

Elizabeth FYI



International Ocean Institute

P.O. Box 524
VALLETTA, MALTA

Telephone: 236596

Telefax: 247594

Cables: INTEROCEAN

Telex: 1946 OCEANS MW;

(Via UK) 9312132 2824 CVG

Electronic Mail (DIALCOM): 75 CMI 044

TELEFAX TRANSMISSION

Date: 24 June 1991 No. of Pages: 1

To: Prof. Dale POEL
c/o IOI HALIFAX Fax: +1 (902) 494 1216

From: Ms. A. MICALLEF TRIGONA
IOI - MALTA Fax: +356 (-) 247 594

Subject: Toursim and Environment in the Mediterranean Research
Project

Dear Prof. Poel,

Unfortunately I have not yet requested our Bankers to transfer the amount of US\$4,388.6 as I had promised in my last fax.

I hope to do this early next month when things will be a bit more settled at this end. Since both Aldo and Fox have left I am sure you may appreciate that it is quite hectic here.

I am finalizing the financial report for submission to Elizabeth next week (for onward transmission to the Ford Foundation) and would require some clarification from you please.

Could you please fax back with information regarding the \$272.90 added onto your last bill? - What is this amount for? Do you have any other miscellaneous expenditure which should be included?

So sorry to bother you again - and please forgive me for having delayed your payment.

With thanks and best regards.

Amelias



International
Ocean
Institute

P.O. Box 524
VALLETTA, MALTA

Telephone: 236596
Telefax: 247594
Cables: INTEROCEAN
Telex: 1946 OCEANS MW;
(Via UK) 9312132 2824 CVG
Electronic Mail (DIALCOM): 75 CMI 044

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

Prepared by Dr Aldo Chircop for the project Alternative Modes of
Funding the Mediterranean Trust Fund

January 1991

Introduction

The Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) has been instrumental in broadening our understanding of development and environmental processes in the region. Adopted in 1975 by sixteen coastal Mediterranean states(1), MAP is a regional regime for the protection and preservation of the Mediterranean coastal and marine environment. Today all Mediterranean states (with the exception of Albania) are parties. Their commitments involve regional and sub-regional cooperation in a broad range of environmental activities as well as the implementation of national measures to render the regime effective within national jurisdiction.

MAP is a cooperative regime involving not only Mediterranean coastal states but also most UN specialised agencies and programmes (UNEP, FAO, UNESCO/IOC, WHO, IMO, IAEA, UNDP, WMO, etc.) as well numerous national and international non-governmental organisations active in the region (e.g., IUCN, IJO, etc.).

The Action Plan has four main components:

- I. Integrated planning of the development and management of the resources of the Mediterranean Basin;
- II. Coordinated programme for research, monitoring, and exchange of information and assessment of the state of pollution and of protection measures;
- III. Framework convention and related protocols with their technical annexes for the protection of the Mediterranean environment;
- IV. Institutional and financial implications of the Action Plan.

The first component seeks to sensitize governments in the region to the problems resulting from current development patterns and the accompanying socio-environmental cost. Principal activities in this component are the Blue Plan and the Priority Actions Programme. The Contracting Parties have now established a Socio-Economic Committee to follow up on this subject.

The second consists of a scientific research programme know

(1) There are 16 states with a coast on the Mediterranean: Spain, France, Monaco, Italy, Malta, Yugoslavia, Albania, Greece, Cyprus, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco.

as MEDPOL, and has resulted in the building of a scientific knowledge base on the sources, types and processes of marine pollution and has now moved to a programme of monitoring. To follow up on this, the Contracting Parties have established a Scientific and Technical Committee.

The third component refers to the legal framework consisting of the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution, done at Barcelona in 1976, and four protocols (Dumping and Emergencies, 1976; Land-Based Sources of Pollution, 1980; and Specially Protected Areas, 1982) including technical annexes. A fifth protocol on seabed activities should be adopted in 1991.

The fourth component sets out the institutional infrastructure of the MAP regime. Since its inception, the institutional component has evolved into a Coordinating Unit in Athens working closely with a Bureau consisting of a small number of representatives of Contracting Parties elected biennially, and Regional Activity Centres (RACs) in Malta (Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea, REMPEC), France (Blue Plan RAC, at Sophia Antipolis), Yugoslavia (Priority Actions Programme RAC, at Split) and Tunisia (Specially Protected Areas RAC, at Tunis). MEDPOL is coordinated from Athens. Each activity has a network of national focal points in most Mediterranean countries. The highest decision making body is the Meeting of Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean sea against Pollution and its Related Protocols, normally convened every two years. The next meeting is the Seventh Ordinary Meeting, and is scheduled to take place between 8-11 October 1991 in Cairo.

The most contentious issue of the fourth component, and indeed in the entire MAP is the financial arrangement of the regime.

MAP budget

Over the years the MAP budget has grown steadily (Table 1), very much reflecting the growth of the regime, gradual institution-building and proliferation of cooperative activities. The Coordinator and the various directors of the Regional Activity Centres prepare budgets which are put together by the Coordinator and proposed to the UNEP Executive Director in Nairobi. The budget is then proposed to the biennial meeting of the Contracting Parties. The principal source of funding comes from the Trust Fund. Other sources include contributions by those

Table 1: Map budgets 1974-92 in \$US(2)

1974	49,100
1975	669,900
1976	1,585,200
1977	2,469,300
1978	3,233,100
1979/80	3,328,165
1981	3,500,000
1982	3,822,000
1983	3,445,000
1984	3,462,000
1985	3,768,000
1986	4,020,480
1987	4,185,497
1988	4,528,300
1989	4,614,510
1990	5,451,000
1991	5,698,000

countries hosting a MAP institution or activity.(3) The summary breakdown of the current biennium (1990-91) budget and income statement are reproduced in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively.

Funding of MAP has changed radically since the inception of the regime. Originally financed in toto by intergovernmental organisations of the UN system, today the brunt of the MAP financial burden lies with the Contracting Parties, who have established a Trust Fund for this purpose. However, sixteen years after its establishment MAP continues to suffer from a weak financial system.

(2) Between 1974-84 expenditure compared with the budget as follows: 1974 - 44,100; 1975 - 518,900; 1976 - 1,090,500; 1977- 2,055,600; 1978 - 2,532,600; 1979 - 1,672,400; 1980 - 1,607,800; 1981 - 1,633,600; 1982 - 1,648,200; 1983 - 2,376,500; 1984- 2,542,200.

(3) For the 1990-91 biennium these amount annually as follows: France (Blue Plan) - FF 1,500,000; Yugoslavia (PAP) - \$150,000; Malta (REMPEC) - \$20,000; Tunisia (SPA) - \$50,000. Unfortunately, these contributions are not necessarily effected as agreed and they may even consist services/facilities in kind which are quantified. Other counterpart contributions to MAP projects include: France (REMPEC) - \$30,000; for MEDPOL, FAO - \$96,000, WHO - \$100,000, WMO - \$22,000, IAEA - \$98,000, and UNESCO/IOC- \$50,000.

Phasing out of UNEP core funding

When MAP was first established in 1975 funding was provided primarily by the newly established United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) through its Ocean and Coastal Activity (OCA/PAC) programme, which was responsible for the launching of the Regional Seas Programme. UNEP's large expenditure in the region was justified as a pilot project which could be cloned in other regions. As a matter of fact, ten other regional programmes have been established since the adoption of MAP.

Although the fourth component of the Action Plan addressed financial arrangements, no mention was made of financial commitments by state parties. Originally, MAP was funded in great part by UNEP. The UNEP Executive Director was mandated to work within the budgetary and institutional framework of UNEP and within the methods of work established by that organisation's Governing Council. However, UNEP had made it clear to Mediterranean states that it would not keep on supporting MAP indefinitely. The Governing Council saw UNEP's role as catalytic and in this respect requested its Executive Director in 1978 to ensure the "the catalytic function, co-ordination and integration, as opposed to involvement in longer-term activities of a primarily executive character" and to take steps "towards the progressive transfer of executive responsibility to the Governments of the region."

Accordingly, the Intergovernmental Review Meeting of Mediterranean coastal states in January 1978 endorsed the principle of "a separate trust fund to ensure the harmonious development and effective coordination of jointly agreed activities." The suggestion was to divide the funding as follows: 50% by governments of the region in accordance with the UN scale of assessment, and the EEC according to an agreement between it and UNEP; and 50% by UNEP and international organisations concerned.

A Governing Council resolution adopted during the Sixth Session called upon Mediterranean states to assume full financial responsibility for the Action Plan at the earliest possible date but not later than the end of 1983. By then UNEP had spent more than \$8 million. Project proposals could still be submitted by Mediterranean states to the UNEP Environment Fund, but these would have to compete with other global and regional proposals.(4) The Executive Director had proposed that UNEP's contribution should be not more than 25% of the cost of MAP,

(4) The total commitment authority of the Environment Fund for 1978 and 1979 stood respectively at US \$ 31.6 and \$30 million, whereas the total allocation for oceans stood respectively at \$4 (13% of total) and \$3.19 (11% of total) million.

provided this did not exceed 10% of the budget allocated for Oceans within UNEP.

Mediterranean states disagreed with UNEP's position. A meeting of experts convened in September 1978 was of the view that Mediterranean governments would not accept the upper limit proposed by the Executive Director. Certain MAP activities should be financed from other UNEP budget lines so as to bring that organisation's participation up to 25% of the total MAP budget.

Although there was disagreement on UNEP's share and on the scale of assessment, in general Mediterranean states agreed that they should increase their financial responsibility for MAP and that national contributions to the Trust Fund should start in 1979.

Mediterranean Trust Fund for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution

The Mediterranean states agreed on the establishment of a Mediterranean Trust Fund during the Intergovernmental Review Meeting and First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention in February 1979. It was formally established on 24 July of that year, with an account in the United States. UNEP agreed to administer the Fund in accordance with UN rules, taking into account the specific needs of MAP. The administration of the Fund would cost 13% of expenditure. UNEP's contribution to Secretariat costs would be phased out by the end of 1983 but this would not necessarily apply to contributions to programme costs.

Terms of Reference for the Fund were adopted. It was initially established for two years under the temporary administration of the Executive Director of UNEP, who in turn was empowered to delegate this responsibility to the MAP Coordinator.⁽⁵⁾ With regular extensions, this responsibility has become more or less permanent. Two sections were envisaged.

Section I would cover expenditures for activities directly derived from the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols. This consisted of contributions determined by Contracting Parties and pledged contributions from Mediterranean coastal states not yet Contracting Parties according to agreed scales fixed by such states, and voluntary contributions from other states and non-governmental sources. An auditor was to be designated by Mediterranean states.

(5) The approved Terms actually entrusted the administration of the Fund to the UN Secretary-General and at his discretion to the UNEP Executive Director.

Section II covered expenditures for other activities agreed to as part of MAP and not covered by Section I. The appropriations in this section consisted of pledged contributions by Mediterranean coastal states generally and by the EEC, and voluntary contributions from other states and non-governmental sources. Pledges could be made at any time on an annual basis or for a number of years. The establishment of cost-sharing schemes was left to the discretion of Mediterranean coastal states.

The Terms of Reference also governed the preparation of the biennium budget put forward by the MAP Coordinator to the Meeting of Contracting Parties, which approves it in turn. The UNEP Executive Director would inform Contracting Parties, other governments and non-governmental sources of their expected contributions according to the agreed scale or voluntary pledges, as the case may be, and of the general budgetary situation. The budget is prepared with a system of chapters under each Section. He was also responsible for the presentation of audited accounts for the financial year.

Once the Fund was established the problem of funding a fast growing regime was mitigated at best. UNEP was a source of secure and punctual funding. For MAP to have a secure funding basis with the Trust Fund it was essential for states to deliver on their assessed contributions and pledges in time. The initial results of the new financial regime were hardly satisfactory. By the Intergovernmental Review Meeting of February 1980, only 35% of assessed contributions were received in the Fund, threatening the stoppage of several ongoing activities within seven weeks. The Fund could only make commitments on the basis of cash in hand. Clearly some governments were late in making their contribution due to internal laws and procedures and this difficulty, with its obvious consequences for the Trust Fund and MAP, remains even today.

Throughout the 1980s the reluctance of Mediterranean states to assume greater financial responsibility and the determination of UNEP to downscale its contribution constrained the growth of the regime. When at the Second Meeting of the Contracting Parties in 1981 the MAP Coordinator proposed a three-year budget programme of \$12,528,900 with a UNEP contribution of \$300,000 (as distinct from \$820,000 originally requested), Mediterranean states immediately protested, demanding a reduction of the budget, an increase in UNEP's contribution and trimming certain budget lines. UNEP's position was that only a substantial increase of national contributions could justify an increase in UNEP's commitment. At the end of the day the Meeting agreed to increase national contributions by an annual 15% in 1980/81 and 1981/8, 18% in 1982/83 and thereafter 5% annually. The EEC and host country Greece also made substantial increases in their contributions. Even so, although a surplus was expected for 1981, deficits were forecast for 1982 and 1983.

Late payments of national contributions continued. In 1987 only \$800,000 were paid by June of that year out of a total of \$3.8 million pledged and arrears for 1985 and 1986 amounted to \$1.1 million. At the Fifth Ordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in 1987 the UNEP Deputy Executive Director invited Parties "to decide on whether they wanted growth, stagnation or reduction." This was a time when MAP was being re-oriented to concentrate on environmentally-sound planning and management of coastal areas.

At the Sixth Ordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in October 1989, the UNEP Executive Director reported that \$3,635,774 were owed to the Trust Fund, notwithstanding that contributions should be paid by 30 April every year. The Director emphasized that "UNEP can only authorize those activities to be started for which full funding is available in the MTF and only to the extent of such availability. No cash advances are possible from any sources and no borrowing is allowed on contributions pledged by Governments. Non-availability of funds automatically results in non-renewal of contracts and stoppage of activities." This problem is grave also for MAP staff, who now work on the basis of six-month renewable contracts. The irony is that following arduous negotiations on the adoption of a programme of activities, in practice the will of the Contracting Parties may not be met when the cash flow is tight or simply runs out.

Increases in national contributions have always been subject to difficult discussion among Contracting Parties and UNEP. Economic conditions in some countries prevent them from agreeing to increases which would have to be paid in hard currency. It was noted on more than one occasion that contributions have been invariably assessed in a currency which is not the national currency of any of the Mediterranean countries. A proposed budget increase for the 1988-89 biennium of 15% was seen as excessive, whereas some states found difficulty even with a 5% increase. This entailed a short fall of over one million with the consequence that some activities had to be reduced.

Regular increases in national contributions are necessary not only in view of adequately funding ongoing and new activities, but indeed to protect the Trust Fund against inflation. At the last meeting of Contracting Parties in 1989 it there was agreement on a 5% increase for this purpose.

Scale of assessment

During the debate in 1978 on the assumption of financial responsibility for MAP by Mediterranean states, the meeting of experts debated at length the scale of assessment to be adopted for that portion of the budget for which they were to be responsible. Several alternative proposals were put forward, but

Table 2: Comparison of alternative scales of assessment in 1979

<u>Contributor</u>	<u>Alternative I</u> %	<u>Alternative II</u> %
Albania	0.08	1.08
Algeria	0.80	1.82
Cyprus	0.80	1.08
Egypt	0.64	1.65
France	46.44	25.00
Greece	2.79	6.50
Israel	1.84	4.20
Italy	26.97	25.00
Lebanon	0.24	1.24
Libya	1.28	2.80
Malta	0.08	1.08
Monaco	0.32	1.32
Morocco	0.40	1.41
Spain	12.21	11.30
Syria	0.16	1.16
Tunisia	0.16	1.16
Turkey	2.39	5.00
Yugoslavia	3.11	7.20

none found consensus. In the end it was agreed to propose two alternatives to states for their consideration: the first proposed the UN scale of assessment; the second set a floor of 1% and a ceiling of 25%. Table 1 provides a comparative description of the two proposals.

The EEC also makes a contribution to administrative and coordinating costs on the basis of an agreement between it and UNEP.

It was finally agreed that the UN scale would apply without a minimum payment (Alternative I). Although this agreement succeeded in launching the Fund, the issue of equitable sharing was far from settled. Three states (France, Italy and Spain) accounted for more than 85% of all national contributions, an issue that would keep on arising at future meetings. At an Extraordinary Meeting in 1982 France complained that if the UN scale were strictly adhered to its contribution would not exceed 25% of the budget. The revision of the UN scale by the General Assembly in 1982 resulted in an additional 6.51% increase on its contribution. By 1987 the scale of assessment of national contributions had changed although the brunt of contributions (over 80%) was still borne by the three most advanced

countries.(6) In the 1990-91 biennial contributions remain more or less the same (see Annex 3), with the exception of Italy whose contribution has risen from 27.20% to 30.10%.

Alternative modes of funding MAP activities

The difficulties of continued funding of MAP activities were discussed by a joint meeting of the Scientific and Technical, and Socio-Economic Committees in 1989. Delegations suggested possible resort to non-budgetary contributions to fund projects. It was noted that that the Trust Fund foresees the possibility of Contracting Parties making contributions in excess of the agreed scale and to receive contributions from other sources. Among the possible sources suggested were foundations and private donors, developing a clearing house to match UNEP funds with contributions from individual donors, fees for ships entering the Mediterranean, a tax on tourists in the region, collection boxes as in the case of campaigns by charitable institutions, tax relief for environmentally sound projects, utilisation of funds from fines imposed for environmental offences, cooperation with commercial institutions such as those issuing credit cards to put aside a small percentage of profits on transactions, taxes on the import of certain goods having a certain impact on the environment (e.g., pesticides), etc.

Most of the suggestions put forward were more suitable for specific projects and for funding those within a national framework. Naturally these would be useful in that they would assist Mediterranean states to implement their environmental responsibilities within the MAP framework. However, core funding needs to be addressed as MAP projects are dependent on a well-developed regional institutional infrastructure.

Two of the suggestions addressed the subject of the under-explored concept of international taxation. The fee suggested for ships entering the Mediterranean immediately caused difficulties as this would easily be construed as impeding the freedom of international navigation and likely to be opposed by major maritime powers. It is true that frequently charges are imposed on ships in port, but they are normally for specific services in a restricted area consisting of internal waters (e.g., for use of

(6) The percentage of contributions to the Trust Fund in 1987 were as follows: Algeria - 0.97; Cyprus - 0.16; Egypt - 0.74; France - 38.01; Greece - 4.00; Israel - 2.44; Italy - 27.20; Lebanon - 0.10; Libya - 2.00; Malta - 0.10; Monaco - 0.11; Morocco - 0.53; Spain - 15.00; Syria - 0.32; Tunisia - 0.32; Turkey - 4.00; Yugoslavia - 4.00.

port reception facilities, collection of garbage).

A levy on tourism was discussed at length. While noting that charges on air tickets would be contrary to IATA rules, Egypt has already introduced a tax of this type on foreign travel. Tourists in the region have a direct interest in the maintenance of a clean and healthy coastal and marine environment. Even if only 10% of the estimated 100 million tourists a year in the region contributed \$1 per capita, \$10 million would be raised. The discussion centered on voluntary contributions. There would be difficulties in some countries that have stringent legislation on public fund-raising campaigns, the funds raised and their eventual use. An organisational infrastructure would be needed and this could be demanding as the possible targets are many: travel agencies, camping sites, sailing clubs, fishing associations, beach facilities, sales of clothing, stickers, etc. Moreover, the collection of voluntary contributions would be more than a one-time affair if the Trust Fund is to have secure funding.

After a discussion of these possibilities, however, the Sixth Ordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties concluded by identifying the only following possible targets for raising additional funds:

- "a) international and United Nations organisations through the submission of sound programmes which may be of interest to the organisations;
- b) offers by the Contracting Parties to provide personnel free of charge in specific projects or programmes;
- c) sales in commercial bookshops of selected publications prepared in the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan;
- d) fund-raising campaigns for very specific objectives or projects to be implemented particularly in the south of the Mediterranean."

It is clear that MAP is in need of new ideas for generating funds and that the time is ripe for the submission of a proposal that would make funding more secure in the medium and long-term.

Conclusion

What is particularly remarkable about the financial arrangements of MAP is that the weakness is well understood but has not been corrected since the Contracting Parties started to pay contributions to the Trust Fund in 1979. In theory, there is

no reason why the Trust Fund should be short on cash if all Mediterranean states paid their annual contribution by the end of April as required. However, by 31 July 1989 all the Mediterranean states without exception had not honoured their pledges for that year, and for several states this included prior years (see Annex 4). Very often politicians leading delegations to the biennial meetings of Contracting Parties find themselves in embarrassing situations which they quickly remedy by pledging payment of arrears or current payments, but the problem resurfaces in the inter-sessional period when pledges remain unfulfilled.

For a region such as the Mediterranean where political, economic, ideological and cultural conflicts take to task any form of cooperation, MAP has achieved much. It has now arrived at a critical moment while it refocuses towards environmentally sound integrated planning and management. Budget adjustments will be necessary and new costs incurred through the adoption of a new programme on coastal zone planning and management. It is clear, however, that the system of state contributions has placed limits on what is achievable through cooperation. There may be the goodwill to cooperate but resources are still needed.

It is conceivable that an alternative or supplementary system of funding that would not be dependent on national bureaucratic processes can be created. The Contracting Parties were close to such a formula in their discussion of a regional tourist levy. So long as the modalities of collection and channelling of such a tax into the Trust Fund can be formulated and set in place, a long-term source of funds would be secured. Tourists in the region are not necessarily aware that they are environmental consumers as much as the peoples of the region are. As a matter of fact a basic weakness of MAP, which might also appear as a failure, continues to be that in the sixteen years it has been in existence it has no grass root support among the peoples in the region, let alone by the millions of tourists from the north. The truth is that the people in the region know little if anything about this complex regime. An attempt has been made to remedy this by setting up a multi-lingual mobile exhibition and brochures, but the results should be measured. The introduction of a regional tourist tax would not only generate funds but would also help build a popular constituency for cooperation among states in the protection and preservation of the coastal and marine environment.

Annex 1

APPROVED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR 1990 - 1991

SUMMARY

	1990	1991
A. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BARCELONA CONVENTION AND PROTOCOL ON DUMPING	2642	2829
B. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LBS PROTOCOL	301	315
C. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL ON EMERGENCIES	471	482
D. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL ON SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS	297	297
E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGEMENT OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COASTAL ZONES	1165	1171
F. PROGRAMME SUPPORT COSTS	575	604
GRAND TOTAL	5451	5698

Source: UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.1/5, 1 November 1989

Annex 2

Sources of financing

<u>A. Resources</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
- Approved contributions to the Mediterranean Trust Fund (see section III)	3,334	3,500
- EEC voluntary contribution (see section III)	587	583
- Greek counterpart contribution (see section III)	400	400
- UNEP Environment Fund (see section III)	50	50
- Bank interest (estimated)	250	250
- Unpaid pledges (4,169 due (1), less 605 required for 1989)	3,564	-
	<hr/>	
	8,185	4,783
TOTAL resources for the biennium	12,968	
<u>B. Expenditure for the Approved Programme Budget</u>		
GRAND TOTAL	5,451	5,698
TOTAL expenditure for the biennium	11,149	
<u>C. Balance to reserve</u>		
(to start 1992 activities)		1,819

Source: UNEP (OCA)/MED IG.1/5, 1 November 1989

Annex 3

Approved contributions to the Mediterranean Trust Fund
for 1990-91

<u>Contracting Parties</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
Algeria	1.05*	35,116	36,872
Cyprus	0.14	4,683	4,917
EEC	2.50	83,340	87,507
Egypt	0.49	16,389	17,208
France	38.00	1,266,800	1,330,140
Greece	2.81	93,640	98,322
Israel	1.47	49,163	51,621
Italy	30.10	1,003,440	1,053,612
Lebanon	0.07	2,342	2,459
Libya	1.97	65,549	68,826
Malta	0.07	2,342	2,459
Monaco	0.07	2,342	2,459
Morocco	0.28	9,365	9,833
Spain	15.00	500,054	525,057
Syria	0.28	9,365	9,833
Tunisia	0.21	7,025	7,376
Turkey	2.25	74,916	78,662
Yugoslavia	3.23	107,690	113,075
Subtotal	100.00	3,333,560	3,500,238
EEC Voluntary contribution		586,708	582,541
Host Country		400,000	400,000
UNEP Environment Fund		50,000	50,000
TOTAL		4,370,268	4,532,779

* With reservation

Source: UNEP (OCA)/MED IG.1/5, 1 November 1989

Annex 4

Regional Trust Fund
for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution
Status of Contributions as at 31 July 1989
(in United States Dollars)

COUNTRIES	Unpaid pledges as at 31 Dec. 1988	Adjustments for prior years	Pledges for 1989	Pledges for 1990	Collections during 1989 for prior years	Collections in 1989 for 1989 & future years	Unpaid pledges for 1989 and prior years	Unpaid Pledges for 1990
Algeria	28,613.98	-	30,044.68	-	26,316.00	-	32,342.66	-
Cyprus	-	-	4,955.82	-	-	-	4,955.82	-
Egypt	-	-	22,920.69	-	-	-	22,920.69	-
France	560,627.55	-	1,177,317.94	-	560,627.55	-	1,177,317.94	-
Greece	-	-	123,895.60	-	-	-	123,895.60	-
Israel	131,170.44	-	75,576.32	-	59,193.00	-	147,553.76	-
Italy	802,371.44	-	842,490.08	-	-	-	1,644,861.52	-
Lebanon	21,255.90	-	3,097.39	-	-	-	24,353.29	-
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	47,063.00	-	61,947.80	-	-	-	109,010.80	-
Malta	2,949.90	-	3,097.39	-	-	-	6,047.29	-
Monaco	-	-	3,407.13	-	-	-	3,407.13	-
Morocco	-	-	16,416.17	-	-	-	16,416.17	-
Spain	-	-	464,608.50	-	-	-	464,608.50	-
Syrian Arab Republic	3,762.66	-	9,911.65	-	-	-	13,674.31	-
Tunisia	-	-	9,911.65	-	-	-	9,911.65	-
Turkey	122,158.00	-	123,895.60	-	-	-	246,053.60	-
Yugoslavia	122,866.80	-	123,895.60	-	122,866.80	2,133.20	121,762.40	-
European Economic Community	80,097.95	-	670,047.60	-	80,097.95	670,047.60	-	-
Total	1,922,937.62	-	3,767,437.61	-	849,101.30	672,180.60	4,169,093.30	-

Total collections during 1989 as at 31 July 1989 US \$ 1,521,281.90

UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.1/Inf.3
ANNEX II