



Deliverable D3.6

**EVALUATION OF SUGGESTED MEASURES AND
MAJOR ATTRIBUTES FOR SUCCESSFUL
IMPLEMENTATION**

Date: December 2016

**Action Plans for Integrated Regional
Monitoring Programmes, Coordinated
Programmes of Measures and Addressing Data
and Knowledge Gaps in Mediterranean Sea**

ActionMed

11.0661/2015/712631/SUB/ENVC.2

Coordinator

Dr Kalliopi Pagou

Project start date and duration

1st November 2015, 15 months

www.actionmed.eu



Acknowledgment

This report was produced as a result of the ActionMed (Action Plans for Integrated Monitoring Programmes of Measures and Addressing Data and Knowledge Gaps in Mediterranean Sea) project. The project was co-financed by the European Union (EU). Grant No. 11.0661/2015/712631/SUB/ENVC.2

Disclaimer

This deliverable reflects only the authors' views. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

This deliverable should be referenced as:

ActionMed Deliverable 3.6: "Evaluation of suggested measures and major attributes for successful implementation" December 2016, 11p.

Authors: Orthodoxou D.L. Loizidou X.I., Michael I. Loizides M.I.

Affiliation: ISOTECH Ltd Environmental Research and Consultancy

Contact person: Orthodoxou D.L (project@isotech.com.cy)

Edited by: Pagou K., Giannoudi L., Streftaris N.

Affiliation: HCMR



CONTENTS

TABLE OF FIGURES	II
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. MEASURE ANALYSIS	3
A. EUTROPHICATION	3
B. CONTAMINANTS AND CONTAMINANTS IN SEAFOOD.....	5
C. MARINE LITTER	7
3. EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION	9

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 1 Measures deriving from each of the three workshops for Descriptor 5 Eutrophication</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Table 2 Measures deriving from each of the three workshops for Descriptors 8 Contaminants and 9 Contaminants in Seafood</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table 3 Measures deriving from each of the three workshops for Descriptor 10 Marine Litter</i>	<i>8</i>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One of the main aims of the ActionMed project was to facilitate Member States in the definition of their programmes of measures (PoMs) for establishing and maintaining Good Environmental Status (GES) in Mediterranean Sea, focusing specifically on measures for the Descriptors 5 (eutrophication), 8 (contaminants), 9 (contaminants in seafood) and 10 (marine litter).

Through ActionMed, Mediterranean Member States were supported in the elaboration of possible measures at national and regional level via the implementation of the dedicatedly developed DeCyDe-4-ActionMed method and toolbox, in a series of national and sub-regional workshops. Specifically, two sub-regional workshops and one national workshop were implemented over the duration of the ActionMed project. The detailed methodologies and tools implemented at each of the three workshops, as well as the main outcomes and outputs have been presented in Deliverable 3.4, which is constituted by three parts; D3.4(a), D3.4(b) and D3.4(c). Each of these reports presents the list of measures, or common measures, agreed upon by the participants, and ranked according to predefined criteria.

In the current report, the authors aim to present and compare the measures for each descriptor deriving from each of the three workshops, as a means of assessing their similarities and differences - their attributes in a sense – and thus undertaking an evaluation for their successful implementation. The undertaken evaluation suggests that:

- EU Directives and national legislation and strategy guide measure development;
- Some measures could be implemented to address more than one descriptor;
- There is more flexibility with regards to the measures identified for Marine Litter, than for Eutrophication or Contaminants;
- There are challenges but also opportunities to the identification of common measures for implementation between neighbouring countries;
- A robust, but easy to implement tool used to evaluate and rank new, suggested measures, could be welcomed;
- The effective application and monitoring of the implementation of the measures is very important;
- The method and tools implemented at the workshops could be replicated to enhance coordination and collaboration among neighbouring countries.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the main aims of the ActionMed project is to facilitate Member States in the definition of their Programmes of Measures (PoMs) for establishing and maintaining Good Environmental Status (GES) in the Mediterranean Sea. This will be achieved mainly through the work of Activity 3 of ActionMed, entitled ‘Assistance in the preparation of Programmes of Measures, by addressing particular gaps identified both at national and regional level, linking together work on Programmes of Measures under the MSFD and under the auspices of UNEP/MAP Barcelona Convention (the PoMs activity)’. To this end, Activity 3 aimed to undertake (i) the assessment of common gaps in national or regional measures and the selection of issues that require action to achieve or maintain GES (Deliverable D3.1, D3.3 & D3.7), (ii) the elaboration of possible measures at national and regional level (Deliverable D3.4, D3.6, D3.8A), (iii) the socio-economic analysis of the proposed measures (Deliverable D3.2), and (iv) the dissemination of recommendations (Deliverables D3.4, D3.6, D3.8).

The elaboration of possible measures at national and regional level was achieved through the implementation of the dedicatedly developed DeCyDe-4-ActionMed method and toolbox. DeCyDe-4-ActionMed aimed to encourage the active participation of stakeholders and decision-makers in the definition of Programmes of Measures for Descriptors 5 (eutrophication), 8 (contaminants), 9 (contaminants in seafood) and 10 (marine litter), and the identification of possible common measures for implementation at a sub-regional level. This was achieved through three participatory workshops, as follows:

- Adriatic Sub-regional Workshop (4th of July 2016, in Piran, Slovenia) bringing together stakeholders from Croatia, Italy and Slovenia to discuss possible common measures for descriptors 5, 8, 9 and 10, for implementation in the Adriatic sub-region.
- Greek national workshop (11th of October 2016, in Athens, Greece) bringing together Greek experts and decision/policy-makers to identify possible measures that could be included in the Greek Programme of Measures, to address descriptors 5, 8, 9 and 10.
- Mediterranean sub-regional workshop (3rd of November 2016, in Nicosia, Cyprus) bringing together experts and decision-makers from Cyprus, Greece and Malta to discuss possible common measures for descriptors 5, 8, 9 and 10, for implementation in the Mediterranean sub-region.

The detailed methodologies and tools implemented at each of the three workshops above, as well as the main outcomes and outputs are presented in the following three deliverables:

- Orthodoxou, D., Loizidou, X.I., Loizides, M.I. (2016). Report from the Adriatic Sub-regional PoMs Decision-making Workshop: Towards common Measures for Good Environmental Status in the Adriatic Sub-region. ActionMed Deliverable 3.4(a).
- Orthodoxou, D., Loizidou, X.I., Loizides, M.I., Petsa, D. (2016). Report from the Greek National Stakeholder Workshop: Towards the definition of

Programmes of Measures for achieving GES for Greece. ActionMed Deliverable No 3.4(b).

- Orthodoxou, D., Loizidou, X.I., Loizides, M.I. (2016) Report from the Mediterranean Sub-Regional Stakeholder Workshop: Towards Common Measures for Good Environmental Status in Cyprus, Greece and Malta. ActionMed Deliverable 3.4(c)

Each of these reports presents the list of measures (or common measures in the case of deliverables 3.4(a) and 3.4(c)), agreed upon by the participants, and ranked according to predefined criteria. The ranking exercise, using the DeCyDe-4-ActionMed toolbox, was undertaken, in order to present the participants/decision-makers with a method to prioritise possible new measures for implementation, based on predefined criteria.

It is not the aim of this report to reiterate the method and tools used in each of the workshops, or to outline the ranking process and results. Rather, the authors aim to present and compare the measures for each descriptor deriving from each of the three workshops, as a means of assessing their similarities and differences - their attributes in a sense – and thus undertaking an evaluation for their successful implementation.

2. MEASURE ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the measures resulting from each of the three workshops, grouped together as per the Descriptor that they relate to. This grouping allows a comparison of the measures, and an analysis based on their similarities and differences. Wherever possible, likely reasons for these similarities/differences, for example relating to the category of stakeholders present, or to the national/sub-regional characteristics, are also discussed.

Each of the three sub-sections that follow includes a tabular representation of the identified measures, as well as a narrative analysis. In the tables, where similar measures have been identified in different workshops, the cells containing a description of these measures have been filled in the same colour. In this way, the reader is facilitated both in making the connection between similar practices, and in following the narrative analysis.

A. Eutrophication

Measures that dealt with municipal wastewater showed up in the top ranking lists of measures for Eutrophication at all three workshops (pink cells in Table 1). The three suggested measures regarding municipal wastewater were: i) expanding the municipal wastewater treatment network to cover as many people/as much area as possible, ii) intensifying checks and controls to ensure that existing wastewater treatment plants are operating optimally, without releasing eutrophication agents to the environment, and iii) updating sewerage networks to minimise losses from leaks.

Table 1. Measures deriving from each of the three workshops for Descriptor 5 Eutrophication.

Adriatic - Sub-regional	Mediterranean – Sub-regional	Greek - National
Update sewerage network to minimize losses from leaks	Awareness-raising for the agricultural sector (e.g. best practices, code of conduct, information about conversion to organic farming) to reduce nutrient loading, especially in nitrate sensitive areas	Completion of wastewater installation works for settlements falling under the provisions of Directive 91/271/EC, and intensification of checks of the effective operations at wastewater treatment plants
Connect all communities with over 5000 residents to municipal wastewater treatment plants (current mandatory limit is 15000 residents)	Banning of shipping/vessel discharges and provision/upgrade of port reception facilities	Delimitation of further nitrate vulnerable zones based on the assessment of the chemical condition of water bodies, drawing up action plans based on crop type, and development of methods/tools for the rational use of fertilizers and water in nitrate vulnerable zones
Set a fertiliser quota in riverine catchment areas	Intensify checks of the effective operation of wastewater treatment plants to significantly reduce the concentrations of Eutrophication contaminants from wastewater outfalls	Integrated coastal water monitoring and intensification of the periodic monitoring of rainwater outlet water and other point sources of pollution that end up at sea
Provide tax exemptions to aquaculture businesses that invest in optimised feeding systems		Completion of the necessary infrastructure at all port installations to ensure the safe reception of ship wastewater or oil residues and other wastes
Engagement and awareness raising in the agricultural sector		Improving knowledge on marine pollution issues through research initiatives, to provide a progressive advancement in knowledge, as well as in prevention, control and mitigation

The agriculture sector was also a target, as the group of measures identified by the stakeholders/decision-makers working on Eutrophication shows (green and purple cells in Table 1). Specifically, engaging with the sector and raising awareness, through the implementation of best practices, codes of conduct and providing information about the benefits of converting from conventional to organic farming, were considered the most appropriate and effective measures for this sector. Particular emphasis was placed on raising awareness to the agriculture sector operating in nitrate vulnerable areas. The delimitation of additional nitrate vulnerable zones and the development of methods and tools for the rational use of fertilisers was a related measure that resulted from the national workshop in Greece. However, the use of fertilisers was also of concern for the stakeholders at the Adriatic sub-regional workshop, as they identified the setting of a fertiliser quota in riverine catchment areas as an important common measure for implementation in the Adriatic.

Vessel discharges were also considered to be an important issue by the groups working on Eutrophication (blue cells in Table 1), specifically those of the Mediterranean sub-regional and the Greek national workshops. The completion or upgrade of port reception facilities in all ports, so as to ensure the safe reception of ship wastewater, oil residues and other waste, were identified as important measures for implementation by these groups.

Only one measure addressing aquaculture was included in the list of measures for Eutrophication, and specifically in the list of common measures identified by the stakeholders at the Adriatic sub-regional workshop. The Greek national workshop participants identified two additional measures for Eutrophication, the intensification of monitoring, particularly of point sources of pollution, and the improvement of knowledge on marine pollution issues through additional research.

This closer look at the Eutrophication measures highlights the three main pressures that participants felt must be addressed in order to address Eutrophication in the Mediterranean: municipal wastewater, agriculture and shipping. Undoubtedly, there are other, important pressures, for example aquaculture, although perhaps not in all the involved countries. However, this identification of common, shared pressures is the first step to the identification of common measures for implementation.

With the exemption of the awareness raising related measures, all other measures have a technical or legislative mode of action. Most the wastewater related measures are technical in nature, reflecting the fact that relevant legislation is in place across the EU, however the extent of its implementation might not always be what is required and/or desirable for optimum environmental protection. Likewise, for port installations, where many member states have completed them in large ports, but smaller ports are still without the necessary infrastructure.

B. Contaminants and contaminants in seafood

As Table 2 shows, there were few similarities between the measures identified to address contaminants and contaminants in seafood, during the three workshops. In fact, the only similarities were between the Mediterranean Sub-regional and the Greek

National workshops, both of which included measures to address waste from the shipping and fishing industry, particularly the enforcement of MARPOL and the provision of port reception facilities. Given that some of the Greek decision-makers participating at the Mediterranean workshop were also participants at the Greek national workshop, these similarities are not surprising, as obviously measures dealing with vessel waste and discharges were important to the Greek stakeholders. The other important measures for Greek experts and decision-makers were related to industrial and municipal wastewater management and the assessment of contaminated sites in need of remediation.

Interestingly, there were no similar measures for contaminants deriving from the Adriatic and the Mediterranean sub-regional workshops. This could be because of the different perceived important pressures in each of these sub-regions, although it is most likely a factor of the different categories/natures of the participating stakeholders. The list of five measures deriving from the Adriatic sub-regional workshop diverge greatly from the other measures in Table 2, in terms of their intent and targets, focussing on data capture, recording and sharing practices, the standardisation of stakeholder involvement and the monitoring and control of the implementation of measures. In a sense, the measures deriving from the Adriatic workshop are a mixture of what concerns the people working in the field i.e. the researchers that made up the majority of stakeholders working in this group. This result is an excellent example of the effect of the participant group, and their expertise, on the workshop outputs, highlighting the fact that, if what is required is a list of policy-driven or technical measures, then stakeholders with that knowledge and expertise must attend the decision-making workshops.

The other possible common measures identified during the Mediterranean sub-regional workshop included the development of accident management plans for land-based and offshore activities, and the regulation of hydrocarbon exploration and extraction activities highlighting the current developments and areas of concern in this particular sub-region.

Table 2. Measures deriving from each of the three workshops for Descriptors 8 Contaminants and 9 Contaminants in Seafood.

Adriatic - Sub-regional	Mediterranean – Sub-regional	Greece - National
Establishment of a standard-systematic procedure (tool) in an official form for stakeholder involvement in the decision-making process	Vessel waste management, specifically liquid discharges from the shipping and fishing industries, through banning of shipping/vessel discharges and the provision/upgrade of port reception facilities	Completion of the necessary infrastructure at all port installations (port reception facilities) to ensure the safe reception of ship wastewater or oily residues and other wastes to avoid pollution of the sea
Establishment of a formal data-sharing policy at a	Establishment of seafood quality standards	Enhance control and enforcement under

European level		MARPOL (International Convention for the prevention of pollution from ships)
Standardisation of source mapping, standardisation of reporting and registering of impacts from sources contributing to contamination in terms of methods, frequency of analysis, instrumentation, thresholds, etc.	Accident management plans for offshore activities (shipping, hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation)	Industrial waste and wastewater management (determination of conditions and prerequisites for the connection of industries to WWTP, and completion of works for the collection and treatment of wastes from industry)
Monitoring and control of the implementation of abatement measures: establishment of a method/procedure or a body that will oversee the implementation of abatement measures	Regulation of hydrocarbon exploration and extraction activities by Strategic Impact Assessments and Environmental Impact Assessments, as well as the Offshore Protocol of the Barcelona Convention	Upgrade of municipal wastewater treatment plants and construction of new ones where necessary
International standard of recording data/measurements/results of monitoring	Accident management plans for land-based activities	Assessment of contaminated sites urgently in need of remediation

C. Marine litter

A look at Table 3 demonstrates that there were a few similar measures for marine litter, arising from each of the three workshops. Unsurprisingly, all three workshops included measures on raising awareness, to both the general public and to specific target groups, such as the tourism and fishing/shipping industries and decision makers (green cells in Table 3). Additionally, the Mediterranean workshop also included a measure on launching a Mediterranean Cleanup Day by UNEP-MAP, which is also a tool for raising awareness about marine litter in the general public.

The implementation of Fishing for Litter practices (pink cells in Table 3) was also chosen as one of the top measures to implement for marine litter, in all three workshops. While the wording varied slightly between the workshops, the main concept concerned the management of both fishing gear/derelict fish gear and of the waste collected by fishermen during their normal fishing operations. Importantly, the free disposal of this waste by fishermen was explicitly mentioned in the wording of two of these measures, as it was considered important for the success of the measure.

Measures specifically addressing plastics were also included in the lists of measures for marine litter, from all three of the workshops (blue cells in Table 3). While the

measure deriving from the Adriatic workshop concerned the monitoring of microplastics in fish tissue, the other two workshops included measures for the reduction of plastics. Specifically, the reduction of the consumption of plastic bags was included in both the Greek national workshop and the Mediterranean sub-regional workshop, whereas the Mediterranean workshop also included a measure on banning microplastics in cosmetics and raising awareness about the sources and impacts of microplastics.

Table 3. Measures deriving from each of the three workshops for Descriptor 10 Marine Litter.

Adriatic - Sub-regional	Mediterranean – Sub-regional	Greece - National
Awareness raising of general public and education targeted to specific groups (tourism, industry, shipping/fishing and decision makers)	Targeted awareness raising campaigns	Awareness raising actions and communication to general public, local authorities, schools etc.
Specific monitoring e.g. for microplastics in fish tissue	Support Fishing for Litter practices, including derelict fishing gear, with no-fee disposal of litter collected by fishermen	Establishment and implementation of a National Action Plan on marine litter and its incorporation in the National Plan for solid waste management
Fishing practices e.g. fishing gear management and fishing for litter and sustainable cleanups	Launch and encourage participation to a Mediterranean Cleanup Day by UNEP-MAP	Undertake measures for re-use, recycling and recovery
Promotion and introduction of green practices in the tourism sector	Reduction on the usage of plastic bags (through e.g. a tax on plastic bags)	Implementation of the measures for the reduction of the consumption of plastic bags
Improvement in wastewater treatment plant and landfill management	Promotion of measures for the ban of microplastics in cosmetics and awareness-raising on the sources and impacts of microplastics	Support and finance "Fishing for Litter" practice. Introduce the "no fees" policy for the disposal of litter brought by fishermen, and improve port waste reception facilities and management

In addition to the above shared measures, the Adriatic workshop also resulted in two additional common measures, the promotion and introduction of green practices in the tourism sector (whose cell appears in green, as this is also partially an awareness-raising measure), and the improvement in the management of wastewater treatment plants and landfills. Establishing a national action plan for marine litter and

undertaking measures for reuse, recycling and recovery were additional measures identified by the participants of the Greek national workshop.

A quick glance at Table 3 clearly presents the three main target groups, according to the workshop participants, that must be approached and facilitated, in order to help address the marine litter issue. These are the general public, the tourism sector and the fishing industry. It also highlights the main litter items of concern: plastic bags, microplastics and fishing related items. It is also positive to notice that measures targeting the sources of marine litter (such as reduction on the usage of bags, green practices in the tourism sector and measures for reuse, recycling and recovery of litter) are also present in this table.

3. EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

The previous chapter presented an analysis of the top measures deriving from the three DeCyDe-4-ActionMed workshops, implemented as part of the project's Activity 3 mandate. This chapter aims to draw out some of the main points and undertake additional evaluation and discussion of the attributes of the measures, as well as of the workshop structure.

- **EU Directives and national legislation and strategy guide measure development**

The above analysis of the measures identified in each of the workshops for each of the descriptors at hand, shows that most of the common measures relate to common pressures that the countries involved, are facing. Specifically, measures relating to municipal waste, vessel/shipping waste and agriculture are those with the greatest commonalities. Notably, emerging issues, such as hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation, as well as more pressing issues, in terms of recent/current European obligations, as is the plastic bag ban, also feature in the lists.

What becomes evident is that most of the measures derive from the regulatory obligations of the countries, and that is where the greatest opportunity for collaboration is apparent. This is positive, since the existing regulations and requirements form a strong basis on which member states can build upon, in order to develop their programmes of measures. Collaboration on these existing, mandatory measures has the potential to avoid duplications and reduce the administrative burden required for their implementation, contributing to the successful collaboration between member states, and thus the successful implementation of the measures.

- **Some measures could be implemented to address more than one descriptor**

Looking at the compiled lists of measures, it becomes evident that some similar measures are repeated across descriptors (e.g. measures on port reception facilities and awareness-raising campaigns). This is not unexpected, or uncommon, since descriptors 5, 8/9 and 10 can have similar pressures and pollution sources, and thus similar approaches.

The greatest commonalities between measures, across all four descriptors, are between the Mediterranean sub-regional workshop and the Greek national workshop. The Greek national workshop, attended by Greek experts and decision/policy makers, preceded the Mediterranean workshop. A subset of those Greek decision/policy makers were also invited participants at the Mediterranean workshop, where possible common measures between Cyprus, Greece and Malta were discussed and identified. The commonalities in measures between these two workshops is therefore not surprising, since: (i) some of the same decision makers attended both workshops, and (ii) Greece was one of the three countries represented at the Mediterranean sub-regional workshop.

- **There is more feasibility with regards to the marine litter descriptor**

In all workshops, the possible descriptor to work with appeared to be Marine Litter (D10). There could be various reasons for this: (1) marine litter is a very popular subject in the recent years, (2) whereas countries have worked extensively with Eutrophication and Contaminants, due to other legislation as well, such as the WFD, marine litter is something new to them. The fact that they do not have established monitoring programmes, coupled with the fact that there are some examples of successful practices from several European countries (e.g. Fishing for Litter), makes it easier to propose new measures. Interestingly, even for marine litter, those measures identified as suitable for common implementation are those that derive from European directives and legislations, for example the need to minimise the consumption of plastic bags and the implementation of Fishing for Litter initiatives.

- **There are challenges but also opportunities to the identification of common measures for implementation between neighbouring countries**

The identification of possible common measures for implementation has not always been a straight forward process. Although neighbouring countries share common characteristics, in terms of pressures for example, differences between these countries naturally do exist, whether they are differences in the natural environment, the socio-economic situation, or the legislative framework of the political priorities, which can complicate the identification of common measures. The fact that these countries are also in different stages with regards to their PoMs development, further complicates the situation. Whereas, an already prepared PoMs (such as in the case of Cyprus) could mean that it is not possible to add new measures that could be shared between the countries, the lack of any publicly available information on the PoMs (as was the case for Croatia, Malta and Italy) meant that there was a lack of background for discussion and agreement. In the case of Greece, it is clearly highlighted that the optimum situation for the development of common measures is one where a draft list of measures, open for discussion and adaptation is available, and where the workshops are actually attended by those people with the decision-making mandate on the final list of measures, in combination with the attendance and input from people working in the field, with firsthand knowledge of the current situation and needs. Such participatory involvement of decision-makers at the early stage of measure definition ensures their buy-in.

- **A robust, but easy to implement tool, in order to evaluate and rank new, suggested measures would be welcomed**

Having a concrete and objective method/tool of evaluating any new suggested measures, so as to decide on which to prioritise for implementation also seems to be well received. While carrying out a full socio-economic analysis on each new proposed measure would be ideal, before deciding which to include in the Programme of Measures, this might be both time and budget unfriendly. Therefore, being able to use a tool like the one proposed by DeCyDe-4-ActionMed, where the criteria and their importance can be customised, coupled with its use by experts in their field, with the necessary knowledge, can ensure that through the investment of a few hours at a facilitated workshop, a list of possible new measures can be ranked and decision-makers can make scientifically-robust and justifiable decisions on which measures to include in their PoMs. A full socio-economic analysis of the more specific, targeted measures can then follow.

- **The effective implementation and monitoring of the measures is very important**

One of the functions of the workshops was also to record the views and opinions of the participants. In all three workshops, a general, recurring remark and concern was the importance to move beyond the simple preparation of lists of measures for each of the eleven MSFD descriptors, to a more practical approach, where the measures are implemented and their implementation is duly monitored and assessed.

- **The method and tools implemented at the workshops could be replicated to enhance coordination and collaboration among neighbouring countries**

The work undertaken within the framework of the three DeCyDe-4-ActionMed workshops has also supported the mandate from the last COP of the Barcelona Convention, to prepare a potential list of Programmes of Measures at regional and subregional levels, required to achieve GES. While the focus of the workshops was on descriptors 5, 8, 9 and 10, they could serve as examples of methodology and tools that can be used to promote and encourage sub-regional and regional collaboration for all MSFD Descriptors and all Ecological Objectives under the Barcelona Convention.

Workshops such as these, which are aimed at bringing together decision-makers from neighbouring countries, for a few hours within a day, in small groups that facilitate discussion and promote dialogue, are effective means of ensuring and enhancing coordination and collaboration among Member States.

