
<td>developed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRIA</td>
<td>Parc National d’Al Hocema (METAP)</td>
<td>developing (low inc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Area Management Programme for Littoral (METAP)</td>
<td>developing low income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUNISIA</td>
<td>Agenze pour la Protection et l’Agriculture du Littoral (METAP)</td>
<td>developing (middle income)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>Southwestern Coast Environment - Turkey (METAP)</td>
<td>other WB projects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*explains whether there is a probability that an investment project will follow the ICAM intervention
C. Case Study Profiles and Evaluation

i. Case Study 1: The Coastal Region (Albania)

46. **General Information on the Case Study.** This case study analyzes two programmes that were financed and organized from two programme sources. Those are: the Coastal Area Management Programme for Albania (CAMP) of MAP, and the Albania Coastal Zone Management Plan of METAP. The national institution responsible for the implementation of both programmes is the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) acting within the Ministry of Health. The CAMP programme was prepared by the experts from various MAP Regional Activity Centres on the basis of the Agreement on the Implementation of the CAMP “Albania” signed by the Government of Albania and MAP. The METAP plan was prepared by the experts of PAP and the American consultancy firm DMI on the basis of a competitive bidding and a resulting agreement between the Government of Albania and the World Bank. Both interventions were performed by international experts in cooperation with local and national experts.

47. **Natural Features.** Albania’s 429 km long coast is dominated by a narrow flood plain opening onto the Adriatic Sea in the North and Central Coastal Region and steep mountains coming down to the Ionian Sea in the South Coastal Region. This diverse and dynamic land-sea interface has been a corridor of intense interaction between natural systems and human activities for centuries. The rich diversity of coastal habitats and geomorphologic features, including beaches, wetlands and lagoons, barrier islands and dunes, large bays and harbors, rocky cliffs, caves and grottos, have provided an irreplaceable natural resource base for people since the Illiric tribes first settled here over 3,000 years ago. The flood plains and wetland areas of the northern coast have been considerably altered to support human settlement, while the rugged character of Albania’s southern coast has to date prevented intense urbanization.

48. **Socio Economic Situation.** Although geographically a part of Europe, the country suppressed any influence from the outer world, tolerating intermittently the “political friendship” of only a few countries. As a result of such isolation, a self-sufficient economy was created, based upon the exploitation of indigenous natural resources by means of obsolete technologies. The main economic activities are mineral extraction, agriculture, some basic industry and energy production. Although possessing the necessary prerequisites (favorable geographic location and natural assets), tourism was not considered a desirable economic activity. The general result of this restricted economy was a low level of production (GDP was about 600 US$) of a limited number of essential goods. These goods supported only the basic needs of a fast-growing population. The consequences of this peculiar model of development upon the environment are ambivalent. The primary and secondary activities (such as mineral extraction and oil refining) using inappropriate technologies have caused serious damage to the rivers and coastal waters (mercury pollution in the Vlore bay). On the other hand, the non-existence of some space-consuming activities, particularly tourism, have spared precious natural features from damage and left them almost intact. Albania is embarking on a fundamental transition from a centrally planned economy to a market-oriented one. The actions and policies to support these goals should be intricately linked to those for improving the quality of the environment. In this regard, an environmentally benign and economically sustainable development strategy has become the underlying objective of the Government’s future strategy for economic transition.

49. **Environmental Situation.** The coastal areas of Albania are relatively unpolluted with the exception of localized pollution in Durrës and Vlore due to untreated sewage discharge, and some beaches which are littered due to uncontrolled disposal of solid wastes. However, with plans for increasing tourism, offshore oil exploitation, fisheries output, and shipping, procedures for

---

5Priority Action Programme, Blue Plan, MEDPOL, Specially Protected Area, Environmental Remote Sensing, 100 Historic Sites
reducing pollution and protecting the coastal environment will become more important, and indeed essential, if Albania is to avoid the same mistakes other countries have made in the development of their coastal zones.

50. **Description of CAMP Intervention.** The geographic scope of the CAMP was the entire coastal area of Albania, from the border with Yugoslavia to that with Greece. The implementation agreement of the CAMP envisages 14 activities, encompassing the various mandates of MAP’s Regional Activity Centres, most of which can be placed under the ICAM “umbrella”. The most important of those activities is the preparation of a Coastal Area Management Plan for the region of Durresi-Vlora, the central part of Albania’s coastal region. This evaluation deals primarily with the implementation of this activity since it integrates the results of the majority of other CAMP Albania activities. The objectives of the Albania CAMP are the following:

- **Overall,** to propose how to protect and rationally utilize the coastal resources over a relatively long period of time. The task of such a programme is to determine and recommend appropriate management measures with a view to resolving the existing environmental conflicts and establishing the optimum paths for dynamic development;
- **In the long-term,** it is proposed to develop the coastal area of Albania in harmony with the receptive capacity of the environment and to create conditions for the establishment of a system of integrated planning and management of resources in the region;
- **In the short-term,** it is intended to offer, within the individual activities, solutions to urgent environmental problems which could be implemented immediately. In the elaboration of those solutions, particular attention will be paid to the strategic objectives of the programme.

The principal phases of the programme were: preparatory activities (1992-93), preparation of the programme (1993-94), and finalization and presentation to the Government (1995-96). The programme has been completed, and MAP invested US$ 300,000 in its implementation, while the national authorities made contributions “in kind”.

51. **Description of METAP Intervention.** In view of the ongoing CAMP initiative and preparation of a coastal area management plan for Central Albania, the geographic scope of the METAP programme focused on the northern coastal region, extending between the Yugoslav border and Durresi, and the southern coastal region, extending between Vlora and the border with Greece. Inland, the programme included the corresponding coastal districts. The contract between the Government of Albania and METAP envisages the preparation of Coastal Zone Management Plans for both northern and southern coastal regions. The primary objectives of the METAP Coastal Zone Management Activity included the following:

- Prepare a sound National Strategy and Action Plan for Coastal Zone Management by mid-1995, which would provide an environmentally sound basis for cost-effective investment decisions and sustainable development in Albania’s coastal zone;
- Prepare a strategy and action plan to strengthen institutions and improve the legal and regulatory framework as it pertains to coastal zone management in Albania; improve integration and coordination of effort among the responsible institutions in Albania; and provide training to strengthen those institutions engaged in various aspects of coastal zone management; and
- Identify and establish priorities for investment projects which will be needed for effective coastal zone management, including (i) environmentally sound tourism development and construction of infrastructure to accommodate tourism; and (ii) measures to improve the protection of the environment, biodiversity, and national parks in sensitive coastal areas.
The principal phases of the programme were: preparation of the plan (1994-95), and the preparation of the pre-investment programme for the priority areas (1995). The programme has been completed, and METAP invested US$ 400,000 in its preparation.

52. **Performance Evaluation.** With regard to the objectives to develop a comprehensive management framework for the Albanian coast, both the MAP and METAP interventions can be considered successful. This was achieved despite the lack of a comprehensive environmental management system in Albania (although documents on environmental strategy and a National Environmental Action Plan do exist). Most, but not all of the CAMP activities have been completed, and in that respect partially fulfilled the set objectives. The METAP intervention, on the other hand, managed to achieve fully its particular objective to prepare a National Coastal Management Plan based on the three priorities set for Albania (institutional strengthening, tourism development and biodiversity protection). The project has increased institutional capacity to deal with coastal protection and development through its training component by involving local experts. Both CAMP and METAP projects were of great benefit not only for the enhancement of technical know-how but particularly for institutional development and cooperation. In the Albanian coastal area, 19 sites have been identified on the basis of their biodiversity, landscape and cultural features, and proposed for protected area status. Among these, five priority sites have been selected. In addition to the above, a full scale marine pollution monitoring programme was established; legal and institutional frameworks were set for oil spill response at national and local levels (these actions will lead to the preparation of a National Contingency Plan); remote sensing was successfully used for the monitoring coastline changes; the programmes succeeded in slowing down or amending certain environmentally harmful projects; and the results of CAMP and METAP studies have been taken into account in the preparation of detailed local water supply plans by foreign investors. In terms of tourism, both interventions have proposed elements of a tourism strategy for the area by identifying key projects and areas for future interventions, as well as necessary infrastructure investments. The ICZM plan itself has been used as a baseline document for a follow-up project to be financed by another financial institution. In terms of process, it should be noted that there was a high level of internal consistency, in both interventions, between goals and measures proposed. In terms of external conditions, achievements were realized despite not always very high priority given to environmental considerations (and this is contrary to the objectives stated by the Government) when major development projects are undertaken. National environmental policy is unable to keep up with the need and desire for economic development at the local level. The programmes so far have failed to bridge this gap. Coastal development is not carried forward in an integrated manner, and consequently, environmental issues are given unequal consideration depending on how they affect a project. Enforcement is generally lax when it comes to environmental protection.

53. **Evaluation of Integration.** The interventions have achieved medium results with regard to intersectoral coordination, and to the introduction of environmental and socioeconomic components. The interventions rely heavily on central/local authorities without taking full advantage of other probable actors. Horizontal integration within the various ministries affected by the programmes is as yet incomplete. The vertical integration between the various levels of government needs to be significantly strengthened. These two programmes, CAMP and METAP, are complementary and are the first of this kind in Albania. Proposals for METAP III are based on the results of these projects, as well as on priorities of the Government regarding coastal zone development. The programmes combine natural resource management and environmental objectives with integrated coastal zone management. They take into account the conclusions and recommendations of the Environmental Strategy and the National Environmental Action Plan prepared by the national authorities in 1993 with the assistance of the World Bank. The local participants in the programmes have gained appreciation of the importance of environmental issues in economic development and their incorporation into these development programmes.
54. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** The interventions can be judged as partially successful from the standpoint of political support, as central institutions are well aware and supportive of the CAMP, but there is little evidence of financial commitment. In contrast, the METAP intervention is likely to be followed up through METAP III allocation of funds. The Steering Committee was established for the development of CAMP and METAP projects, including the representatives of various ministries and experts. The CZM plan for the Durrës-Vlore Region, as part of CAMP, and the METAP CZM plan for the North and South regions were translated into Albanian and will be submitted to the National Territorial Council with a view toward their adoption. As a direct outcome of the programmes, the Government established, within the Committee for Environmental Protection, the Department for Project Implementation and Environmental Economy. Various ministries have participated at relatively high level in different stages of the development of the programmes.

ii. **Case Study 2: Environmental Management Plan for the Cres-Losinj Archipelago (Croatia)**

55. **General Information.** The case study analyzes the environmental management plan prepared for the Cres-Losinj Archipelago in Croatia. The plan was financed by a grant from METAP to the national authorities of Croatia. The national institution responsible for the implementation of the activities is the State Directorate for the Environment - Office for the Adriatic. The plan was prepared primarily by experts from a large number of local and national institutions, assisted by a small group of World Bank and other international consultants.

56. **Natural Features.** The Cres-Losinj Archipelago is located to the south of the city of Rijeka in the Northern Adriatic, and is 99 kms long. The archipelago includes two main islands, Cres (the second largest Adriatic island, covering 404 km$^2$) and Losinj (75 km$^2$), and a chain of small isles. The archipelago covers 513 km$^2$ or 16% of the total area covered by the Adriatic islands. According to the 1991 census, the archipelago had a permanent population of 10,361 inhabitants spread over 39 settlements. Ecologically, Cres is not typical of the Adriatic islands. With its steep topography, there are several distinct micro climates and vegetation types ranging from grasslands and maquis, to abandoned olive groves, pine plantations, lemon and orange groves. In the centre of Cres, a freshwater lake, the hydrology of which has yet to be fully understood, supplies water to the two main islands. The island of Losinj is typical of the Adriatic islands. In the northern part, the vegetation is typical Mediterranean maquis, except for some pine plantations. The southern part, including the towns of Mali Losinj, Veli Losinj and the main tourist developments, is covered with old pine plantations. The small island of Susak is the only sandy island in the Adriatic and consequently has distinct vegetation types. In addition, the archipelago has rich marine biological resources.

57. **Socio-Economic and Environmental Situation.** Culturally, the archipelago landscape illustrates millennia of interactions with settlers (Illyrian, Greeks, Romans, Croats, Venetians). The natural and cultural landscapes of the archipelago are unique and threatened by, amongst other things, the outward migration of its indigenous inhabitants, changing labor patterns, and seasonal tourism variations. Economically, tourism is the mainstay. It was at a high point in 1987, with approximately 3 million tourist nights. The subsequent decline was the most profound during the war from 1991 to 1992. It is now slowly recovering. Marine transport and trade are other important economic activities. Fishing is suffering from declining stocks, while agriculture, forestry and quarrying are minor and declining in importance. Environmental impacts, besides those created by the tourism activity, are mostly caused by hunting activities, endangering a number of protected endemic species, as well as migratory ones.

58. **Description of the Intervention.** The purpose of the proposed management plan is to design an operational instrument to protect the natural, cultural and historical resources of the Cres-Losinj archipelago, while allowing for a balanced approach to the development of agriculture,
forestry, and other compatible activities, especially tourism. Its major task is to provide guidelines
to decision makers at the national and local level for the conservation of crucial and irreplaceable
natural ecosystems and cultural resources, while assisting in creating an ecologically and
economically viable future for the area’s human population. The plan examines the technical,
institutional, environmental, social and economic aspects of the conservation of the Cres-Losinj
archipelago. It has three main goals:

- the conservation and management of the area’s ecosystems and habitats, animal and
  plant population, and human communities;
- the conservation and management of the area’s natural, historical and cultural
  resources in a sustainable, multi-goal context;
- evaluation of the related development schemes from the perspective of conservation
  and sustainable development.

The plan provides a framework for implementation and initiates a process in which all concerned
parties will have a chance to participate. It also proposes to government authorities a practical
strategy, technical methodology and adaptations to existing institutional structures to ensure
sustainable development and conservation of natural and cultural resources in and around the
area. The plan was completed in 1995, and METAP has invested US$ 217,000 in its preparation.

59. **Performance Evaluation.** With regard to the objectives to adopt the plan by the local
authorities, and to establish the institutional framework for its implementation, the intervention can
be considered successful. However, implementation of the plan has not matured enough to enable
assessment of its longer-term effects. Also, it is too early to assess the measurable outcomes of
the intervention, particularly if one is looking for the improvement of the environmental situation. In
terms of non-measurable outcomes, it can be said that the plan successfully incorporates
environmental concerns into the decision making process, and that the plan has received general
acceptance and support at national, regional and local levels, with a result of raising public
awareness on major environmental issues. This is largely due to special efforts of the institutions
involved in the studies. Internally, the plan is very consistent. A good example is the way the plan
deals with the important problem of revitalization of depopulated rural areas. The data in the plan
were well organized and provide a good example for future studies of this kind. The preparation of
the plan was managed mainly at the local level, while the support of national authorities was
marginal. There are also some weaknesses in the performance of the plan. Although certain
conflicts were clearly identified (hunting vs. sheep husbandry; forestry vs. sheep husbandry;
traditional vs. modern forestry practices), recommendations for their resolution were not
elaborated. In spite of the sociological survey carried out at early stages of the plan preparation, a
number of local concerns about services and quality of life in general, as a major factor influencing
sustainable development and contributing to emigration of the young, were not within the scope of
the plan.

60. **Evaluation of Integration.** The plan has generally achieved high levels of integration. It is
well developed linking environmental with social and economic issues, and shows good
understanding of the local conditions. The recommendations in the plan respect the carrying
capacities of the islands. However, as a weakness it could be mentioned that the plan is basically
an ecological study, which deals with other environmental issues (e.g. pollution) in a rather limited
way. Another example of this is the extensive treatment of the biodiversity issues in both terrestrial
(vultures) and marine environments (dolphins). The plan has achieved mixed results with regard to
the governance integration. There have been very few linkages with the Government-level
institutions, while those at local level were quite developed. Local participation was satisfactory.

61. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** The intervention can be judged partially successful. Although
the plan provides a good basis for a follow-up containing investment proposals, direct financing of
the implementation of the plan has not been secured. One of the major recommendations of the
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plan, the establishment of a Management Agency, is already in the first stage of implementation, securing the institutional framework. However, given the existing legal situation of the municipalities, the implementation of other financing proposals (mainly economic instruments) of the plan is uncertain. Political support at the local level is high.

iii. Case study 3: The Mediterranean Coast-SDAGE (France)

62. **General Information.** The case study analyzed in France refers to a national endeavor, entirely programmed and financed from national sources. The Schema Directeur d’Amenagement et de Gestion des Eaux (SDAGE) is a river basin management plan envisaged to be prepared for each of the major river basins of France. The preparation of SDAGE for the Rhone river basin has been organized and guided by the Ministry of the Environment-Regional Directorate for the Rhone, Mediterranean and Corsica region, and the Rhone-Mediterranean-Corsica Basin Committee. However, a large number of regional and sub-regional institutions, organizations and firms have participated in its preparation. The focus in this plan is on the coastal section of the Rhone-Mediterranean-Corsica Basin (RMCB). It has been prepared by the RMCB Water Agency, together with IFREMER and CQEL, big consultancy institutions.

63. **Natural Features.** Rhone-Mediterranean-Corsica Basin is one of the most complex and diverse geographical areas of France. From the Mediterranean coastline it extends deep inside the continental part of the national territory, encompassing the watershed of the biggest river in France -- the Rhone, including the mountainous area of the Alpine region. In this broad context, the Mediterranean sea is not only the last receptive medium for all the residuals being generated by human activities and natural processes upstream in the Rhone river basin area but is, together with the terrestrial coastal zone and the territorial waters, an integral part of the hydrographic basin of the Rhone-Mediterranean-Corsica area.

64. **Socio-Economic and Environmental Situation.** This brief description refers only to the coastal section of the area covered by SDAGE. It is one of the most developed coastal areas of France. The major conflicts occurred between industry and tourism, aquaculture and tourism, industry and fisheries, and agriculture and lagoon fisheries. Concentration of population and their activities has consumed most of the coastal space resulting in harmful environmental effects. The management of the coastal space has become very difficult, with urban and regional spatial plans becoming not very efficient management tool. New (and costly) instruments have been devised such as Coastal Conservatory (Conservatoire de Littoral), with the idea of preserving and protecting the remaining coastal space. This scheme has proven to be relatively successful. However, the degradation of the marine part of the coastal area has become a preoccupying and mobilizing subject. Its monitoring became a necessity because it has permitted the measurement of the contamination by particular pollutants, and analysis of the resulting disequilibriums.

65. **Description of the SDAGE Intervention.** Besides the necessity to deal in an integrated way with all the issues generated by human activities, including those with adverse effects on the natural systems within one large ecosystem (in this case the Rhone river basin watershed area), there is a legal requirement in France which obliges the authorities to undertake the necessary measures to prevent environmental damages within their jurisdiction. It is The Law on Water, formulated in 1964, and reconfirmed in 1992, which indicates that the spatial coverage of the law concerns the continental ground and underground water, as well as the adjacent coastal waters within the limits of the territorial waters. It requires that every intervention, and in particular those related to controlling pollution in freshwater and marine systems, be continuous, coherent and comprehensive (in other words, integrated) with regard to the spatial coverage. The geographic scope of the intervention analyzed in this case study is the entire coastal area of France between the Spain and Italian borders, including the island of Corsica. The coastal area inside the terrestrial part extends to the boundaries of the closest watershed area, while the marine area extends towards the presumed area of influence of the discharged waters (generally it is
considered to be the 100m bathymetric line). Although SDAGE is fundamentally a medium term water resources management plan, its ambitions go beyond that major goal, to contribute to the promotion of socially and economically sustainable development of RMCB. It has two major goals: to evolve from water management per se to the integrated management of large and complex water areas, and to give priority to the collective interest. The first orientation means that all types of water resources are investigated; that all their interrelationships, as well as physical, chemical and biological forms are taken in consideration; and that water demand, use and supply are considered in an integrated way. The orientation towards the collective interest means that management should be oriented towards the interests of all the users and the entire population, with priority being the public health. The plan proposes ten major objectives, which are mainly related to the management of water resources, including controlling water pollution, guaranteeing high quality of water, giving priority to good management before making new investments, and respect for natural systems and their preservation, etc.

66. **Description of the Intervention along the Mediterranean Coast.** The SDAGE section of the Mediterranean coastal area proposes a very rigorous methodological procedure which results in 50 homogenous zones that present coherent management units. Each one of these units constitutes a homogenous zone for the optimal integrated approach to the management, rehabilitation, conservation, as well as the exploitation of the coastal area. The plan develops a large number of analyses as well as management proposals for each unit. The preparation of the plan was initiated in early 1992. The first draft of the project has been completed by mid 1995, while the final draft has been adopted by the Basin Committee in 1996. The total cost of the coastal section of the project has been estimated at US$ 1.1 million.

67. **Performance Evaluation.** The intervention can be judged successful. Major improvements were achieved in the understanding of the problems, and concerted institutional action was evidenced by the approval and adoption of the plan. The plan constitutes an evolution from water quality management to marine ecosystem management intervention. Objectives and actions are targeted to specific priority areas. Although it is too early to assess the measurable outcomes of the intervention, the plan has succeeded in positioning itself as the basic reference for monitoring the coastal waters, as well of the fresh water systems in the Mediterranean coastal area. Internally, the plan is very coherent, and has been implemented very rigorously. Innovative methodologies were utilized, and this concept of management can be transferred to other areas as it stresses the integration of management of water resources and aquatic systems protection with coastal zone management. Certain conceptual aspects (such as the methodology of definition of coastal units and target management objectives to specificities of each zone) can be directly applied to all similar projects. The plan has initiated the establishment of an integrated information system for the whole French Mediterranean coast. Another aspect that could be mentioned is the enlargement of the management regime from regulatory mechanisms to negotiations and arbitration mechanisms. Among weaknesses, it could be mentioned that the plan is focusing more on the protection of the environment than on development control. From the point of view of externalities, the plan’s good internal coherence, and its good positioning within the existing institutional mechanisms did not require extra external help or support.

68. **Evaluation of Integration.** Sectoral integration was high judging by the integration of coastal management aspects in integrated management of water and aquatic systems, ensuring the continuity of coastal systems in the entire water basin. Good coordination among the regional (SDAGE) and local water management plans (SAGE - Schema d’Amenagement et Gestion des Eaux) was achieved with the stress at the local action. However, the task of harmonization with other lower spatial level plans and policies is left to the local level without clear principles or criteria for conflict resolution. A high level of institutional integration of administration, socio-professional groups, technical experts, and others has been achieved, but this participation was limited only to the institutional level. There have been no direct incentives for the private sector, associations, or the general public to participate in water and marine resources management.
69. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** Being linked to the Water Authority’s Action Plans, the long-term financial sustainability of the plan seems to be secured. Other economic mechanisms have also been secured (such as fresh water user fees). Institutional sustainability can also be considered as very high. Coordinated monitoring mechanisms for coastal water quality have been established. This all points towards very high political support that the plan has gained.

iv. **Case Study 4: The Island of Rhodes (Greece)**

70. **General Information on the Case Study.** This case study analyzes the Coastal Area Management Programme (CAMP) for the Island of Rhodes. The programme was administered by the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP), and financed by MAP in its first two phases. Phase III, was financed under METAP by the European Investment Bank (EIB). The national institution responsible for the implementation of the programme was the Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works of Greece. The programme was prepared by experts from MAP’s Central Coordinating Unit in Athens, its Regional Activity Centres, and other international experts in cooperation with local and national institutions in Greece. The legal basis for the implementation of the intervention in Phases I and II was the “Agreement on the Implementation of the CAMP for The Island of Rhodes - Greece”, signed by the Government of Greece and MAP. For the activities in Phase III, a contract was signed between MAP, EIB/METAP, and the Government of Greece.

71. **Natural Features.** The island of Rhodes with its 220 km of coastline is situated at the north-eastern corner of the Dodecanese Archipelago in the Aegean Sea. It is 80 km long and covers an area of 1400 km$^2$. The central mountains are relatively high (1215 m at Mount Attaviros), surrounded by plains northwards and southward. The plains are boarded by sandy beaches. The continental shelf is narrow and depth increases rapidly close to the coasts. Its geographic position makes it a particularly interesting site for the study of terrestrial insular populations and of marine species introduced through the Suez Canal as well as for the relic species of the ancient Thetys. Three main types of natural terrestrial ecosystems can be observed: forest, shrub lands and wetlands. The forests covered 52% of the island before 1940, but are now reduced to 20% due mainly to forest fires. Shrub lands cover 30% of the island, and are marked by human impacts due mainly to fires and overgrazing. There are four main marine habitats: near shore sandy bottoms, forests of cystoseira generally on shallow rocky substrate, seagrass meadows at a greater depth, and then coraline algae concretions in poor light conditions between 20 and 80 metres depth.

72. **Socio-Economic Situation.** The current development pattern is characterized by imbalances and constraints to future options, creating problems and trends which need to be addressed. The economy is caught up in a saturated mass tourism market, environmental resources are stretched and the hinterland rural communities are marginalized. The main trends underlying the development pattern of the island include the following:

- resource development biased towards the maximization of economic growth;
- over-dependence of the economy on coastal tourism;
- geographic concentration of tourism development along the north and east coasts;
- polarization of development along the north/south divide;
- limited economic linkages of tourism with agriculture and manufacturing;
- social and economic marginalisation of hinterland communities;
- employment growth faster than population growth;
- accumulated environmental pressures on the coastal environment;
- neglect of ecological and cultural resources;
- weak enforcement of planning and environmental controls.

73. **Environmental Situation.** Despite the absence, so far, of major irreversible impacts on the terrestrial and marine environment, there are conflicts between human use and rapidly expanding
development activities, and the carrying capacity of the environment. The expansion of development along the coast has relegated agriculture and environmental conservation to a secondary role. The coasts of Rhodes are exploited by mass tourism leading to an important urbanization and local degradation of areas such as in the northern part of the island and to a lesser extent on the east coast. On the other hand, the west coast from Kamiros onwards is more protected due to the exposure to winds and swell from the North-West and to rocky coasts hard to access by land. Major environmental “hot spots” are:

- recurrent marine pollution in Kolymbia (east coast), and in Kremasti-Ixia on the western coast;
- over exploitation of ground water in the northern coast of the island in the Trianda region, the Koskinou-Kalithies band, and Sgourou-Faliraki;
- sea water intrusion in the city of Rhodes, Kalithies, Koskinou, Trianda and Afandou, as well as on the south east coast in Kalathos and Gennadi;
- gradual deterioration of the quality of the beaches (beach erosion and coastal reshaping) in the city of Rhodes, the bay of Ixia, parts of the coastal strips along the Kremasti-Theologos-Soroni-Kamiros-Skala area.

The existing planning laws are particularly important for environmental policy: the Framework Planning Law (Ekistics Law) for physical planning, and the Environment Law for environmental planning and control. Both are elaborate pieces of legislation but several limitations result in poor enforcement:

- lack of an integrated planning process (no framework for regional planning and consideration of socio-economic issues);
- Planning Law is not enforced as a whole but selectively, occasionally and reluctantly;
- land property plays an important role in society and family solidarity. Planning controls affecting development rights are generally resented and often actively resisted seen as a state threat to individual rights. Land use planning as a centrally administered governmental responsibility is poorly enforced.

74. **Description of the Intervention.** The geographic scope of the CAMP was the entire island of Rhodes. The project was implemented in several phases. Before the CAMP actually started, a number of activities was carried out under the PAP pilot programme (1988-1990). Preparatory activities were completed and considerable knowledge was gathered on the state and problems of ecosystems on the island of Rhodes. This could be considered as the first phase of the project. The second phase of the project was implemented as CAMP “The Island of Rhodes” (1991-1992) through which all MAP components were included equally, following the Agreement signed in November 1990. The overall objectives of the Rhodes CAMP were very similar to those in other CAMPs (see: Case Study 1 on the Albania’s Coastal Region). The Agreement envisaged the preparation of a number of sectorial activities (such as implementation of the activities envisaged by the protocols of the Barcelona Convention; liquid waste management; monitoring of pollution; general water resources master plan; implications of expected climatic changes; programme of environmentally sound energy planning; protection of historic settlements; GIS training programme; application of EIA; development/environment scenaria; specially protected areas management) which were, then, integrated under an “umbrella” activity, the Integrated Planning Study for the Island of Rhodes. The results of this phase were presented at a Presentation Conference in December 1992. Out of a total of 14 activities envisaged by the Agreement, only in seven significant progress was made by the above date. The first two phases were financed by MAP (US$ 250,000) with a significant counterpart contribution by the Government of Greece. One of the main outcomes of the conference was the proposal for a follow-up to the project on a number of important activities. This was presented to the EIB for possible financing. The third
phase (1993-1996) was financed by a grant from the EIB (US$ 470,000). Ten activities, out of the 14 in the CAMP Agreement, were selected for their completion or a more in-depth elaboration. For the successful implementation of the project, the active involvement of national and local authorities, and international, national and local institutions and experts was a very important factor. The results of the project were presented at a conference held in Rhodes in May 1996. It was agreed at the conference that the achievements of the CAMP project will only be maximized by using its output as a master plan for the definition of a future investment programme for the island of Rhodes. Until today, this programme has not been prepared.

75. **Performance Evaluation.** The overall intervention can be considered partially successful. The CAMP intervention completed only seven out of 14 activities planned by the time of the 1992 presentation conference. The METAP intervention (Phase III of the project) was fully successful because all the activities were completed as planned. The whole programme left significant positive impact on the organization of the administration and technical services at all levels. It introduced a holistic approach to development and environmental management. It improved significantly the capacity of technical services at the local level to use some environment/development related tools, e.g. GIS, EIA, pollution monitoring, project development, etc. The training programme on GIS, for example, managed to create a strong core group of local experts (under CAMP), while under the METAP programme the resources were provided to furnish a GIS lab at the Prefecture. The elaboration of detailed studies in both programmes, leading to the provision of a large data base, will assist in the further development of relevant projects for the island as a whole. This process contributed to the improvement of decision making through the establishment of a first generation information system. It introduced a long-term perspective into the local decision making. With regard to “process outcomes” (or intangible ones), the available information shows that the thinking of all the authorities (and also developers) was influenced by the programmes. The programmes have speeded up the development of key infrastructure projects. Internally, both programmes have achieved high consistency between the goals and results (although the CAMP initiative did not achieve all of its objectives). But the external environment of the project did not contribute as much as was expected to the outcome of the programmes, which prevented some objectives from being realized. The first impediment was lack of an adequate legal framework, particularly in the Planning Law (such as possibility to build without license/permit on a plot which smaller than 4,000 sqm). And second, a fully operative coordinating mechanism at the Prefecture level (certainly needed, considering the number and diversity of activities in both programmes) never materialized, which contributed to a longer than expected implementation time for the CAMP activities.

76. **Evaluation of Integration.** The various activities and reports in both programmes were not coordinated in a manner that would have been easily recognizable for the local administration. In that respect the sectoral coordination could be judged low. However, a better result was achieved in the Integrated Planning Study for the Island of Rhodes (started in CAMP and finalized in the METAP programme), where the results of all activities were utilized, and assistance to the local authorities was provided in a more concrete manner. The environmental component was very highly regarded and introduced very early in all the activities of both programmes. The vertical integration among Government departments was partially successful. A majority of the activities in both programmes was carried out on the Island of Rhodes. Only a small group of dedicated experts from the Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works made a significant contribution to the project, particularly within the CAMP programme. This has certainly contributed to the better collaboration of local and national agencies in their efforts to deal with major problems. But the project has as yet failed to achieve a very high level of integration between the various layers of government. Horizontally, at the prefectural and municipal levels, relatively good collaboration was achieved. Although the programmes have created an awareness among local society of the long-term implications of development, and alternative options, and in spite of the full technical achievements, there was insufficient effort to engage local society in
pursuing a longer-term strategy of integrated coastal zone management. The programmes have not shown an explicit endeavor to communicate the results and build up the social capacity to adopt such a strategy.

77. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** The proposed investment programmes have relatively high chances for long term financial sustainability, mainly owing to the possibility of EU financing of the major infrastructure projects supported by the programmes. This also brings political support to the programmes. But the existing legal and institutional frameworks are insufficient for an effective support and follow up to the CAMP and METAP activities, and their chances for sustainability over a longer term are judged as medium.

v. **Case Study 5: The Mediterranean Coast (Israel)**

78. **General Information on the Case Study.** This case study analyzes the preparation of the Master Plan for the Mediterranean Coast of Israel. In 1970, the National Planning and Building Board recognized that Israeli coastlines should be treated as resources of national value, and issued an order for the preparation of national plans for all its sea and lake shores. The national institutions responsible for the preparation and implementation of this plan are the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of the Environment of Israel. The plan was entirely prepared by national experts.

79. **Natural Features.** The Mediterranean coastline of Israel extends along 188 kms from Rosh Hanikra on the Lebanese border to Zikim on the border with the Gaza Strip. The coastline can be divided into four morphological sections according to physical characteristics and sedimentological properties:

- Rosh Hanikra to Acco--a sedimentologically isolated region with abraded rocky platforms and narrow beaches;
- Haifa Bay--bounded by the Acco promontory on the north and the Carmel mountain range on the south;
- The Carmel coastal plane--between Cesarea and Haifa, consisting of three low parallel ridges of calcareous sandstone, parts onshore and parts offshore with relatively narrow sandy beaches; and
- South of Cesarea--here, sandy beaches are occasionally interrupted by sections of calcareous sandstone cliffs up to 40 m high.

The rivers flowing from the interior hill ranges to the Mediterranean shore are today mainly seasonal, flowing only in winter. They are of no major economic importance, but are features of natural value and, where not polluted, are significant breeding grounds for local fisheries.

80. **Socio-Economic and Environmental Situation.** Human activity along this coastline dates back to prehistory, and has left numerous offshore and onshore archaeological remains. Due to the lack of natural bays, artificial construction was always necessary in this open shoreline to provide shelter against the stormy Mediterranean Sea. At least twelve coastal settlements with harbors are well known from earliest historic times along this intensively used maritime corridor. Roughly 70% of Israel’s population lives within 15 km of the Mediterranean coastline. Intensive settlement along the coastal strip over the last 50 years now dominates the land use patterns of the area, particularly the two major population centres of Tel Aviv and Haifa. This narrow coastal strip is the focus of the country’s economic and commercial activity. Tourism is a major economic sector along the coast, not only in the urban tourist resorts but also at newly developing rural sites, intending to offer a different type of accommodation with particular emphasis on “recreational villages” in a rural setting. The coastal strip also contains the most fertile agricultural land of Israel, especially for citrus production. There is severe conflict between the expansion of urban
settlements along the coastline and the preservation and protection of the fertile agricultural land. The main transportation arteries run very close to the coastline for much of its length, particularly from Tel Aviv northwards. The coastal highway and the railway run on an almost parallel alignment along the calcareous sandstone ridges in order to avoid encroachment on agriculturally productive land. In view of the high concentration of population and economic activity in the coastal strip, development policies in Israel have attempted to restrain further expansion of the major urban settlements along the coast. Focus has been on promoting the establishment and expansion of urban and rural settlements in the underdeveloped northern and southern regions of the country. Encroachment on agricultural land has been restrained, although not prevented, and linear development along the coastline has been restricted. Much of the coastline is designated for various types of public open space. Areas of particularly high natural value, mainly river mouths and rocky shores, have been designated as Nature Reserves. Beaches of high value for recreation in natural surroundings and sites of archeological interest for visitors have been designated as Nature Parks. Beaches of high value for recreation in natural surroundings and sites of archeological interest for visitors have been designated as Nature Parks. Beaches of high value for recreation in natural surroundings and sites of archeological interest for visitors have been designated as Nature Parks. Beaches of high value for recreation in natural surroundings and sites of archeological interest for visitors have been designated as Nature Parks. Beaches of high value for recreation in natural surroundings and sites of archeological interest for visitors have been designated as Nature Parks.

81. **Description of the Intervention.** The geographic scope of the intervention is the entire Mediterranean coast of Israel. The first stage of the National Outline Scheme for the Mediterranean Coast (as the plan is officially called) was approved in 1983. The main objectives of the plan were to prevent non-essential coastal development, to protect large sections of the coastline as nature reserves, national parks and coastal reserves, and to allocate coastal areas for tourism and recreational activities. The master plan included a highly effective clause prohibiting development within 100 meters of the coastline. relaxation of this regulation is occasionally permitted only if approved by the National Board. To help provide a comprehensive long-term guide to planning policy, beyond the general guidelines in the approved master plan, the National Board commissioned a more detailed document for the resource management of the Mediterranean coastline for tourist and recreation activities. This coastal resource management plan, prepared by the Ministry of the Environment, was recently submitted for approval to the National Board. A multidisciplinary team of land use planners, geologists and ecologists prepared base surveys of coastal resources and prepared guidelines for some of the main resource management issues such as: sand supply, offshore structures, cliff erosion, special geological features, offshore rocks, and natural coastal processes. The team also prepared ecological guidelines for rare and unique habitats, rocky shore habitats, important biotic features, and areas adjacent to nature reserves. The coastal resources management plan is based on principles of suitability and sensitivity of coastal resources. The dominant principle adopted for resource management was the definition (i.e., the control) of the intensity of development. The plan was conceived 26 years ago, while the first version was adopted 13 years ago. The plan has been implemented since then, with regular updates and amendments. The cost of its preparation was impossible to estimate considering the long period for its preparation and implementation. But it is clear that it has been entirely financed from national sources, and that the cost itself has been considerable.

82. **Performance Evaluation.** The design and implementation of the Israeli Master plan can be described successful. Together with this plan, a number of other management and planning initiatives have originated, such as Israeli tourist master plan, the immigration master plan, and others. There are some weak points too. It is mainly an environmental protection and coastal development plan, while an overall strategic vision is missing. To a certain extent, this void has been filled by the preparation of other, complementary (above mentioned) strategic plans. The planning zone is relatively narrow, up to 2 km, hemmed in by infrastructure, and in the long run, this might result in the intensive development being too close to the shoreline. From the urban development point of view, the 100 meters set-back is not always observed and is sometimes too loosely interpreted. There is a philosophy of land reclamation and on the creation of artificial
islands, which the plan was not able to suppress, and which in the long run could conflict with the sustainable development of the Mediterranean area. Litter control is weak, particularly in the area controlled by the nature reserve authorities. An overall Master Plan for the reduction of pollution is missing. Some measurable and non-measurable outcomes could be observed. An example of the excellent managerial approach by the Haifa District Town Association is the development of the model for the pollution of Haifa Bay by the six major polluters. The plan deals, to various degree, with all aspects of environment and all types of pollution and resource management issues, using the preventive approach. Particularly impressive is the effectiveness of water resources management, both in quality and quantity. In the same manner, the plan succeeded in minimizing, outside the main urban conurbations, encroachment on the coastal strip, in safeguarding the landscape, in using resources in a sustainable way and in keeping pollution to acceptable levels. All this was achieved because of a high level of integration, at a relatively low cost. From both the internal and external point of view the plan is a success. Its objectives were rigorously achieved, even enlarged in the course of the process, while the external environment has been very supportive of the effort. A high degree of collaboration has been achieved with the Planning Department of the Ministry of the Interior.

83. Evaluation of Integration. Although commenced as a land-use plan it was turned into an integrated coastal zone management plan. Existing plans and regulations, pertinent to the Masterplan and covering coastal zone management and pollution prevention/control, are good, although not all aspects are covered. Although environmental issues are very prominent in all the planning analyses, and all decisions have been made on the basis of the assessment of environmental impact, not enough attention has been paid to biodiversity and fishery resources. Government representatives have been involved in the planning and decision-making process, as have those from NGOs, but the same cannot be said for the private sector.

84. Evaluation of Sustainability. Besides the government’s effort to monitor and update the implementation of the plan, no other financial resources have been envisaged for its long-term implementation. Economic evaluation of development proposals/measures is weak or non-existent, and the use of economic instruments needs substantial strengthening to make the programme cost-effective. In the institutional sense, effort has been made to develop indicators for specific sectors (agriculture, energy, transport) that is likely to lead in the future to the use of indicators for sustainable development. It can be added that the Israeli Plan 2020 includes a strong sustainable development element which is now being followed up by the preparation of a national sustainable development strategy.

vi. Case Study 6: The Ligurian Region (Italy)

85. General Information on the Case Study. The case study analyzes the Master Plan for the Italian region of Liguria, in the northern part of the Ligurian Sea. The authority responsible for the plan preparation is a Regional Directorate for Urban Planning. The technical activities have been carried out by the Office of Physical Planning of the Ligurian Region, together with a number of regional experts and institutions, specialists in particular fields.

86. Natural Features. The coast of Liguria is long—about 350 km, starting at the border with France. The coastal area of the region consist of 63 municipalities, with more than 70% of the region’s population living within its limits. It also comprise a majority of regional economic resources and activities, with tourism and transport being the most important. The physiographic characteristics of the Ligurian Region have created a popular misconception that the region is basically a very narrow coastal strip, faced with numerous problems closely related to natural processes, as well as management of natural resources (particularly soil management and prevention of associated risks and disasters). Although the majority of activities are located in this narrow coastal strip, any planning intervention must include within its sphere of analysis portions of the hinterland, where the boundaries of major watersheds lie.
87. **Socio-Economic and Environmental Situation.** Urbanization trends, particularly after World War II up to the 1980s, have to a large extent been concentrated along this narrow coastal strip bringing additional pressures to an area already burdened by the lack of quality land for settlement. Urbanization was followed by the need to provide enough land for industry, tourism (the area is one of the most developed and exclusive tourism areas of Italy) and, in particular, for transportation (harbor, railway, highway), since the port of Genova, Italy’s largest port, located in central part of the Ligurian region, has traditionally been the entry and exit point for goods to and from rich Italian regions along the river Po. All of these problems have created pressures upon the natural systems of the region which have, in turn, highlighted the need for very careful and sensible coastal planning and management.

88. **Description of the Intervention.** This plan is the final activity in a series of planning interventions which started, first, with the Regional Government’s adoption of the Preliminary Coastal Plan Project (the Coastal Plan is legally referred to as “The Orientation Scheme”). That document has detailed aspects of the regional territory, landscape, and the economy. Second, on the basis of the Preliminary Coastal Plan, the Landscape Plan (PTCP) was adopted in 1990 (the first among the Italian regions). The Landscape Plan has been the principal instrument for protection of the regional landscape. Thirdly, a Coordinated Territorial Plan for the Central Area of the Ligurian region, with all the regulatory schemes, was approved in 1995 (the plan being analysed here). Its principal objective was managing the most densely populated and economically active areas of Genoa and Savona. The plan has the following principal goals:

- to conserve and protect coastal and marine natural resources;
- to restore the coastal landscape, both natural and urban;
- to increase the productivity of marine resources.
- A number of objectives have also been defined, such as:
  - protect rural and wilderness sites along the coastal zone which have maintained their natural state or landscape values of non urbanized areas;
  - promote the recovery of degraded coastal areas;
  - improve accessibility to the sea;
  - encourage tourism development consistent with local carrying capacity;
  - regulate the construction of tourism facilities and other coastal engineering works;
  - provide incentives for the construction of small marine and port facilities;
  - define criteria for the construction of coastal defense works;
  - improve the aesthetic image of the waterfronts.

The plan can be considered as a very strict coastal land use plan with an emphasis on the problems and issues of the narrow coastal strip (actually, the law regulates that the area of the regulatory intervention should be up to 300 m inland, and up to the bathymetric line of 20 m). The plan involves a very rigorous methodological procedure which, first, defines 16 coastal homogenous zones, along the entire length of the coast. A number of interventions have been proposed, ranging from conservation and recovery, to rebuilding and reuse of the railway line. At this level, the plan further outlines 40 specific territorial areas for projects, with urban interventions to be implemented by the municipalities. Second, the plan gives detailed proposals for those 40 focal points, including specific guidelines for project implementation. Finally, the plan gives proposals for specific issues of regional interest, such as:

- beaches and coastal defenses;
- prospective for the development of the maritime sector;
- guidelines for reuse of the railway lines; and
- coastal accessibility and viability.

The cost of the preparation of the plan is estimated at US$ 750,000.
89. **Performance Evaluation.** The plan has been successful in achievement of its objectives, although they have been defined within a rather limited scope, i.e. mainly within the environmental protection and restoration, and development control, and mainly over the terrestrial part of the coastal zone. The objectives were set in general manner, such as: protection of the marine and coastal environment, restoration of the coastal landscape, the increase of the tourist facilities, etc. But, the weakness of the plan is that the aspects relative to coastal water quality monitoring and to the impacts of human activities upon the coastal waters have not been included. However, methodologically, the plan is very consistent and uses innovative technical approaches. The definition and analysis of homogenous coastal units is particularly interesting. To a large extent it is similar to the SDAGE in France (see Case Study 3). One non-measurable outcome is that the plan is treated by the planning authorities as a common planning basis for all the constituent parts of the region. This methodology could also be easily transferred elsewhere in the Mediterranean region. Besides the establishment of a good information base, it is too early to judge the measurable outcomes of the plan, such as the improvements in the development control of the region, or improvements in the state of the most important ecosystems.

90. **Evaluation of the Integration.** In the preparation of the plan, the work of several departments of the regional planning administration was well coordinated. Horizontally, the global-regional objectives were given priority over particular local objectives. Although there are some data, the marine part is largely under-documented; the environmental continuum of watershed-marine does not appear. There is also a break at the Government levels: the Regional Government of Liguria manages only the terrestrial part of the region, while the marine part, including beaches, remains under the authority of the central Government (Ministry of the Environment). The Plan has been developed by the regional administration (Town Planning Service) but its approach failed to pay special attention to public participation. Consultations occur between provincial and municipal authorities, leaving the plan largely unknown to the general public.

91. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** Financially, implementation of the plan is not yet secure. However, there is a proposal for special funds to be allocated by the regional administration for the implementation and further studies on particular subjects of the plan, such as the coastal defense and the environmental monitoring. There is an action programme to prepare other plans such as municipal master plans, contingency plans and design of the maritime structures and port facilities. The coordination problems among different regional administrative structures, and fragmentation among different administrative bodies at the state, regional and municipal levels could reduce the prospects for the longer term sustainability of the plan. It is expected that once this plan will be transformed into a Coastal Master Plan that the situation will improve.

vii. **Case Study 7: The Area of Al-Hoceima (Morocco)**

92. **General Information on the Case Study.** The case study refers to the development of a natural park in Al-Hoceima, on the eastern section of the Mediterranean coast of Morocco. Establishment of the Park is part of a national policy to create several national parks along the coastline of Morocco. The role of the Park is to serve as a natural barrier against adjacent urbanization and as a source of complementary income for local farmers and fishermen in the area. A detailed survey of the area has been elaborated, a special Park Authority has been created and a Management Plan has been developed through METAP funds. Three Ministries are directly involved in the project: Agriculture, Fishing and Merchant Marine, and Environment. The Park has not acquired legal status yet. At this stage the Ministry of Agriculture and Agricultural Development (leading agency) seeks international funds for implementing the Management Plan. The details of the Plan are to be decided by the Management Committee.

93. **Natural Features, Socio-Economic and Environmental Situation.** The Mediterranean coast of Morocco has special significance for the country as a zone of transport, agricultural
production, recreation and tourism. In the past twenty years it has experienced intensive urbanization mostly from tourism activities. Major conflicts in the area revolve around agriculture and tourism, industry and fishing, fishing and marine resource management, rural development and the conservation of nature. In this particular part of the Mediterranean coastline there has been intensive urbanization as a result of opportunities in tourism, fishing and agriculture. Traditional agricultural and fishing practices are gradually abandoned in favor of more profitable activities and land is gradually converted to urban/tourist uses. As a result there are significant threats to natural areas and open rural space. Urban plans in the neighboring town and tourist areas of Al Hoceima foresee additional development and expansion in the near future. As a result there is the danger of losing the last few open spaces along the coast to competing uses. The location of the Park is sandwiched between the urban area of Al Hoceima and the tourist zone to its west. It is envisaged that the land and marine area of the Park would be managed on the basis of nature conservation and open space preservation, reinstating/supporting traditional rural activities in the area for complementary income.

94. **Description of the Intervention.** The proposed intervention is the designation of an area (land and marine) as a National Park, that is, a rural area managed on the basis of ecosystem protection. Part of the area is covered by natural vegetation (forest area), part of it is considered as important for biodiversity preservation (terrestrial and marine ecosystems) while part is inhabited sparsely and is foreseen to be managed as an open space reserve with some traditional activities supported. Detailed plans are to be specified by the Management Committee. Minor infrastructure works are also envisaged to create paths and itineraries for visitors as well as a administrative centre for the Park Authority. Strong regulation and monitoring of human activities is envisaged throughout the Park. Overall there is experience in the country in managing such areas as parks and some preliminary steps have been already taken in the sense of hiring a Director and preparing a Management Scheme.

95. **Performance Evaluation.** This management plan is part of a broader national strategy to create a “network” of protected areas. The plan is conceived of as an area of strict conservation within a zone of intense development pressures and conflicts. With regard to these limited objectives, the plan has been rigorously executed. It is a well documented survey and study for the conservation of an area of special national and international significance from the point of view of heritage and biodiversity conservation. It has been well accepted by the administrative institutions responsible for nature protection because it is based on an assessment of the environment from the point of view of biology, ecology and cultural heritage. The proposals are well developed and adapted to the existing institutional capacity and experience in managing nature conservation areas. It provides a very good and detailed database for future management activities. The project has been delayed, however, and, as a consequence, a repetition of the inquiry is to follow. Internally, there is a good coherence between the objectives set and the plan’s results. However, since the plan’s objectives were limited only to the conservation issues the plan is less concerned with analyzing the pressures and influences emanating from the outside environment upon the zone itself. This could be considered as the weakness of the plan.

96. **Evaluation of Integration.** The plan shows a limited perception of integrated management because it is essentially based on eco-centrism with a limited perspective on development. Consequently, the environmental component has been dominant from the early stages of the plan preparation. Although there was an analytical treatment of the natural ecosystem, there is a limited analysis of conflicts in the area, as well as of socio-economic costs and benefits of the park creation. The potential roles of various actors, except for the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Fishing and Merchant Marine, are not well defined. There is the lack of a general integrating framework ensuring coordination of various sectoral policies and interventions in coastal areas. The participation of the general public is non-existent, while only different administrative levels have been involved.
97. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** There are no specific mechanisms or financial resources for implementing the project, particularly of its operational and follow-up aspects. Even before the formal decision to create the Park, a Director was appointed and trained in national park management. The implementation of all actions envisaged in the Study will require substantial commitment and mobilization of resources and institutions.

**viii. Case Study 8: Agency for the Coastal Protection and Planning (Tunisia)**

98. **General Information on the Study Area.** This case study analyzes the role and activities of APAL (Agence de Protection et d’Aménagement du Littoral) a national level institution created in December 1995 by the President of Tunisia to coordinate public and private actions in coastal areas. The year 1996 was a preparation stage expected to lead to a five-year Action Plan for 1997-2001. The establishment of the Agency has been helped by METAP.

99. **Natural Features.** Tunisia’s 1300 km coastal area has a dominant role in terms of the country’s economy as it concentrates some 70% of population, 50% of agriculture, 88% of industry (in terms of employment) and almost the entirety (96%) of tourism. Particularly the northern part has supported human activity since antiquity. The most important settlements of the country (Tunis, Sousse, Sfax, Gabes and Bizerta) are located on the coast. The most productive agricultural land and most of the water resources are concentrated in coastal areas. Inland sites and especially the south lack water resources and present evidence of desertification resulting from bigger or smaller droughts, progressing of the Dakar Desert and inappropriate land use practices in marginally productive soils. The coastal strip also encompasses most of the tourist assets (cultural sites like Carthage but also natural assets like the beaches) in the country.

100. **Socio-Economic and Environmental Situation.** Tunisia’s development is heavily based on exploiting natural resources (oil), agriculture and tourism (sea and sun mass tourism). As a consequence there are intense pressures on coastal resources - primarily water, land and sea fronts. In addition there are conflicts in resource use among competing activities (tourism vs. agriculture, industry vs. tourism). However the most important development/environment conflicts are evidenced in terms of urbanization of the coastline, beach erosion, pollution and liquid and solid waste disposal. Tunisia’s public administration is relatively well developed (as compared to other countries in the Region) and disposes of range of policy tools (plans and programmes but also regulatory statutes) to cope with the development of human activities and environmental protection.

101. **Description of the Intervention.** The geographic scope of APAL’s activities is the entire coastal area of Tunisia from the border with Algeria to that of Libya. The primary purpose is quite broad in scope: to protect the Public Maritime Domain (PMD) by regulating its use, to monitor the coastal environment, preserve and enhance the cultural and natural heritage, ensure the rational management of coastal resources and develop/support community action and participation in coastal management. Its operational tasks are codified with respect to monitoring the coastal environment, regulating development in the PMD, rehabilitating degraded areas (especially sand beaches) and protecting sensitive areas. For these purposes an Agency was created within the Ministry of the Environment and Planning as a special status Public Institution. APAL is still at an early stage of development, capitalizing on high level political support for its activities and the good will of other established government agencies (ANPE, General Directorate of Forestry, etc.) to cooperate with it. As it is not at an operational stage (until the end of July 1997 the Agency will be in a mobilization stage, when its mandate and precise role will be defined) it is premature to consider any major constraints to its operation. However, its scope suggests the need for broad mobilization of human and financial resources which, for the moment, rely on State funding.

102. **Performance Evaluation.** At its early stage of deployment, this intervention can be judged successful. APAL has been created with a strong legal framework and benefits from strong
political will at the highest level. It legally has the full control of the Maritime Public Domain. APAL’s scope is well defined in terms of beach erosion management, conflict resolution in the use of coastal space, and the development of a data bank for the coast. APAL has also benefited from international support especially from the experience of the French Conservatoire du Littoral and Environment Canada National Geomatic Programme. The mobilization phase of APAL’s implementation does not allow an assessment of measurable impacts to date. Concrete mechanisms for intervention are still absent, and its mode of operation is still based on the good will to cooperate. The above facts suggest a very strong external influence upon its performance. The headquarters of APAL is in Tunis with regional branch offices in the main coastal agglomerations.

103. **Evaluation of Integration.** APAL staff is interdisciplinary and very motivated. The principle of sectoral integration is highly prominent in their thinking. However, the preparatory phase in APAL’s establishment was carried out without any specific consultation with major actors outside the Government (i.e. tourism industry, NGOs, local authorities, general public, etc.), and there is no concrete provision for such systematic feedback. The specific role of APAL at the end of the decision making process is not yet clear, especially in relation to ANPE (this is expected to become clearer at the end of the mobilization period). The role of the “Observatoire du Littoral” (established in relation to MAP/Blue Plan initiative on the observation of sustainable development trends and processes in the Mediterranean) is not very clear in relation to existing data banks and institutions dealing with data collection, and there are no direct links to APAL activities.

104. **Evaluation of Sustainability.** APAL’s scope is very broad and requires substantial mobilization of organizational, financial and human resources. Although there are very good ideas about where financial resources for APAL might come from, there is no guarantee or commitment for securing them from the major actors. The principle of autofinancing ensures the long-term viability of the activities if APAL succeeds in setting efficient mechanisms of the fund raising. APAL’s role in protecting coastal land will be facilitated by the fact that a relatively large proportion of the national coast is still undeveloped and in a natural state. The existence of an established administrative agency (the Forest Directorate General) with a strong tradition in management of dune and forest areas relieves somewhat the operational role of APAL. The political will to support APAL seems to be very strong.

ix. **Case Study 9: The Bay of Izmir (Turkey)**

105. **General Information on the Case Study.** This case study analyzes the Coastal Area Management Programme (CAMP) of MAP for the Bay of Izmir, and in particular, the related Integrated Planning Study for the Area of Izmir, which was prepared within that programme. The CAMP was prepared by the experts from the MAP Coordinating Unit in Athens and its Regional Activity Centres, and a group of international experts together with national and local institutions. The responsible Turkish institutions were the Ministry of the Environment, and the Metropolitan Municipality of Izmir (MMI).

106. **Natural Features.** The Bay of Izmir is one of the largest bays in the Aegean coast of Turkey, and extends about 24 km in east-west direction, with an average width of about 5 km. The bay is usually considered as consisting of three sections according to the topography and hydrology: the Inner Bay, the Middle Bay, and the Outer Bay. The water depth in the bay ranges from 10 m in the Inner to 60 meters in the Outer Bay. The Inner and Middle Bays do not have appropriate capacities for water exchange and autopurification. On the south shores of the Bay, much of the land is covered by high hills with steep slopes and there is a narrow alluvial plain along the shoreline. In contrast to the south shore, the north shore is characterized by low, flat river deltas. However, along the eastern side of the north shore, there is an area which is covered by fairly high hills. Similar to the south shore, the north shoreline is also characterized by a narrow alluvial plain. At the east end of the bay, there is a valley known as the Bornova plain. This alluvial valley is
about 5 km wide, and slopes gradually to elevations about 80-90 meters at its eastern end. This area is used both for agricultural and industrial purposes.

107. **Socio-Economic Situation.** As in most urban areas of Turkey, population pressures in Izmir (Turkey’s third largest city) are enormous. The existing population of approximately 2 million will, according to some estimates, double in the next 30 years. Izmir, together with a number of “satellite” cities in its vicinity, is a major industrial area. In addition to large industrial establishments, a large number of small- and medium-scale enterprises have flourished in and around the city. Environmental control over these establishments does not seem to be very efficient. Their residues are discharged untreated into numerous streams running into the Inner Bay of Izmir, adding to its already high level of pollution. The continuing industrialization of the area has been the response to an ever-increasing demand for new jobs. Some of the industries are located in watershed areas which are of vital importance for the water supply of the city.

108. **Environmental Situation.** The present environmental situation of Izmir, particularly that of the Bay area, suggests that the natural systems are no longer able to accommodate pressures from human activities. Recent development has brought about a series of conflicts of interest over the use of resources which have resulted in the deterioration of these natural systems, diminishing their capacity to produce the high quality goods and services the area has traditionally provided (fisheries, tourism, agriculture, etc.). Characteristics of the current situation may be summarized as follows:

- Urban development, reflecting high population growth, is continuing around the bay area and consuming the scarcest of resources - the land. Urban waste waters are one of the major sources of pollution of the bay.
- Wastes discharged by the industries situated around the bay have critically affected water quality and cut down on opportunities for recreation, tourism and fishing.
- Because of accidents they may cause, port facilities in the eastern part of the bay, and navigating vessels, present a constant threat to the bay ecosystem.
- Loss of cultivated land to residential purposes on the one hand, and increasing demands for agricultural produce on the other, have reduced the nature conservation areas, decreased the level of flood protection, and increased soil erosion.
- The decision to build a waste water treatment plant in the delta of the Old Gediz River has been a response to the urgent need for an adequate sewerage system. However, the proposed solution for the disposal of treated effluent into the old bed of the river will probably affect the marine environment of the Middle and Inner Bay.
- Discharges of domestic and industrial waste waters, urban and agricultural run-off, sediments and contaminated waters from rivers and streams have had a cumulative adverse effect on the water quality and natural characteristics of the Inner Bay, resulting in eutrophication.

The system of resources management in the area is split between four administrative and decision making levels, namely, the central government, the Governorate of Izmir, the metropolitan, and the district level. The existing mechanisms of decision making require much better coordination among these levels. There is no single authority entrusted with the environmental management of the entire area.

109. **Description of the Intervention.** The geographic scope of the intervention is the area of the Metropolitan Municipality of Izmir. However, for some issues a larger area has been taken in consideration. The activities of MAP can be divided into two major phases:

- from 1987 to 1989, during which time the project was in a pilot phase. Most of the activities were undertaken by PAP.
from 1990 to 1993, the period of activities undertaken within the framework of “The Bay of Izmir” CAMP, following an agreement signed between the Turkish government and MAP.

A number of activities were completed in this first phase which helped, first, to solve some urgent problems in the area, deepen knowledge on the deterioration of some natural systems, and to critically assess certain solutions proposed by the World Bank-financed sewerage project. Second, it created the basis and rationale for the CAMP. The opportunity to continue activities in Izmir following Phase I, as part of the CAMP exercise was readily taken up by MAP, the Turkish Government and the authorities of Izmir. MAP and Turkish experts jointly prepared an action programme, contained in the Agreement relative to the Coastal Area Management Programme for the Bay of Izmir. A total of 11 activities was envisaged. At the time of the preparation of the Agreement, it was envisaged that the World Bank will be involved in the project (under METAP), and that some of the activities will financially be supported from that source. However, the Turkish Government shifted its support to other projects, and the Bank's involvement failed to materialize. Although not being the fault of the World Bank/METAP, that fact had significant negative effects on the final implementation of the programme, with only 50% of the activities being carried out. The major output of the programme has been “The Integrated Management Study for the Area of Izmir”, which proposed the following measures:

- urgent measures for the alleviation of acute problems related to the unsustainable use of resources;
- measures to be taken in the interim 5-year period by the end of which the institutional system of ICAM is expected to be established, enabling the preparation of the Integrated Coastal Master Plan of Izmir; and
- methodological framework for the preparation of the master plan.

The results of the CAMP phase were presented at a conference held in Izmir in September 1993, following official close out of the CAMP. MAP invested about US$ 200,000 in the CAMP activity, with significant “in-kind” contribution by the Turkish authorities. Upon the completion of the MAP/CAMP Project, local and national authorities continued to carry out the activities in the area of MMI. According to recent information, the investments into the sewage system project are being continued; instead of the lagunar system, the biological treatment system was chosen, the EIA study for the project was also prepared, the preliminary studies for marine research for the Bay of Izmir were implemented by MMI, and the final report presenting the data collected in the period from 1994 – 1996 was printed and distributed. The Project of Monitoring of Air Pollution is being continued. Some of these activities have been proposed in the documents worked out in the framework of the MAP-CAMP project.

110. **Performance Evaluation.** The intervention can be assessed as partially successful, since only half of the planned activities were implemented. More direct or measurable outcomes are difficult to detect at this early stage of the implementation of CAMP proposals. However, since the publication of the CAMP “Izmir Bay” results (1993) major positive changes can be observed in the management and the actual development of the Metropolitan Municipality of Izmir (MMI). These positive changes can partly be attributed to the change in the management of the MMI (new mayor, new head of town planning, new head of environment), and partly, directly or indirectly, to the CAMP results. A new Masterplan for the MMI is now being prepared by a team of consultants, broadly along the lines suggested by the CAMP. The guidelines given for the preparation of the Master Plan at this stage are still imprecise and insufficient. An information system to include all the relevant data for the MMI is in preparation. A number of innovations have been introduced, especially in the location of industry, which already led, or will lead in the future, to major environmental improvements. A number of major decisions have been taken concerning the sewage collection, treatment and disposal which will lead to major improvement in the water
quality of the Bay of Izmir (these activities are part of the World Bank financed Sewage Treatment Project). A new national law on the management of the Izmir Bay was proposed. The decisions to build an underground and a ringroad should improve air quality and reduce noise and congestion in the area of Izmir.

111. Evaluation of Integration. The Master Plan is still only a land-use plan and has not been transformed into a management plan as suggested by the CAMP. Not enough attention is being paid to the economic aspects of the Plan: to the economic forces in future development; how to shape future economic development to suit land-use development; and to the use of economic tools in the implementation of policies. A significant improvement can be detected in the implementation of the existing environmental regulations, as well as in the enforcement of the existing land-use plans. A comprehensive programme of pollution monitoring of the Izmir Bay started in 1996. The Government, in cooperation with the Municipality, is regulating the quality of coal to be used in energy production. A cleaner Air Plan is being developed for Izmir, which will use GIS to monitor and control air quality. This plan will include the existing emission inventory which is continuously being upgraded. A significant improvement can be seen in the relationship between the national and municipal authorities, as well as between industry and the Government in general. The present implementation and enforcement structure is still weak, particularly as far as illegal housing is concerned. The level of participation of general public during the implementation of CAMP activities was low.

112. Evaluation of Sustainability. It appears that no specific time table has been set for the completion of the Master Plan (which is considered to be the major activity in the CAMP implementation/follow-up phase) and the process is slow. Although the Bay is the main environmental/economic resource, it is not always the major focus of planning. In spite of the increasing support environmental and urban management is gaining in the Municipality of Izmir, the financial future of these activities remains unclear. The present municipal administration remains committed to the implementation of the CAMP’s proposals (they have asked MAP for the continuation of activities), but an eventual new administration may have a completely different set of priorities. That is why the longer term institutional and political sustainability of this intervention has been judged as medium at best.

D. Summary of Major Findings at the Project Level

113. All the projects identified by the group have been thoroughly analyzed and evaluated at several levels. The results are presented in Table 5. Major evaluation has been performed for case studies by employing three dimensions, which are considered as crucial for the implementation of Integrated Coastal Area Management in the region: performance impact, integration and sustainability. A brief summary of major findings with regard to these dimensions will be provided below.

114. Performance. More than half of the case studies were judged as successful. It is evident that they have fulfilled most of the objectives stated. In those which were considered as partially successful, all of the activities planned were simply not performed (as is the case in some CAMPs). One weakness of this evaluation criterion is that the project which set out with limited objectives, and a smaller number of activities, had a greater chance of completing successful. For example, initiatives in which only individual coastal management plans were realized, have been completed successfully (Albania - METAP, Greece, Cres-Losinj, France, Israel, Liguria). The exception within this group is a successful realization of the METAP programme for the Island of Rhodes in Greece (more than 10 activities all of which have been completely realized). On the contrary, the activity realization rate of CAMPs in Albania, Greece and Turkey is 50 - 70%. Besides insufficient financing and withdrawal of some partners (Albania and the Bay of Izmir), it is obvious that a number and volume of the activities (CAMP Albania and CAMP Rhodes) should have been planned more real, while the project management within these initiatives (CAMP
### Table 5. Presentation of Case Studies Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Programme/Plan</th>
<th>Main Conflicts</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Albania - a. CAMP (MAP)</td>
<td>Environment, conservation vs. rapid development</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>High/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– some use of economic instruments&lt;br&gt;- regulatory instruments: emission standards&lt;br&gt;- coastal monitoring of pollution &amp; other trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– CAMP activities not coordinated&lt;br&gt;- centralised approach to management&lt;br&gt;- limited vertical integration&lt;br&gt;- limited public participation&lt;br&gt;- limited sectoral integration&lt;br&gt;- lack of enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Croatia- Cres/Lošinj Archipelago Management Plan (METAP)</td>
<td>Environment, protection vs development</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>High/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– biodiversity conservation sites identification&lt;br&gt;- favourable investment prospects&lt;br&gt;- policy instruments&lt;br&gt;- zoning, EIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. France- SDAGE (Other)</td>
<td>Urban and industrial development vs coastal resources and ecosystem protection</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>High/Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– innovative methodology utilized&lt;br&gt;- integrated information system initiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Programme/Plan (Program source)</td>
<td>Main Conflicts</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greece - Rhodes CAMP (MAP and METAP)</td>
<td>Expanding tourism vs. other uses</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>High/ Medium</td>
<td>− linkages with investments/other projects&lt;br&gt;− strategic decision making&lt;br&gt;− public awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Israel - Coastal Master Plan (Other)</td>
<td>Urban and tourism development vs. protection of open natural landscape</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>High/ High</td>
<td>− linkages with future long-term planning for sustainable development&lt;br&gt;− sustainable development indicators developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Italy - Liguria Spatial Coastal Plan (Other)</td>
<td>Urban development vs. coastal land protection</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>High/ Medium</td>
<td>no consideration of interaction between land and sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Morocco - Al Hoceima Management Plan (METAP)</td>
<td>− Fishing vs. biodiversity conservation&lt;br&gt;− Rural development vs. biodiversity conservation</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>High/ Medium</td>
<td>− good documentation and data base&lt;br&gt;− solid methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tunisia - APAL (METAP)</td>
<td>− Tourism vs. coastal erosion&lt;br&gt;− Conflicts over use of space</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Too early to judge/ High</td>
<td>− strong political motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turkey - CAMP Izmir Bay (MAP)</td>
<td>Population and economic growth vs. acceptable land use and environmental values</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Medium/ Medium</td>
<td>− environmental information system developed&lt;br&gt;− regulation enforcement improved&lt;br&gt;− linkage with industrial relocation&lt;br&gt;− pollution abatement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhodes) should have been improved. Another criterion in assessing the case studies’ performance is the positive effects which the projects themselves have produced. The internal influences of the projects on the effects have been higher than the outside influences. This practically means that the consistency between goals and results; or scope of the projects vis-à-vis the problems; or the consistency between resources employed and results, have been much higher, than, for example, outside support given to the projects in the environment where they have been implemented. This was especially obvious in case of the Israeli Master Plan, the Albania and Rhodes CAMP and METAP Programmes, where, at least in the programme phase, almost none of the important environmental problems have been left aside and where entire coastal area has been treated in a relatively comprehensive way. Furthermore, it is clear that very fact that the projects were able to exist in some areas was enough to produce some results. This was felt in the significant improvement of the institutional capacity (Albania, Ismir, Rhodes), or environmental awareness in most of the case study areas, particularly in Israel and Cres-Losinj. This could be considered as one of the best results of the ICAM initiatives in the region so far. Outside support or outside “environment” of the projects has been, in general, rather weak. A possible reason for this could be the insufficient engagement of the “alternative” social structures (NGOs, citizen pressure groups, etc.), which would stimulate administrative structures to take a more active part within the initiative realization. In this connection, the Israeli Master Plan and the APAL Project in Tunisia, could be emphasized. The latter is clearly a result of a more active involvement of the Tunisian authorities in the improvement of environmental management in the whole country. A contrast to these difficult to measure or “unquantifiable” outcomes, the case studies could not be evaluated by their measurable outcomes (such as improvement of the environmental situation, or changes in the resource use practices in the area, or km of roads built, etc.) because this would be premature, since most of the projects have only recently been completed leaving, thus, very little time to assess their success in this respect.

115. Integration. This criterion is perhaps the most representative of the ICAM implementation in the region. Integration is an objective which is difficult to achieve, since not all the methodological questions have yet been properly answered, and the most appropriate tools and techniques not yet developed. A high level of integration was achieved only in Cres-Losinj, France, Israel and Tunisia. These were almost a single sector interventions (coastal preservation, water pollution prevention, land use, or creation of an institutional framework). All other interventions have rated only medium success in achieving integration between the various sectors. These were mainly projects comprised of a larger number of, very often, unrelated or remotely related activities. A partial success was achieved also relative to the question of early inclusion of environmental concerns in the coastal management process. Although the situation is improving, and many actions are judged by the environmental impacts they have very early in the process, only in half of the case studies examined this element had a high value (e.g. in Cres-Losinj, France, Greece, Morocco, Tunisia). The question of governance and participation is the weak point in all the projects. Overall, it may be judged as unsatisfactory, particularly with regard to participation of the general public. Most projects stated that participation was one of their objectives, but in practice participation was limited to the representative bodies, and sometimes not even to them. A governance level, for example, was evaluated as medium in almost all interventions, indicating a relatively unsatisfactory participation of the administrative structures in coordinating actors or stakeholders. A participation level of the general public was judged more favourably in Cres-Losinj, France and Italy (only at the local level), while in Albania (in both projects) a wider participation has almost not been noted.

116. Sustainability. This is the crucial point if one wants to assess the possibility of the project’s implementation. From the financial point of view, the prospects in most of the cases are not bright. Only in a few cases the commitment by the authorities or other decision-makers to support financially the implementation of the project’s proposals could be identified (France and Greece were evaluated favourably, while the weakest financial prospects have CAMP Albania, Morocco
and Turkey). In too many cases the external financial support was expected for the continuation of the project’s efforts (METAP Albania and METAP Greece). This lack of the financial sustainability or inability to mobilize resources domestically, could be troubling. However, projects originating in more developed countries were financially more secure. Another form of the financial security was the prospect of an investment project to follow immediately after the completion of the documentation phase (again, the situation more typical for developed countries of the region, such as in Greece). Therefore, the financial sustainability could be assessed as medium, at best, in most of the case studies. Institutional and political support was better, indicating the growth in the sense of ownership of the projects. Roughly half of the projects in both elements have been evaluated as having high sustainability (high in Croatia, France, Israel, Tunis, while in other countries a medium institutional and political support is to be expected). This may be an encouraging sign, and if the participation level of all the interested actors in the projects could be increased (assessed as low, in general, in the dimension of integration), that could also increase the prospects for financing the follow up proposals (it could attract potential investors), bring improvements in the environmental situation and resource use practices (with increased environmental awareness and education), as well as improve other measurable outcomes of the ICAM projects in the region.
E. Summary of Major Findings at the Programme Level

117. This section will present the evaluation results at the programme source level. Three major programme sources have been identified in the region: CAMPs of the Mediterranean Action Plan, METAP projects of the World Bank, European Union, European Investment Bank and UNDP, and other national and international sources. The sources here refer to the funds for financing the interventions. Each one of these sources is typical, either from the point of view of the availability of financing, project’s objectives, the use of project’s outputs, or the possibilities and prospects for the follow up. Therefore, their separate presentation can be considered as legitimate, and valuable for future directions to be taken with regard to ICAM efforts in the region.

i. Coastal Area Management programmes of MAP

118. **Performance.** Since 1988 MAP has started 7 CAMP projects. Until now, four have been completed (Croatia, Syria, Turkey, Greece) while three are on-going (Egypt, Tunisia, Albania). In this analysis, all of them have been identified first as projects, for four of them the questionnaires have been received (Albania, Turkey, Greece, Syria), and only three of them have been analyzed as case studies (Albania, Greece, Turkey). MAP CAMP projects had a significant impact on the region and the benefits would outweigh the costs by several factors (the average cost of the projects analyzed is about US$ 240,000). No benefits-cost study is needed to justify this statement. These benefits are particularly significant in low income countries such as Albania. The projects, as well as the whole initiative, are more successful in their catalytic role and with regard to the objectives stated in paragraph 29 of this report (these objectives were applied to all CAMPs). But the camp case studies have been assessed as partially successful with regard to the fulfillment of their objectives. On average, only about 50 -70 % of the activities have been implemented. The best situation was in Syria, but the number of activities there was not large, while in Albania (with the activities envisaged) the number of completed activities was rather low. The problem could be in the fact that feasibility studies are not envisaged, and financial sources (either MAP, host government’s or other) very often are not secured in advance of programme implementation. In spite of the fact that the programmes are sometimes lacking external support, the overall impacts of the programme itself is surprisingly good, particularly in increased institutional capacity. It is the general judgment, that the capacity of local experts involved has increased significantly as a result of training and other educational activities (particularly in Greece, Spain and Albania). The influence made on the decision makers is also quite significant. However, it was difficult to quantify outcomes because not enough time has lapsed since the implementation of the projects’ proposals.

119. **Integration.** Because of the way CAMPs are being developed and carried out, the sectoral integration is not rated as very high. Generally, there is little coordination among various components of MAP involved in CAMP implementation except, partially, when integrated planning studies or plans for the areas are being prepared (in Albania, Syria and Turkey). Integration of environmental concerns in the overall thinking about the developmental problems in the areas concerned is present. This was the case in scenario exercises (such as in CAMP Rhodes), or when ICAM programmes were prepared (CAMP Albania). Governance level and participation of all the actors in the areas where CAMPs are being implemented is judged as medium (Greece) to low (Albania and Turkey). Not enough efforts have been employed to involve all the stakeholders, particularly NGOs or the general public. It is true, however, that the countries’ legal or administrative contexts are not ready yet to allow for a better public participation. These governance contexts are not always favorable towards the inclusion of the wider public in environmental management. Also, financial resources are not ample enough to allow for thorough implementation of this aspect.
120. **Sustainability.** CAMP projects’ longer term sustainability is not secure enough. Although pledged, there has been no evidence that the actual financial resources have been secured for the follow-up proposals. Only where there was an investment project envisaged, have activities continued (Rhodes and Kastela Bay, with EIB and EBRD/WB projects on water treatment). Sufficient institutional and political support exists, but since the necessary domestic financial support has not materialized the overall rate in most of the projects could not be more than medium. This is one of the biggest problems of the CAMP initiative. Even if good results in preparing the proposals are achieved, they are left hanging in the air because of low financial sustainability.

**ii. METAP**

121. **Performance.** This analysis has identified 17 METAP projects started since 1988, for which 7 questionnaires were received (Albania, Croatia, Greece, Israel, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey), and 5 case studies thoroughly analyzed and evaluated. Most of the projects, compared to CAMPs, were limited in scope, project-driven, and concentrated in “hot spot” areas (it must be said, that there is a large group of METAP regional policy-oriented projects, but they were not included in this evaluation). The average cost of the project analyzed was approx. US$ 360,000. Although it is not very high, the benefits outweigh the costs. The average METAP project had 50% more money available than the average CAMP intervention, and less activities to implement. This has allowed for better preparation and completion of the activities envisaged, and for the fulfillment of projects’ objectives. Most of the projects evaluated were assessed as successful. The projects were internally quite coherent, which helped them succeed even without external help as expected. Contrary to CAMPs, a larger share of the activities has been performed by the outside (largely international) consultants, and the effects on the capacity building were probably smaller than in the case of CAMP interventions. METAP interventions have proven to be good examples of projects whose recommendations have been followed up (for more information see Table 1 and paragraph 42). In several cases, for example, preliminary activities led to investment project with the objective to clean up the environment or improve the overall environmental situation.

122. **Integration.** The sectoral integration within projects was fairly good, although the number of sectors involved in these projects was relatively limited and smaller than in CAMPs. In addition to sectoral integration, the environmental concerns were incorporated early in the coastal management process, both in CAMPs and METAP projects. However, as in CAMP projects, there is a lack of adequate public participation. Local and national representative bodies were adequately present throughout the whole process of the projects’ preparation. More direct methods of public participation were not exercised, probably because of practical reasons, since the territorial extent of many projects was quite large. Due to the directives issued by the World Bank, in several case studies NGOs were better involved and represented than was the case in CAMPs. This is certainly a factor which will have to be improved in the future.

123. **Sustainability.** The projects are generally more sustainable than the CAMP ones. In developed countries of the region, there are good prospects that investment projects will follow (Greece, for example). In some developing countries, such as Albania, the project follow up was promising, but the subsequent political events have temporarily slowed down that positive development. In some other countries, the future is financially less secure (Morocco, for example), because the investment projects were not clearly identified. Political support given to the projects is very high, but the institutional structure necessary to back these proposals is often lacking. This fact cannot always be described as an internal weakness of the project but as an external factor associated with the general country context.
iii. Other initiatives

124. **Performance.** A total of 8 such ICAM projects have been identified in the region, out of which 5 questionnaires have been received, and 3 case studies analyzed and evaluated. The average cost of the case studies intervention has been more than US$ 900,000, which by far outweighs the other interventions. Most of these were large scale national projects with full support of the national authorities and institutions. Their success rate was judged as high. Some of them have presented very innovative methodological approaches, which could be utilized elsewhere in the region. The interventions were rather limited in scope, and with a smaller number of activities than in CAMPs, and even in METAP projects. They were aimed at reducing the pollution problems (France, Italy), monitoring the environmental situation (France), or specifically dealing with the coastal development issues (Israel). In some of them, however, the lack of adequate consideration of the seaward dimension of the coastal area is evident (Italy), therefore reducing the level of integration of these two elementary parts of the coastal area. Some of the projects were quite successful in guiding coastal development, like in Israel, where the plan was actively implemented for more than a decade.

125. **Integration.** Sectoral integration may be considered as quite high, but largely due to a limited number of sectors involved. In none of the three case studies evaluated is the socio-economic component (population, economic development issues, tourism projections) very prominent. The interventions have succeeded in integrating the issue of coastal development with environmental protection, particularly at the terrestrial side of the coastal area (Italy, Israel). The governance level is relatively high. Since most of the interventions were national ones, and in countries with relatively developed legal and administrative contexts, this requirement was almost compulsory. The level of intragovernmental integration was relatively high (particularly in France where vertical integration between departments and provinces was quite successful). In most of the interventions a large number of national and local institutions was involved, as well NGOs, but not so with the general public.

126. **Sustainability.** Being national level interventions, the case studies analyzed demonstrated a relatively high level of financial sustainability. This was also due to the fact that all of these interventions were located in developed countries. It has to be noted that there is less initiative to finance ICAM interventions out of the local or national sources in the developing countries of the region. In these countries it is expected that ICAM projects will be supported from the international sources, particularly through MAP and METAP. Encouraging sign, however, is that there is growing demand for such interventions (METAP, 1997). In the three case study areas, the national interventions were supported by the adequate institutional arrangements in as well as by the strong political support (the plan in Israel, for example, has been retained despite several changes in administration).
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

127. The overview of the projects identified and case studies evaluated has demonstrated a wide diversity of integrated coastal area management programmes in the Mediterranean, particularly at a local level. Overall, the status of coastal area management in the region is at a much higher level as compared to the situation that existed 5 or 10 years ago. International assistance and cooperation increased significantly in comparison to the previous periods (i.e. with the establishment of METAP, and the assistance of the European Union through various programmes and initiatives). Simultaneously bilateral aid increased significantly. Although many of these activities did not explicitly address the coastal management issues, they supported a number of components of coastal area management. Through activities of CAMP and METAP several developing countries were systematically exposed to the integrated management of coastal areas.

128. On the basis of this experience one can observe the following general characteristics:

- A majority of case studies are still at a pre-implementation phase.
- The geographic area of intervention varies, and the usual criteria are administrative boundaries with few exceptions (the island of Rhodes and SDAGE where administrative boundaries coincide with geophysical ones).
- Population issues are not always properly taken into consideration.
- Human activities have been treated in an adequate way in most cases although the emphasis has been primarily on tourism (Albania, Greece, Croatia, Israel), reflecting the prevalence of tourism in the Mediterranean. Rural activities are also treated in a relatively satisfactory way (Israel, Albania).
- Urbanization and land-use conflicts are present in most cases but fail to be satisfactorily integrated into management policies (except in Israel and Italy).
- Human impacts on natural ecosystems have been treated in a satisfactory way from the point of view of identifying conflicts but economic analyses of environmental impacts are lacking in general.
- Future dimensions of human activities and environmental impacts are not always adequately treated except in the cases of integrated planning studies (Albania, Greece, Turkey).
- There has been little feedback from such cases to national development plans.
- Except in CAMP activities, very little exposure to specific tools of ICAM (such as EIA, GIS, carrying capacity assessment - CCA, rapid appraisal of coastal environments - RACE, conflict resolution, cost-benefit analysis, economic instruments, etc.) is evident, and even in CAMPs the emphasis is on the use of such tools for data management mainly and simple suitability analyses (GIS).

129. Various case studies dealt with in this assessment could be characterized by the following approaches:

- “Land-use planning” as expressed in the mandate of the Tunisian APAL, the Israeli Master Plan and the Italian PTC (the Liguria Region);
- “Protected Area Management or Natural Habitat Management” within the framework of National Park of Al-Hoceima (Morocco) and Cres-Losinj Archipelago (Croatia);
• “Problem Identification” and “Resource Management Planning”, a double approach applied in the cases on the Island of Rhodes (Greece), Izmir Bay (Turkey), Albanian Coastal Region and the French SDAGE.

• As to the fourth approach, which may be tentatively explained as a more complex management of activities brought into relation with the resource capacity, it has been applied, but only to a limited extent, such as in the tourism carrying capacity assessment in an area of the Island of Rhodes.

130. In administratively highly centralized countries (Israel, Turkey, Albania, Croatia, France) coastal area management features prominently in national development and national land-use planning or in environmental strategies at the national level. In other countries there is a growing recognition of the need to integrate coastal planning with national development planning and environmental planning.

131. The trend is definitely positive that the results of ICAM are being used increasingly in policy making and managerial decisions (at least at the local level). To support this trend, international donors should help ensure that ICAM generates results (studies, policy proposals, etc.) which are more “user friendly” for policy makers and managers. There needs to be greater cooperation between the policy/managerial establishment and the CZM institutions/experts.

132. In some cases ICAM initiatives did lay the groundwork for the interventions which led or could lead to the improvement of the quality of the environment (the island of Rhodes, Haifa Bay, Kastela Bay). In other cases (e.g. Albania, Cres-Losinj, Al-Hoceima, Izmir) plans and studies/proposals were used to provide guidance and as a source of right management options for decision makers.

133. In a few Mediterranean countries, notably the EU members, certain tools important for coastal area management have been institutionalized, such as EIA, pollution monitoring, information systems etc., as well as economic and legal/regulatory instruments developed both at the national and international levels. While environmental assessment is increasingly recognised among the developing countries of the region as a standard tool for evaluating potential environmental impacts of a proposed development activity, it is not consistently applied in these countries. More often, environmental assessment, when applied, is used at the project level to suggest changes to the project to make it environmentally more acceptable. Many types of economic instruments have been used in implementing CZM plans, particularly in the northern countries of the region. In these countries, the most frequently used instruments are: user charges and fees, especially in the field of water, waste water, and solid waste; tourist taxes, governments subsidies to promote development, and economic incentives to encourage compliance with regulations. However, there was little evidence of these economic instruments being used in the southern and eastern rim countries. This was one factor contributing to the low financial sustainability achieved at the project level in many countries. Instead, coastal management in these countries is characterized by command and control systems. The problems with this approach are twofold: first, many regulations are inadequate to control intensively used coastal areas; and, second, regulations are not well enforced. As the financial stakes on the coast are high there are strong incentives to circumvent regulations, sometimes with the tacit agreement of the local authorities.

134. Major factors contributing to the success or failure of ICAM initiatives in the region may be analyzed at the level of the system, or of the individual programme, plan or project. System related factors are those resulting from the wider context in which the initiative is implemented, and which are not necessarily the consequence of the initiative itself. Project related factors are those resulting directly from the initiative itself.

135. Among the system related factors contributing to ICAM program success, the following could be mentioned:
• international assistance (loans, sponsored studies, grants, etc.);
• tradition (e.g. long-term tradition in land-use and sea-use coastal planning);
• efficient public service;
• political factors (e.g. favourable change in administration, creation of the necessary policy framework, strong political leaders, government support to ICAM, awareness of the need for ICAM);
• policy framework (integration of land-use planning, pollution prevention and natural resource management; informal experts’ networks, towns associations; integration of environmental policy into the overall policy framework; high level of integration between national and metropolitan/municipal authorities; establishment of strong environmental office; improvement in cooperation between national and local authorities; establishment of the Coastal Management Agency);
• institutional support and leadership (commitment to environmental protection and conservation, and to public service to implement it; planning at the national level);
• high degree of state ownership of land;
• public awareness (continuous public debate about the environment; land-use plans available for public inspection; involvement of local actors and academic and business communities in decision making).

136. Among project related factors, the following could be mentioned:
• the adequate methodological approach to the implementation of initiatives (in most of the cases analysed the intervention boundaries were properly defined either at ecosystem, functional or administrative/planning levels; in majority of cases some sort of involvement of all actors was materialised; use of planning tools and implementation instruments was introduced to local experts, etc.);
• financial and human resources were made available to project teams (in some cases economic instruments were used to sustain financial support; in majority of cases adequate local staff with appropriate qualifications was involved; in internationally financed projects satisfactory technical assistance was provided, etc.);
• governance arrangements were envisaged by the project design (in majority of cases adequate institutional arrangements were planned; in some cases local communities were sufficiently involved to create the adequate level of ownership of the project; some projects have shown enough transparency in decision-making, etc.).

137. In spite of all the efforts and positive developments, there are still a number of areas of concern:
• lack of high level horizontal integration (communication at a national level between responsible agencies and institutions is not at a satisfactory level);
• lack of vertical integration (coordination between national and local levels is not desirable);
• effective involvement of the private sector and participation of the general public is an exception rather than the rule;
• practical use of implementation tools for ICAM (EIA, GIS, some more sophisticated forms of economic instruments, etc.) is still not at a satisfactory level (for example, the information systems, although established in most of the projects supported through international assistance, were not expanded to cover larger territories);
there are still no signs of efforts to replicate or transfer the experiences and successes to other locations;

existing pollution monitoring programmes are still not used as a management tool, while the improvements in water and environmental quality were difficult to assess (quantify);

compliance with existing legal instruments is still not adequate and appropriate, while the system of monitoring of compliance (e.g. inspectorates) is lacking in a number of countries, or is inefficient and inadequate;

in a number of cases, end-users of the results of the activities were not clearly identified and they were not involved with design of the programmes;

in most of the cases where comprehensive ICAM programmes were prepared, coordination among the various components was not adequate;

the capacity of the administration to prepare follow-up investment proposals to be submitted to international financial institutions or other donors was not adequate.

B. Lessons Learned

138. Several important lessons could be learned from this evaluation:

Performance

- an evaluation mechanism has to be built in right from the beginning, while programme monitoring must be linked to evaluation throughout project implementation;
- fulfillment of project level objectives in the planning phase does not automatically lead to implementation of recommendations or of the plan;
- fulfillment of project level objectives does not ensure impacts beyond the immediate project area, unless results are widely disseminated and replicate elsewhere.

Integration

- environmental concerns must be integrated into the design and implementation of an initiative from the very beginning;
- a programme could be issue-oriented at the outset, taking primarily into account most of the factors contributing to these problem issues, but will have to become more comprehensive at a later stages in order to deal with all complex linkages and provide integrated solutions;
- the interested national institutions, demanding and initiating the project, should be better identified at an early stage;
- policy interventions must be closely linked to the objectives of the ICAM initiative;
- without undermining the importance of technical capacities, it is advisable to ensure that the solutions to technical problems relevant to coastal environments be adapted to the local customs and cultural context.

Sustainability

- strong political commitment at all levels to the preparation and implementation of initiatives is the most important determinant of sustainability of an initiative;
- participation of stakeholders and end-users from the design phase through project implementation is of utmost importance;
• a longer-term sustainability of the project should be secured, while greater importance should be accorded to an easier utilization of project results by the institutions and those who benefit from these results.

C. Recommendations

139. During the last years, several encouraging events in the Mediterranean region facilitated the adoption of ICAM as a basic instrument in the realisation of sustainable development in coastal area. In this respect, the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted, in Tunis 1994, a MEDAGENDA 21 and established, two years later, the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development. This commission has gradually become a driving force towards implementation of a vision of sustainable development in the region. Therefore, a number of recommendations in this document are intended to help chart its work.

140. In 1997, METAP entered its third phase with a programme for the period from 1997 - 2000. After longer preparations and active involvement of the Mediterranean countries in the decision-making process, a Launching Document was prepared, highlighting Integrated Water and Coastal Resources Management among its most important priorities, which would be implemented through the following activities:

• improved management capacity and new management tools;
• developing plans and strategies (preparation of river basin plans and CZM strategies);
• incentives (economic policy instruments to promote sustainable use of water and other coastal resources);
• resource utilization (improvements in infrastructure, as well as management practices);
• investments.

141. Among other national and international initiatives, those related to the PHARE Programme and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership of the European Union should be mentioned. PHARE covers the economies in transition of Central and Eastern Europe, while in the Mediterranean, PHARE assists countries of the Balkan Peninsula. CZM is an important component of this programme. Euro-Med Partnership was launched in Barcelona, in 1995, with particular emphasis on environmental protection and maintaining environmental quality as a condition for entering into free trade agreements. Integrated coastal zone management is seen as an important tool for achieving these objectives.

142. Based on the experiences assessed, the following recommendations are aimed at supporting Mediterranean countries in achieving the objectives of the above mentioned initiatives. Recommendations are divided into three groups, namely: (i) overall policy recommendations that regional countries should consider; (ii) specific recommendations for METAP III; and (iii) specific recommendations for MAP.

i. Overall Policy Recommendations

143. Riparians in the region are urged to consider the following:

• Develop country CZM strategies and integrate their implementation into national development strategies and plans.
• Integrate water resources management and coastal zone management. Downstream impacts of river basin regulation and water resource use should be taken into account when developing management plans and investment strategies. Transboundary effects of river basin and coastal zone development should also be considered and riparian
countries encouraged to cooperate in upstream and downstream planning when transboundary water resources are concerned.

- Explore opportunities for appropriate use of economic instruments related to project financing. These should include market based water pricing, user fees, environmental taxes, penalties, and elimination of subsidies.
- Establish new or enhance existing systems for enforcement of laws and regulations concerning land-use, access to coastal and marine resources (e.g. fisheries, wetlands, fresh water, forests, etc.), biodiversity, water and air quality, and solid waste management in coastal areas.
- Invest in capacity building and institutional strengthening using national and regional expertise available in the field of coastal management.
- Establish appropriate institutional mechanisms to achieve vertical and horizontal integration in CZM.
- Countries should strive for full harmonization of coastal zone management policies and their implementation between local and national administration.

ii. METAP

144. For METAP, specific recommendations are:

- Support the implementation of national, regional (sub-national) and local coastal area management plans through preparation of investment projects and strengthening institutional capacity to implement them.
- Build capacity for environmental assessment and the use of economic planning tools which allow internalisation of environmental costs in determining cost/benefit ratio of proposed development activities in the coastal zone.
- Continue support for adoption and use of implementation tools and techniques, including preparation of indicators (including those on sustainable development) on the progress of specific policies, programmes, plans and projects.
- Collection, treatment and disposal of municipal and industrial waste waters is the major problem in the Mediterranean coastal zone, requiring considerable investments. Such investments should be given high priority for project preparation. Whenever possible municipal and industrial waste waters should be separated to facilitate treatment.
- Funding institutions should consider the establishment of enabling legislation (e.g. authorizing appropriate institutional arrangements) for major investments for the implementation of coastal management programmes; institutional linkages should include interministerial committees, intergovernmental bodies, etc.
- Countries should be assisted in their institutional capacity for project identification and preparation. The METAP regional project preparation facility and UNDP’s Capacity 21 capacity building unit should be utilised to the fullest possible extent.
- METAP activities should be linked with those of MAP as well as with other international programmes in the region in order to increase sustainability of the effort, expand scope and increase cumulative impact of related interventions.
- METAP should be encouraged to prepare a detailed study assessing use of economic instruments in the region, e.g., where they are used, why they do or do not work, what are constraints to their adoption, etc.? Use of economic instruments should be phased
in project design where there is potential in countries to adopt them (as a demonstration project initially).

iii. **MAP**

145. For MAP, specific recommendations are:

- Local level programmes (CAMPS) should be more focused on sustainable development and potential end-users should be involved early in the coastal management process. ICAM should become a standard approach in achieving the sustainable development and management of the coastal regions. In applying ICAM particular emphasis should be given to coordination among different sectors and levels of administration.

- Design and development of CAMPs should be encouraged and strengthened. Projects should be preceded by the feasibility study. In the development of new CAMPs particular emphasis should be given to intersectoral cooperation, coordination between national and local levels, and to capacity building. Particular attention should be given to the realistic planning of CAMPs, and to proposing a viable number of activities to be implemented.

- Countries which have already developed CAMPs should be encouraged to utilize accumulated knowledge and to replicate the approach in other localities and regions within their territories. Within this activity, a maximum of national resources should be mobilized. Also, direct exchange of experience and know-how between CAMPs should be encouraged and assisted. Possibility of publishing a CAMP newsletter as well as opening a www site should be examined.

- Contracting Parties should encourage wider involvement and participation of private sector and general public in the development and implementation of CAMPs.

- Link CAMP activities with those of METAP as well as with other international programmes in the region in order to increase sustainability of the effort, expand scope and increase cumulative impact of related interventions.
ANNEX: Questionnaire on the Studies

I. BASIC INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME/PLAN/PROJECT

1. What is the name of the programme/plan/project?

2. Name the institution responsible for the preparation and implementation of the programme/plan/project?

3. Where did the programme/plan/project originate? (At the national level/At the local level)

4. What are the general goals and objectives of the programme/plan/project? Please, describe.

5. What are the administrative and planning areas of the programme/plan/project? Please, describe.

6. What were the criteria for the definition of the programme/plan/project? Please, describe.

7. What are the major phases of the programme/plan/project? Please, explain.

II. GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME/PLAN/PROJECT

1. List the major conflicts in resource use and spatial allocation in the coastal zone (e.g., tourism vs. agriculture, industry vs. fisheries) and the main actors.

2. Was the programme/plan/project successful as compared to its objectives? (Successful / Moderately successful / Not successful). Please, elaborate.

3. What were the major constraints?

4. Was there an evaluation mechanism for the programme/plan/project? Please, explain the evaluation mechanism.

5. Were the main economic activities and social issues in the programme/plan/project area incorporated in the programme/plan/project in an adequate way? (Yes / Partially / Not / Not applicable).

6. Assess the degree to which the programme/plan/project incorporated relevant environmental issues? (Adequately / Partially / Not at all). Please, elaborate.

7. Is there a financial mechanism to extend activities beyond the life of the programme/plan/project (i.e. environmental taxes, user fees, budget allocations, etc.)? Please, explain.

8. Did the programme/plan/project enhance the capacity of the institutions involved to deal with the problems treated in the project (e.g., through training)? (Considerably / Partially / Not adequately). Please, explain.

9. Did the results of the programme/plan/project lead to tangible results in the area? (Infrastructure / Improved coastal management / No tangible results). Please, explain.

10. Were results of the programme/plan/project linked to the policy making and managerial decisions? (Yes / Partially / No).

11. What are the prospects of follow-up activities to the programme/plan/project? Please, explain.
12. Has programme/plan/project policy planning and implementation been monitored and the results expressed: (In quantitative way, In qualitative way).

13. Have indicators been used or expected to be used to measure: (Progress towards sustainable develop., Progress in environmental performance, Progress in the performance of METAP activities).

III. ASSESSMENT OF SPECIFIC ISSUES

a. Institutional issues

1. Administrative framework

   1.1 Is there a coastal zone management policy framework in your country and is this framework part of a sustainable development plan? Please, explain.

   1.2 In your view is this policy framework: (Adequate, Workable, Not practical)

   1.3 Has your project/program/plan been developed as part of this coastal management policy framework? If yes, what mechanism (ad hoc or formal) has been used to integrate it with the overall framework? Please, elaborate.

   1.4 What administrative framework (e.g. interministerial committee, coastal commission, etc.) has been used for the planning and implementation of your programme/plan/project and how was your programme/plan/project coordinated with national, regional and local authorities? Please, explain.

   1.5 Has the programme/plan/project led to a successful integration between various governmental authorities? (Yes / Partially / Not at all)

   1.6 Is environmental impact assessment (EIA) a required procedure in your country? (Yes / No)

   1.7 Was EIA carried out in your programme/plan/project? (Yes / No)

   1.8 If EIA was implemented, was it useful? (Yes / No). Explain why.

2. Legal framework

   2.1 Does your country have an adequate coastal law and laws dealing with coastal waters? If yes, are they enforced: (Effectively / Partially effectively / Not at all). Please, explain.

   2.2 Have the various laws and regulations affecting the coastal area environment been harmonized? (Yes / No). Please, explain.

3. Economic/financing framework

   3.1 How would the environmental measures or recommendations proposed in the programme/plan/project be financed? (National government sources / Local government sources / Private sources / International sources). Please, explain.

   3.2 Is the government or local authority raising funds for financing environmental expenditures relating to the programme/plan/project from the following sources: (Local taxes, User charges on natural resources, User charges on local services (sewage, etc.), Other).

   3.3 Are the above funds adequate for achieving programme/plan/project objectives? (Fully / Partially / Not adequately). Please, explain.

b. Environmental issues

   1. List the main environmental issues in the programme/plan/project area.
2. Did the programme/plan/project address adequately marine pollution and associated effects, and the state of coastal ecosystem(s)? (Yes / No / Not applicable).

3. Did the programme/plan/project adequately deal with the following issues: (Solid and hazardous waste, Land-based sources of marine pollution, Collection, treatment and disposal of waste waters, Industrial waste, Transboundary pollution).

4. Did the programme/plan/project deal with the management of the following resources: (Freshwater, Soil, Fishery resources, Biodiversity, Coastal forests, Cultural heritage, Landscape).

5. Was any marine pollution "hot spot" identified in the area covered by the programme/plan/project? (Yes / No).

6. Was there adequate institutional expertise for the measurements of environmental pollution and assessment of its effects in the area covered by the programme/plan/project? (Yes / Partially / No).

7. Was an environment monitoring system part of the programme/plan/project, and if so, was it related to the regional monitoring system such as MED-POL? (Yes / No).

8. Was the available environmental information utilized for managerial decisions? (Yes / No).

9. Were the existing regulations for control of pollution enforced in the area covered by the programme/plan/project? (Yes / Partially / No). If no, explain why.

10. Did the programme/plan/project make any recommendation regarding ecosystem conservation (protected areas, sanctuaries, etc.)? (Yes / No).

c. Human activity issues

1. Has population dynamics in the programme/plan/project area been taken into consideration? (Medium-term projection (5-10 years), Long-term projection (more than 10 years)).

2. Have the future economic growth issues been taken into consideration? (Yes / No)

3. Can natural resources in the area sustain future economic and population growth? (Yes / No)

4. Have changes in the economic activities and their impact on the coastal zone been taken into consideration? (Fisheries, Agriculture, Forestry, Mining, Manufacturing, Transport, Energy, Tourism, Other services, Other)

5. Is there an effective forum or mechanism for conflict resolution regarding resource use in the coastal zone? (Through legislation (specify), Through mediation (explain)) If mediation, at what level?

d. Urbanisation and land/sea use issues

1. Have trends in urbanisation and its impacts on the coastal zone been taken into consideration? (Yes / No)

2. Were the following issues important in the programme/plan/project? (Population growth, Anticipated urbanisation, Demand for land, Infrastructure development, Demand for social services, Uncontrolled development).

3. Is the existing and future use of the marine environment in the programme/plan/project area taken into consideration? (Yes / No)
e. **Tools for Integrated Management**

1. Which technical tools for integrated management have been utilized during the preparation of the programme/plan/project?: (Geographic Information System, Remote sensing, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Multicriteria analysis, Carrying capacity assessment, Cost-benefit analysis, Development scenario, Other). Which of the applied tools were the most useful (name)?

2. Which policy tools for integrated management have been utilized during the preparation of the programme/plan/project?:

   Economic instruments:  
   - User fees and charges  
   - Resources prices  
   - Green taxes  
   - Tourist taxes  
   - Subsidies  
   - Credits

   Regulatory instruments:  
   - EIA  
   - Zoning  
   - Emission standards  
   - Planning  
   - Environmental audits

   Procedural instruments:  
   - Reviews  
   - Public hearings  
   - Conflict resolution  
   - Negotiations  
   - Mediations  
   - Voluntary agreements

f. **Participation, public awareness/attitudes**

1. Who are the major stakeholder (interest) groups in the programme/plan/project area (for example, tourist industry, mining industry, fisheries, etc.)? Please, list.

2. Was there provision for stakeholder (interest) group participation in implementing and designing the programme/plan/project? Please, elaborate.

3. Did the private sector, NGOs and general public participate in the programme/plan/project? (Extensively / To certain extent / Not at all). Please, describe.

4. Was there developed a sense of close association with the programme/plan/project among the affected population? (High / Medium / Low)

5. Has the programme/plan/project contributed to community cohesion or led to conflict? Please, explain.

6. Were public awareness issues addressed in the programme/plan/project through?: (Radio, TV, Newspapers, Brochures/leaflets, Education, Presentation at community level, Lectures, Other (specify)).

7. Are traditional attitudes, uses and rights to the coastal zone by local groups respected in current management regime? (Yes / No)

8. Was a social assessment prepared in programme/plan/project preparation to determine potential impacts? (Yes / No)

9. Have social or cultural norms (e.g., attitudes/values) influenced the project design and implementation? Please, explain.

10. Have attitudes changed as a result of the programme/plan/project? (Significantly / Moderately / No change).

11. Who are the principle beneficiaries of the programme/plan/project?

12. Are there significant incentives for public participation/support for the programme/plan/project over the long term? (Yes (specify) / No)

13. Was the enhanced know-how and methodological development applied in other projects in the country? (Yes / No)

14. Have you shared/exchanged information on the programme/plan/project with other initiatives in the region (other than METAP or MAP activities)? (Yes / No)
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