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Venue, participation and objectives

1. One of the recommendations of the 2015 CAMP Assessment Report was to boost the network of CAMP and other ICZM projects implemented according to the provisions of the ICZM Protocol. To this end, PAP/RAC has prepared and uploaded to its web site an online networking tool, which has to be populated with the contribution of the Contracting Parties (CPs). An initial meeting was needed to discuss the network structure and future activities, as well as to agree on the format of the contributions to be provided by the CPs.

2. The meeting was organised at the PAP/RAC premises in Split on 17-18 December 2019. It was attended by 15 participants from 11 Mediterranean countries and representatives of PAP/RAC. The registration list of participants is attached as Annex I, and the Agenda of the meeting as Annex II.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting

3. Ms Željka Škaričić, PAP/RAC Director, welcomed the participants, thanked them for coming to the meeting at that somewhat inconvenient date. She explained the purpose of the meeting, which will start considering a network of CAMP projects financed by the MTF, but also similar ICZM projects with different names, which were financed within the framework of other funding instruments, such as coastal plans for example. She mentioned that the idea of a CAMP network appeared during the implementation of the projects in Italy and France, where Italy insisted on strengthening links among projects. Ms Škaričić then invited the participants to think of the best tools to be included in the network, as well of what they expected the network to be.

4. Since there were some people who attended a PAP meeting for the first time, all the participants briefly introduced themselves.

Agenda item 2: Introduction

5. Mr. Marko Prem, PAP/RAC Deputy Director, made a brief presentation on the CAMP history within the Barcelona Convention system, gradual evolution from sectoral focus to ICZM, and to the latest transboundary projects. He also informed on the three CAMP assessments performed in 1996, 2001 and 2015 respectively. His presentation is available here.

6. Ms Škaričić pointed out the two transboundary projects in preparation, namely Albania-Italy and Cyprus-Israel, and mentioned the CAMP Bosnia and Herzegovina that should be signed in the beginning of 2020. She also mentioned that in the recently concluded COP21 Malta formally requested a new CAMP, based on their satisfaction with the results of the first one implemented in the period 1999-2002. She then invited the present representatives of the countries that had had a CAMP to inform the meeting of the changes the projects had made.
7. Mr. Slavko Mezek, Slovenia, informed that the CAMP Slovenia had been highly focused on regional planning. At the time there were governance problems as municipalities were fragmented and municipal interests had to be coordinated. A set of recommendations was prepared to slow down ribbon development. It was proposed to relocate the coastal road further inland and to transform the coastal area into a green recreational zone. This was finally done in 2018 as a follow up activity of the CAMP.

8. Ms Daniela Addis, Italy, explained that the CAMP Italy had almost been a transboundary one since it involved three very different regions (Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany and Sardinia), and in Italy regions have a fair amount of autonomy. The project was very ambitious and from the start there was also collaboration with the CAMP France to test the methodology. A great added value was that the method was tested, data were exchanged, and all the components of the MAP collaborated on the project, as they always do in the CAMP but one should emphasize it as it is very important. She mentioned that they also tested MSP. Some of the results were used in the MAP system, notably during the development of the Common Regional Framework (CRF) for ICZM. The representative of Cyprus enquired as to how they developed MSP in their CAMP. Ms Addis explained that the issue of MSP had just been touched since MSP is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transport and not of the Ministry of Environment, so it was impossible to go deeper in the subject. MSP was used as a tool for spatial planning on the sea side, but was not translated from a legal point of view.

9. Mr. Sylvain Petit, France, stated that one of the key outputs of CAMP France was the understanding that there were no ICZM policies but rather a set of policies relevant to ICZM. In the CAMP, they looked at what the policy gaps were and which areas were not covered by the policies.

10. In the discussion that followed, the following points were raised:

- It would be useful to draw a list of issues that should be dealt with in the future CAMP projects, such as ICZM, MSP, governance, policy issues, etc.

- A link should be made between past and future projects. It is obvious that there has been an important evolution in CAMP. Today we are moving towards more policy objectives. We want to avoid having a fragmented approach, and therefore we must focus on the countries' objectives and not risk having some consultants pushing in favour of their priorities.

- Coherence of MAP components is important, and it would be a good idea to have a network of CAMP experts. It might also be useful to have a collection of good practices which would be a compilation from all the projects. This platform could be transformed into a clearing house for ICZM and MSP.

**Agenda item 3: CAMP network site: presentation and discussion**

11. Mr. Petit, as former project officer at PAP/RAC, explained the CAMP network web site and its initial structure, and then invited the participants to make comments and suggestions.

12. Comments were numerous ranging from difficulty to find the site in search machines, suggestion to put activities list in alphabetical order to the appropriateness to call it CAMP Network as it could be confusing. Namely, people usually associate “network” with people and organisations and not projects and activities. Regarding the results of the questionnaire on CAMP which had been distributed to the participants prior to the meeting, Ms Škaričić informed that the answers were very diverse, so that the following day it would be necessary to decide exactly what to include. If it is felt that themes have not been addressed properly in the CAMP, there is no need to mention them. Focus must be on good practices, which will be useful for people who will make a CAMP in the future.
13. Eventually it was decided to prepare a prototype scheme for the contents of one activity and that a group of experts would work on it the next day during the work in groups. The suggested structure was as follows:

- General introduction
- Clear separation: CAMP project / other projects of the MAP system and in which the PAP/RAC had a role (eg. MedPartnership) or was involved (eg. when the PAP/RAC guidelines were used). Then common subcategories:
  - Keywords
  - Issues
  - Outcomes
  - Actors
  - Links to documents

A suggestion was made to add a category “legal and policy”.

14. The issue was raised of the projects that had been completed long time ago. It would be difficult to fill in the questionnaire for those since the people who had worked on those projects are mostly unavailable for the task. Ms Škaričić explained that the Focal Points were expected to make that effort. However, she clarified that the information collected related only to the CAMP projects evaluated in 2015 and later, and not to those implemented earlier. Other comments and suggestions made can be summarised as follows:

- The length of the text should be maximum 1500 characters per subcategory.
- A category of planning tools and methodologies could be added (for EIA, cumulative impact assessment, land-sea interaction, etc.)
- Having a clearing house with a directory of experts could be very useful, even if it may be necessary to check that it is compatible with EU confidentiality rules.
- It is important that the platform is updated regularly; this platform is also a way of implementing the ICZM Protocol and its article 16 on networking.
- It would be good to write a short text on why this CAMP network is being established and what it will bring to countries.
- All the themes will be divided into 3 categories: human activities and pressures, natural and cultural resources, and cross cutting issues.

**Agenda item 4: Short introduction to CAMPs in preparation**

15. The first day session was concluded by the presentation on the two transboundary CAMP projects in preparation. Ms Ioanna Constantinidou, Cyprus, presented the CAMP Cyprus-Israel. She first informed the audience of the CAMP projects implemented in the two countries: in Israel in the period 1996-2000 and in Cyprus 2006-2008. She then briefly described the projects, their results and follow-up. She also introduced the legal framework of the two countries regarding the coastal zone planning and management. Finally, Ms Constantinidou explained how it came to the transboundary CAMP, what its goals were and what had been done so far. Her presentation is available [here](#).

16. The other transboundary CAMP in preparation is the one between Italy and Albania covering the area of Otranto Strait. The presentation was made by Mr. Rezart Kapedani, Albania. He first presented the project area which includes the Puglia Region of Italy and the Vlora County of Albania. A feasibility study was prepared giving an overview of the main characteristics of the proposed CAMP area: geographical description, hydrography and geomorphology, history and cultural legacy,
economic activities, and main environmental issues. He then focused on the relevant legal basis in the two countries, with special focus on ICZM. Finally, Mr Kapedani presented the goals of the CAMP Otranto and the next steps to be taken. The presentation is available here.

**Agenda item 5: Work in groups**

17. On the second day of the meeting the participants were divided into three working groups. Two groups regarded the two transboundary CAMP projects, respectively, and the third, most numerous group, had the task to work on the prototype scheme for the contents of one activity for the web site. When the work had been done, each group presented its work.

**Agenda item 6: Plenary session**

18. The experts from Italy and Albania drafted, based on the Feasibility Study for their transboundary project, a sort of “Transboundary CAMP Manual” to support the implementation of such kind of projects, detailing the main characteristics of transboundary CAMP projects, taking into account, as much as possible and if applicable, other international experiences and transboundary partnership.

19. Ms Athena Mourmouris, on behalf of the representatives of Cyprus and Israel, explained that the respective CAMP was at a very early stage, since the Feasibility Studies (different for each CP) had just come to their end. A joint FS will follow in the coming months. Furthermore, given the geographical distance, this transboundary CAMP cannot have a strictly speaking cross-border character, but rather a trans-national one in the sense of addressing mostly horizontal methodological issues, which might be useful eventually for other Mediterranean countries as well. During their meeting, the three experts briefed each other on the results of the stocktaking part of their FS and tried to understand better the starting points. For sure, the two countries start with a considerable common ground. They also have differences, even in governance aspects. This is a challenge, since they could examine such different approaches and bring forward proposals. It is likely that a methodological policy-oriented part (possibly with guidelines) will be included in the CAMP, as well as another part with case studies (selected geographical areas with major economic activities, eg. tourism, putting emphasis on how to ensure integration on both the land and the sea parts of the coastal zones). Still, there is a need for finalisation of the approach to follow in consultation with the respective competent authorities.

20. The work of the third group was individual and each expert had proposals for improving the text for the web page. Changes were proposed to the scheme proposed the day before. Basically, it was concluded that the focus should be on recent and current CAMP projects, while for the older ones only the elements that are still relevant should be selected. In any case, it is not advisable to go into too much detail. The main point is to avoid too technical terms and to make the site easy to use for people who are not from the Barcelona Convention system. Finally, it was pointed out that governance was a crucial issue that should be included in every CAMP. The participants were invited to send their contributions in writing, while PAP/RAC will work with INFOR/RAC on the improvement of the web site.
Agenda item 7: Closure of the meeting

21. Ms Škaričić suggested that the meeting had been very useful which was confirmed by the participants. They agreed to meet once a year to continue developing the network. Ms Škaričić thanked the participants once again for attending the meeting at a rather inconvenient period and for their dedicated work in the meeting. Wishing them safe return home she declared the meeting closed at 12:30.
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ANNEX II

Agenda

Tuesday, 17 December

9:00 – 9:30  Registration of participants.

9:30 – 9:45  Opening of the meeting: welcome, objectives, organisation of work (PAP/RAC).


Discussion focused on the expectations from the CAMP Network.

11:00 – 13:00 CAMP Network site: presentation, discussion.

14:30 – 16:30 CAMP Network site: presentation, discussion - continued.

16:30 – 17:15 Short introduction to CAMPs in preparation: CAMP Albania-Italy; CAMP Cyprus-Israel.

Discussion.

Wednesday, 18 December

9:30 – 12:00 Work in groups:
 – finalising the material according to the previous day discussion;
 – bilateral meetings regarding CAMPs in preparation.

12:00 – 12:45 Plenary session:
 – presentation of the results of the work in groups;
 – conclusions and recommendations;
 – next steps.

12:45 Closure of the meeting.