



United Nations Environment Programme

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة • 联合国环境规划署

PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT • PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE
ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ

Report

International Review Meeting for Country Projects on Integrated Assessment of Trade-Related Policies and Biological Diversity in the Agricultural Sector

**Geneva
26-28 November 2007**

MEETING REPORT

Table of contents

1. Introduction	page 2
2. Highlights of workshop and main achievements	page 3
3. Summary by sessions	page 7
4. Conclusions	page 12
5. References and Annexes	page 13
Annex 5.1. List of Participants	
Annex 5.2. Workshop Agenda	
Annex 5.3. Results of the working group exercises	

Financial support for this initiative is provided by the European Union and Sida



1. Introduction

UNEP's Economics and Trade Branch (ETB) organised on 26-28 November 2007 in Geneva the first International Review Meeting of its initiative on Integrated Assessment of Trade-related Policies and Biological Diversity in the Agricultural Sector (for further information about this initiative, please visit: <http://www.unep.ch/etb/areas/biodivAgriSector.php>).

The main objectives of the meeting were:

- (i) To review progress of the 6 country projects implemented in Cameroon, Jamaica, Mauritius, Madagascar, Uganda and Papua New Guinea.
- (ii) To discuss major challenges and opportunities encountered during project implementation, notably with respect to integrated assessment methodologies, stakeholder consultation and influence on decision-making.
- (iii) To provide a venue for information and experience sharing amongst country project teams, as well as with international experts of the Core Advisory Group (CAG) and of the International Steering Committee (ISC).
- (iv) To identify and discuss important next steps of project implementation in 2008.

The meeting was structured over a three-day period. The first day was devoted to presentations by country teams on the progress of the project activities followed by a discussion session including other country teams, UNEP ETB staff and members of the CAG. The second day consisted of the International Steering Committee meeting, which focused on discussing and debating several substantive issues, notably the EU-ACP negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs), the impact of integrated assessments on policy and decision-making processes and tools and methods for assessing biodiversity in an agricultural trade context. The last day consisted of a series of presentations by international experts on measuring biodiversity impacts, valuing biodiversity resources and functions and scenario development. In the afternoon, bilateral meetings with the country project teams and working group sessions were held in parallel to further discuss issues of concern, as well as to identify and plan future project activities for 2008.

Section 2 of this report summarises the main issues highlighted during the workshop and key achievements. Section 3 provides an overview of each session held during this 3-day meeting. Conclusions are provided in section 4 while section 5 contains several annexes including the agenda, participants' list and results of the group work sessions. All presentations given during the meeting can be found at: <http://www.unep.ch/etb/events/2007BiodivFirstReviewMtgNov.php>.

2. Highlights of workshop and key achievements

2.1. Country projects implementation and management

A year after initiation of the 6 country projects, this meeting provided the first opportunity to review intermediate results of the integrated assessment (IA) studies and discuss important challenges and opportunities encountered during implementation.

Presentations by country teams demonstrated that:

- All projects have been successfully launched at the national level, notably through initial launch and capacity-building workshops held in the first half of 2007.
- Project teams and National Steering Committees (NSC) have been established and are up and running.
- The focus (i.e. the trade-related problem(s) that the IA aims to address) have been identified and the conceptual framework of the integrated assessment have been developed and further refined on the basis of stakeholder consultations. For some projects, the baseline and indicators of assessment were also determined.
- In some cases, monitoring and evaluation systems have been developed and put in place (e.g. Madagascar).

Box. Summary of country projects' focus

Jamaica: Impacts on the sugar cane industry of reforms of the EU-ACP Sugar Protocol as part of EU-ACP negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements (loss of trade preferences).

Mauritius: Impacts on small sugar cane growers and large corporations of reforms of the EU-ACP Sugar Protocol as part of EU-ACP negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements (loss of trade preferences).

Cameroon: Impacts of the national law (No.2004/025) liberalising trade in the cacao sector.

Madagascar: Impacts of national trade measures (particularly non-tariff measures) in the aquaculture shrimp sector implemented as a result of increase in regional and international trade competition.

Uganda: Impacts of trade liberalisation in the horticulture sector following EU-ACP negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs).

Papua New Guinea: Impacts of trade liberalisation measures (especially tariff reduction) affecting major export crops (e.g. coffee and palm oil) on two major staple food crops (taro and sweet potato).

Some interesting similarities between the different projects surfaced during discussions. For example, both Jamaica and Mauritius aim to identify the impacts of a loss in trade preferences on the sugar cane sector due to reforms of the EU-ACP Sugar Protocol. Whereas sugar is not an important source of foreign exchange in Jamaica, the export of sugar constitutes a major source of revenue for Mauritius. The main concern in Jamaica is the potential loss of some 30,000 jobs in rural areas. This difference partly explains that the project in Jamaica is heavily focused on the identification of possible alternatives to sugar cane (e.g. shift to ethanol production and/or tourism) as opposed to the Mauritius project, which devotes more attention to reviewing various policy options for increasing competitiveness and sustainability of the sector (e.g. regrouping of small farmers).

Despite their different sectoral focus, the projects in Cameroon and Madagascar have the following features in common:

- Both focus on ex-post assessment of national trade policies. In the case of Madagascar, it appears that a number of non-tariff measures related to quality, sanitary and phytosanitary measures have been translated into national trade law, notably to address increased competition from Asian shrimp aquaculture producers.
- The main objective of the IA is how to make production in the chosen sector more sustainable, notably by exploring opportunities for exploiting niche markets on the basis of quality production (e.g. certification, labelling).
- Initial IA results point to largely positive economic impacts but negative environmental and social impacts; the challenge therefore is how to reconcile both trends and assess the overall impact of trade on the sector.

Like Jamaica and Mauritius, the project in Uganda is linked to the process of regional trade negotiations for the EPAs. Despite the initial stage of the IA study, the project team was able to seize the political opportunity provided by ongoing negotiations and provided preliminary policy recommendations to the Ministry of Trade. The situation with regard to the EPAs should be clarified soon, as the current WTO waiver that protects the EU trade preferences expires on the 31st December 2007. If the EPA negotiations are not concluded by then, the trade preferences will lapse, which means that some of the ACP exports to the EU will then face higher tariffs from 1st January 2008.

The project in Papua New Guinea is conducting a two-step assessment looking at the impacts of tariff liberalisation in major export crops, such as coffee and palm oil, on two staple crops (taro and sweet potato). Compared to the other projects, social, livelihood and poverty-related issues are at the core of this IA exercise.

Project teams highlighted a number of challenges related to project management and implementation, which were discussed at different points during the meeting including in the context of the bilateral sessions held on the last day. These challenges can be summarised as follows:

- Being able to follow and respect the agreed project activity timeline.
- Difficulty in obtaining relevant information and documentation on the selected sectors/policies.
- Changing personnel and structures in ministries (e.g. after elections, fluctuation/rotation).
- Length of administrative procedures such as for the recruitment of staff for project implementation.

2.2. Integrated assessment methodology

As country teams are starting the process of assessing impacts (summarized as stage C of the integrated assessment process – see draft Reference Manual, Volume I), a major part of the discussions focused on methodological issues, notably (i) how to assess impacts on biodiversity? (ii) How to establish causal relationships between trade policy and biodiversity impacts? (iii) How to choose and identify relevant indicators and policy scenarios/options?

Methodological challenges were first pointed out during presentations by country teams. On the second day, there was a short presentation on the Draft Reference Manual and a full hour discussion on biodiversity-related assessments. This was followed on the last day by three presentations on:

- Measuring biodiversity and socio-economic impacts.
- Valuation of biodiversity and biodiversity resources and functions.
- Scenario development – the case of the EU-Mediterranean EFTA.

Important conclusions reached by participants include:

- 1) It is extremely difficult to measure biodiversity (there is not one universal measure of biodiversity which works everywhere) and there is no specific/unique tool for measuring biodiversity.
- 2) There are different perceptions and definitions of biodiversity, such as natural biodiversity, crop genetic biodiversity, social aspects of biodiversity and biodiversity loss. A distinction was also made between components of ecosystems and biodiversity in general.
- 3) Using available tools and techniques, each project team has to develop and adopt its own country-tailor made methodology for IA. This includes identification and prioritization of principal indicators of measurement.
- 4) It is important to identify causal chains and the range of knock-on effects following a trade policy change. This suggests that IA is a dynamic process.
- 5) It may be useful to undertake a quantitative analysis of economic impacts following a change in trade rules/policies. This can be the starting point of the IA.
- 6) It is useful to review available literature and documentation from other sectors/countries.
- 7) The IA should go further than concluding that impacts can be positive, negative and/or uncertain. It is important to arrive at some kind of overall result/impact that can guide decision-makers with respect to biodiversity problems and opportunities.

The main methodological challenges discussed include:

- **Data access and availability.** For example, in the case of Uganda, some data on health-related issues is not available. In other projects, stakeholders are unwilling to share information and relevant analysis. Data collection is also highly time consuming and resource intensive. Interestingly, Jamaica pointed out that exceptional access to data has been a formidably opportunity for undertaking the IA.
- **Isolating trade-related impacts.** Given the dynamic nature of IA and the range of policies with potential impacts on biodiversity, it can be very difficult to isolate a trade-related impact and to establish a clear cause-effect relationship.
- **Biodiversity measurement.** Recognising the complexity of measuring biodiversity, some participants consider that biodiversity measurement is doable but that it is frequently (if not always) constrained by limited time and resources. Most participants agree that direct and indirect changes in land use have significant impacts on biodiversity and that it may be useful therefore to understand first land use changes and then draw linkages to biodiversity impacts. However, some participants also emphasized the importance of other aspects of biodiversity such as cultural, historical and tribal components.

2.3. Stakeholder consultation and participation

Consultation with stakeholders and their participation in the IA is a recurrent topic for all project teams and it was discussed during the meeting at several stages.

All projects have set up a multistakeholder consultation process, notably through the establishment of the National Steering Committee and the conduct of stakeholder workshops (launching and capacity building workshop). For the project in Jamaica, the broader stakeholder consultation process has been deferred until completion of parts of the IA study. This is due to the fact that the national-level discussion with regard to the sugar industry is highly politicized and that plenty of material and documentation on the sugar can industry already exists but it has unfortunately not resulted in any policy changes because a fundamental conflict between politics and economic rationality. This has left a legacy of cynicism, which explains why the project team decided to postpone national-level consultation until concrete results from the IA study can actually be shown.

In general, there was an agreement that stakeholder engagement is a key factor guaranteeing legitimacy and accountability of the findings and results of the assessment process and that engagement is also a prerequisite for effective implementation of policy recommendations and actions stemming from IA. At the same time, a number of challenges were pointed out by project teams:

- Feedback from stakeholders is generally weak and this negatively affects the process of information collection. It is also difficult to sustain stakeholders' interest in the long run.
- Stakeholders have very different levels of understanding of the project and of IA in general.
- Some stakeholders are unwilling to participate and engage in the IA process and it is difficult to identify those stakeholders that would be most cooperative, i.e. 'the right individuals'.
- Entrenched views and political interests can seriously jeopardize the IA exercise. In the NSC, stakeholders often push their own agendas. It is therefore a challenge to reconcile diverging stakeholders' views.
- It can be resource intensive (time, staff, cost) to consult with stakeholders.

Without attempting to resolve all the issues mentioned above, the meeting pointed out 2 or 3 important points considering this subject:

First, it is important to consider that there are many different ways and techniques of consulting and engaging stakeholders. In some cases, it may be useful to personally meet key stakeholders; in others, e-mail correspondence may be sufficient. Stakeholder workshops can be an important tool for stakeholder involvement, but in some cases, other approaches may be more effective.

Second, it is critical to identify those individuals that have the power and willingness to make things change, and to work through them to induce real policy changes. Policy-makers' interest in a project will often fade if they are not convinced that it will make a difference.

Third, it is important to use different languages depending on whom one talks to. This requires packaging and marketing the results and findings of the IA according to different target audiences. A well-planned communication/marketing strategy at the start of the project can be of great help and it should consider the positive role that media can play in advancing environmental-related issues.

2.4. Influencing decision-making

An important conclusion of this meeting is that IAs cannot be reduced to technical exercises: they are policy-oriented assessments that aim to influence the policy and decision-making process in favour of more sustainable production and consumption patterns. The question is: how do you have an impact on decision and policy-makers?

The relevance and influence of IA to where power lies was a key theme of these three days. Almost all country teams outlined it as a critical challenge they are currently facing. On the one hand, it is clear that policy change is a slow process that demands a step-by-step approach. On the other hand, country projects are implemented over a two-year period and aim to induce change within that period. They operate in a context where decision-making is largely 'top-down' with relatively weak stakeholder participation. In addition, decisions often lie in the hand of a few individuals, which make up a powerful economic and political elite.

Acknowledging that these challenges and constraints will persist, it is important that they are understood, recognized and anticipated during project implementation and that different ways are explored to address them.

Interesting points of the discussion included:

- The distinction between being policy-driven and policy-oriented, a point emphasized by Jamaica where 'there have been 110 years of political failure to provide a viable solution for the sugar cane industry'.
- The importance of the global political and economic context within which these assessments are being conducted, such as for example climate change, biofuels and energy efficiency issues, regional trade negotiations and agricultural trade negotiations.
- The importance of timing of IA with respect to important trade policy changes and negotiations, such as in the case of Uganda where the Trade Ministry needed the information much earlier in order to use it in the regional negotiations on EPAs with the EU.
- The need for quantitative data that will capture decision-makers' attention and thus for cooperation with statistical offices or other organizations that generate data.
- The importance of targeting individuals that can really influence policy-making at national level and of providing them inspiring information on concrete socio-economic and livelihoods benefits.
- The need to show that there is a 'stake' for everyone involved and concerned by IA (i.e. win-win situation).

3. Summary by sessions

FIRST DAY

Vera Weick of UNEP-ETB presented an overview of activities conducted under this initiative since its launch in July 2005, as well as the meeting's main objectives and agenda.

3.1. Presentations and discussions on Jamaica and Mauritius projects

The country project in **Jamaica** focuses on the sugar industry, which is characterised as being in crisis. With the gradual phasing out of trade preferences with the EU it is expected to be internationally uncompetitive because of high production costs. The collapse of the industry would leave land available for other uses and different alternatives are being discussed as part of the project. A shift to ethanol production seems to be more politically-driven than the result of sound economic, social and environmental cost-benefit analysis. A key social concern is the future of the 30,000 low-wage sugar cane growers. Whilst important decisions need to be taken regarding the future of the sugar cane industry, the problem is that the sector is dominated by a powerful elite that has no interest in seeing change happen.

To respond to the EU proposed reform to cut sugar prices by 36% within a period of 4 years, the **Mauritius** government has developed a Multi-annual Adaptation Strategy (MAAS), which includes 6 main policy options: (i) regrouping of small farmers; (ii) sustaining difficult areas under sugar cane; (iii) moving out of sugar cane; (iv) centralisation; (v) right sizing of labour force; (vi) shift to ethanol production. The IA study in Mauritius will review the impacts of these different policy options and biodiversity-related impacts, focusing initially on the regrouping of small farmers. Two main focus groups have been identified: small farmers and large corporations. Some of the challenges confronting the country team include the weak networking between stakeholders; being insufficiently informed of other relevant past and ongoing projects/studies; non-availability of socio-economic data; and the difficulty of capturing dynamic effects of trade changes.

During the discussion session, the feasibility and opportunity of alternatives to sugar cane were discussed including ethanol production, tourism, pharmaceutical products and other crops. Questions were asked regarding their economic, social and environmental viability, notably in terms of potential impacts on biodiversity. It also appeared that political factors were key in determining which policy option may be adopted. Given their focus on the same sector, it was recommended that both project teams should share experience and compare results of the IA.

3.2. Presentations and discussions on Cameroon and Madagascar projects

The main focus of the IA project in **Cameroon** is the 2004 National Trade Law, which liberalised the cocoa sector, and its related economic, social and environmental impacts. This law encouraged the expansion of cocoa plantations together with the revalorisation of prices paid to producers. The expansion of cocoa farms is mainly done at the expense of natural forests or by using land previously exploited for other crops. The results are habitat fragmentation and land use changes. Interim analysis shows that cocoa producers are economically gaining from liberalisation of the sector (e.g. increased income and employment, improvement in living conditions). On the other hand, environmental impacts are largely negative and include land conversion, deforestation and species loss.

The **Madagascar** project is looking at trade policy changes on shrimp aquaculture, which is a strategic and expanding sector for the country. Winners are large economic operators and investors while small farmers and local people are the main ones losing from expansion. It also causes mangrove deforestation, coastal erosion, water and soil pollution. Conflicts have erupted between industrialists and farmers over control and appropriation of the resource. One way ahead may be the certification of shrimps produced by Madagascar, which will help ensure that economic, social and environmental impacts are all given due consideration.

The discussions focused on the different policy options that could be considered to help move both the cocoa sector in Cameroon and the shrimp sector in Madagascar on a more sustainable path. MSC certification is a positive and promising option for Madagascar. Organic cocoa production seems less feasible in Cameroon given the fact that cocoa produced in forestry areas usually requires significant amounts of pesticide use to guarantee decent productivity levels. The pros and cons of expanding cocoa production by (i) converting forests; (ii) planting on agro fields; (iii) rehabilitating degraded land were also reviewed.

3.3. Presentations and discussions on Uganda and Papua New Guinea

The IA conducted in **Uganda**, which focuses on horticulture, aims to help the Government put in place policy packages that address biodiversity-related aspects of the EU-ACP negotiations on EPAs. These negotiations are expected to result in increased market access for the horticulture and floriculture sectors, with potential increases in land conversion, use of agro-chemicals, and water and energy use. Farmers would benefit from a rise in income but may suffer due to negative health effects and risk of malnutrition caused by reduced water and fish availability. There is also a strong gender component as most flower farms employ more women than men. The IA study is looking at three main scenarios: (i) status quo where Uganda maintains same trading regime with the EU; (ii) Eurocentric scenario whereby the EPA is signed and Uganda's priority is increased market access; (iii) ESA Eurocentric scenario, which looks at how Uganda's products may be affected by competition from Eastern and Southern African (ESA) countries receiving the same level of market access to the EU.

The overall objective of the **PNG** project is to assess the impact of expansion of oil palm and coffee plantations on the genetic biodiversity of two staple food crops - taro and sweet potato – as a result of the tariff reform programme of the late 90s. Research shows that there has been a loss of some 890 varieties of sweet potato and taro over the past 30 years. While living standards of farmers may increase and new employment opportunities are generated, there is much concern that there is a significant loss of agricultural biodiversity with negative social and cultural impacts.

The discussions focused on the problem of obtaining relevant data within the project timeframe. In Uganda, there is no data available on the impacts of agro-chemicals on health. In PNG, some organisations are reluctant to share information on socio-cultural impacts of palm oil and coffee plantations' expansion. Water and energy efficiency issues were also discussed as they are key factors of the Uganda project.

The first day ended with concluding remarks by Vera Weick emphasising:

- The usefulness of the conceptual framework, which has helped all country teams define their assessment focus and the main issues to be studied.
- The fact that agricultural trade issues go far beyond economics and have important social, historical, cultural and political dimensions that need to be accounted for within the IA process.
- The importance of linking the IA exercise to the national decision-making process and constantly review how IA findings could most effectively have an impact on key policy decisions.

SECOND DAY (International Steering Committee Meeting)

3.4. Opening session

The second day opened with remarks from Hussein Abaza, Chief, Economics and Trade Branch, including the following key remarks:

- UNEP has explored the use of integrated assessment in a range of sectors for a decade. It is vital for all stakeholders to view the environment as an opportunity rather than a constraint.
- If the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are to be adequately attained, the environment needs to be approached in a more integrated fashion considering the 3 pillars of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – giving each equal importance.

- UNEP-ETB past and ongoing initiatives have consistently shown that through the application of integrated assessment, it is possible to alleviate poverty, increase employment, protect the environment and increase market access. This body of work would not have been possible without the active and effective engagement all relevant stakeholders.
- The first International Review Meeting aims to bring together members of the country teams with members of the ISC to share experiences and discuss intermediate results.
- The goal of this initiative is not only about carrying out effective integrated assessments, but most importantly to develop sustainable policy options for the different sectors reviewed under the country projects with a specific emphasis on biodiversity.

Vera Weick briefly informed members of the ISC of the background and history of the initiative, its main objectives and major activities conducted to date. She also presented in more detail the structure of the IA projects and the related national and international-level dimensions, important visibility activities that have contributed to raising awareness about the initiative and next steps for 2008. These include:

- Conduct of national review workshops by project teams
- Organisation of visibility event at CBD-COP9
- Organisation of a side-event at the IUCN World Congress in October 2008
- Development of a discussion paper on a topic of relevance to the country projects
- Refinement of the Trade and Biodiversity Reference Manual
- Finalisation of the country assessment studies
- Organisation of a second International Review Meeting to close the 1st phase of the country projects.

3.5. Morning session

The morning session was divided into two parts: first, there was a short presentation by Mireille Perrin Dercorzent (Consultant to UNEP-ETB) on the Reference Manual and its stage of development; second, the EU Delegation to the WTO in Geneva gave an update on the EU-ACP negotiations on EPAs.

Reference Manual

The presentation of the Reference Manual described the main stages of its development, including:

- How it builds upon earlier work conducted by UNEP in this field.
- UNEP-WCMC role in preparing the first draft receiving input from a range of international experts.
- The decision at the 2nd ISC meeting in 2006 to split the manual into two volumes.
- The editing process that was conducted in 2007 prior to the diffusion of the manual at the IAIA annual conference held in June 2007 in Seoul.
- The distribution of the manual to country teams first in October 2006 during the capacity-building workshop of Geneva and in July 2007 further to its editing.

As it stands, the reference manual has two volumes. Volume I is a practical step-by-step guide outlining the main stages of IA, further sub-divided into actions and action sheets to help guide potential users. Volume II is an accompanying reference document, which provides detailed information on indicators, valuation techniques, and relationships between agricultural trade and biodiversity. It also includes guidance on how to develop a conceptual framework of an IA, largely based on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment framework.

The manual will be revised and further developed on the basis of input and feedback from country teams. In order to ensure that it is used as widely as possible, it will also be translated into French and Spanish. Finally, it is important to consider the manual as a living document, which needs to be further improved based on country and project-based experience.

EU-ACP negotiations on EPAs

Two representatives from the EC Delegation to the WTO provided an update on the regional negotiations on EPAs. John Clarke, Deputy Head, started by outlining the rationale for conducting EPA negotiations. First, with the existing EC-ACP Preferential Agreements, the share of ACP exports into the EC has not increased over the last three decades. Second, EPAs will be non-discriminatory and will thus be fully compatible with WTO rules. This will protect the EC from future trade disputes, such as was the case for cotton for the past 15 years. Third, the EPA will be negotiated on a region-by-region basis and will be accompanied by a solid aid component. The EC stressed that they have no intention of expanding their own market access but rather to increase economies of scale, trade/investment flows and to minimise barriers to trade for all ACP countries. Fourth, the EC believes that EPAs will also encourage ACP countries to diversify their economies beyond primary products into a broader range of goods and services that are essential to a healthy sustainable economic development. Potential sectors identified include telecommunication, financial service and information technology.

The EC also clarified some of the 'misconceptions' surrounding the proposal behind the EPAs. The EC does not intend to use the EPA as a 'stick' against ACP countries. Acknowledging that there will be adjustment costs related to EPA implementation, the EC is ready under the 10th EDF to provide the necessary aid and technical assistance. Regarding the sugar sector, the EC believes that it is vital to move away from the sugar protocol to a more economically viable solution.

During the discussion, some participants expressed their concerns over EPAs. In response to comments that small ACP countries may lose out and have too weak a negotiating power compared to that of the EC, the EC emphasised that EPAs will encourage greater regional market integration and market access. The EC recognises that ACP countries will face increased competition and that some sectors are problematic. For example, ACP countries have few comparative advantages in sugar, especially compared to large producers such as Brazil. Countries like Jamaica and Mauritius could explore the possibility of developing geographical indications (GIs) for their sugar so that it catches a price premium on international markets. Questions regarding stakeholder participation and real involvement in the EC SIA process were also asked. The EC responded that its Sustainability Impact Assessments (SIAs), which took place between 2002 and 2007, have followed a fully transparent consultative process open to general public scrutiny. The EC's SIA is based on the principles of independence, transparency and deliberative participation. For example, the SIA on EPAs has succeeded in identifying the needs in the sugar sector and the design of a generous aid package to support countries in need.

3.6. Afternoon session

There were two substantive sessions held in the afternoon, one which focused on biodiversity measurement and the other on the impact of IA on the decision-making process. Each session reviewed some of the main issues, challenges and opportunities, as well as difficulties country teams have encountered around these topics. Important points, conclusions and recommendations have been summarised above in sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 respectively.

THIRD DAY

3.7. Morning session

The morning session consisted of the following presentations:

- Jan Joost Kessler from AIDEnvironment gave a presentation on measuring biodiversity and socio-economic indicators based on research focusing on four commodities: soy (in Argentina and Brazil), palm oil (in Indonesia and Malaysia), beef (in Argentina and Brazil) and coffee (in Honduras and Vietnam). The research aimed to assess biodiversity impacts

of Dutch/EU trade and consumption of these commodities by using a measurement indicator known as Natural Capital Index (NCI).

- Markus Lehmann from the CBD Secretariat gave a presentation on valuation of biodiversity and biodiversity resources and functions. He presented some basic concepts of economic valuation emphasising the importance of values and willingness to pay for a certain good or service and the difference between economic and monetary values. Several valuation tools were reviewed notably revealed-preference methods, stated preference methods, benefit (functions) transfer. The challenge is to decide what tool to use in which circumstance. For example, it is important to consider which critical ecosystems may be impacted by a trade-related change and to focus on the most important ones. Participatory mechanisms such as focus group discussions may be helpful in obtaining data and information from local communities.
- Clive George from the University of Manchester presented the SIA study commissioned by the EC on the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area (EMFTA) with a focus on scenario development. His presentation was preceded by a brief overview by Chloe Hill (UNEP-ETB) on scenario analysis as a decision-making tool to evaluate the range of possible development options and their impact on the economy, society and environment. Two scenarios were considered in the SIA of EMFTA: the baseline scenario and the liberalisation scenario of EMFTA in industrial products, agriculture and services. The SIA concluded that there would be an overall economic benefit of the EMFTA but that it needed to be accompanied by appropriate parallel measures to mitigate adverse social and environmental impacts. They include, amongst others, unemployment, loss of government revenue leading to reduced spending on health and education, greater vulnerability of poor households, increased waste generation, increased pressure on water resources and adverse impacts on climate change and biodiversity mainly due to scale effects of increased production and transport.

3.8. Afternoon session

The afternoon session consisted of bilateral meetings with each country team and group work exercises, conducted in parallel. The objective of the bilateral meetings was to discuss in greater depth and detail issues of importance and/or concern to project teams.

In the context of the working groups, project teams worked in pairs on the following two issues:

- (i) Planning for the first National Review Workshop and identification of important project activities' milestones in 2008. Their task was to develop an outline for the meeting and start identifying main activities leading to its organisation.
- (ii) How to make an impact on decision-making? The aim of the brainstorming exercise was to reflect on the impact that the project and the related IA study will have on decision-making in the respective sector/country.

Results of the working group sessions are attached in annex 5.3 together with the instructions.

4. Conclusions

This first International Review meeting proved highly valuable to all parties participating in this initiative, notably country project teams and members of the ISC and UNEP-ETB staff. In particular, the exchange of views, experience and information amongst country teams, and between project teams and advisors (i) highlighted interesting similarities and differences between the country projects, as well as areas for cooperation and cross-fertilisation; (ii) allowed to establish linkages between national-level implementation and international-level research and analysis; (iii) outlined the importance that global issues, such as climate change, global energy and water use, and regional/international trade negotiations, have for the domestic context within which these projects are implemented.

The main outcomes and achievements of the meeting include:

First, clarification and discussion of some of the main challenges encountered by project teams during implementation notably with respect to (i) day-to-day project management and coordination; (ii) methods, tools and techniques for assessing biodiversity impacts in an agricultural trade context; (iii) participation of, and consultation with stakeholders; (iv) influence on the policy and decision-making processes.

Second, concrete suggestions and possible ways forward for addressing these challenges and difficulties. In particular, the following key points emerge from the meeting:

-> ***Project implementation:***

Close cooperation between core project team members is critical. Based on contacts and networks that different project team members may have, such cooperation may increase the opportunities for accessing valuable and relevant information which stakeholders may first be reluctant to share.

-> ***Methodology:***

Using available tools and techniques, each project team has to develop and adopt its own country-tailor made methodology for IA. Second, the IA should go further than concluding that impacts can be positive, negative and/or uncertain. It is important to arrive at some kind of overall result/impact that inspires decision-makers and lead them to take decision considering biodiversity. As follow-up to the meeting, UNEP in collaboration with the core advisors will provide countries with more specific guidance for this part of the study.

-> ***Stakeholder participation:***

It is important to take a strategic approach to stakeholder consultation, meaning to be clear about the objective one wants to achieve and the right way to get there. In this context it may be useful to identify individuals who have the power and willingness to change things, and to work through them to induce real policy changes. Second, it is important to use different languages depending on whom you talk to. This requires a well-planned communication/marketing strategy developed at the start of the project.

-> ***Influencing decision-making:***

IAs are inherently policy-oriented exercises, which aim to influence and change important decisions policy-makers take regarding the economy, society and the environment. It is important to demonstrate that there is a 'stake' for everyone involved in, and concerned by IA (i.e. win-win situation).

Finally, the meeting was also useful in helping country teams prepare for the next stage of the assessment study and identify key activities that will need to be conducted in 2008. Bilateral and working group sessions provided the opportunity to review and discuss in greater depth these issues in the context of each project situation.

5. Annexes

5.1. List of participants

Participants from Country Projects

Jamaica	
Anthony Clayton Professor Institute for Sustainable Development University of the West Indies 13 Gibraltar Camp Way Mona Campus, Kingston 7 Jamaica, West Indies Tel: +876 970 0257, 977 1659 Mobile: +876 909 2506 Fax: +876 977 1658 Email: anthony.clayton@uwimona.edu.jm	Anthony McKenzie Manager-Strategic Planning and Policies National Environment and Planning Agency 10 Caledonia Avenue Kingston 5, Jamaica Tel: +1 876 754 7540 Fax: +1 876 754 7594 Email: amckenzie@nepa.gov.jm
Cameroon	
Etienne Assoumou Ebo Sous-directeur de la Conservation et de la Protection de la Biodiversité Ministère de l'Environnement et la Protection de la Nature Immeuble Ministériel No 2 Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: +237 77 36 89 41 Email: eassoumou2000@yahoo.ca	Jean Pierre Mvondo Awono Coordonnateur du CEDC Centre for Environment and Development Studies in Cameroon (CEDC), P.O. Box 410 Maroua, Cameroon Tel: +237 77 63 63 55 Fax: +237 2293391 Email: jpmvondoa@yahoo.fr
Madagascar	
Lalanirina Gabrielle Rajoelison Chef du département Département des Eaux et Forêts de l'Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques (ESSA Eaux & Forêts) Université de Antananarivo Boite Postale 175 Antananarivo, Madagascar 101 Tel: +261 (0)20 24 742 49 Mobile +261 33 11441 94 Email: g.rajoelison@univ-antananarivo.mg	
Mauritius	
Roshini Brizmohun-Gopaul Research and Development Officer Horticulture Division, Agricultural Services Ministry of Agro Industry and Fisheries Horticulture Reduit, Mauritius Tel: +230 454 3013	Raj Kumar Ramnauth Principal Biometrician Biometry and Statistics Division Agricultural Research and Extension Unit 3 rd Floor, Newry Complex St Jean Street Quatre Bornes Mauritius

Mobile: +230 256 7871
Fax: + 230 464 4857/230 464 8749
Email: rbrizmohun-gopaul@mail.gov.mu,
brizmohun@hotmail.com

Tel: + 230 466 3885
Fax: +230 464 8809
Email: biometry@areu.mu

Uganda

Francis Ogwal
Natural Resources Management
Specialist
National Environment Management
Authority
Environmental Monitoring and
Compliance
Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road
P.O. Box 22255
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 251064/5/8, 256 41
342717/342758
Mobile : +256 77 2517045
Fax: +256 41 257521
Email: fogwal@nemaug.org

Alice Ruhweza
Consultant
National Environment Management
Authority
Trade and Environment
NEMA House, Room 315, Plot 17/19/21
Jinja Road
P.O. Box 22255
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 752 780020 ext. 162
Mobile: +256 752 780020
Fax: +256 312 271635
Email: aruhweza@nemaug.org
aruhweza@hotmail.com

Papua New Guinea

Veronica Mangi
National Agricultural Research
Institute
Chemistry Laboratory
P.O.Box 8277, BOROK0 111
National Capital District, Papua New
Guinea
Telephone: +675 321 2690
Fax: +675 320 24 11
Email: veronica.mangi@nari.org.pg

Maggie Moi-he
Acting Assistant Director
Trade Development Branch, Trade Division
Department of Trade & Industry
PO Box 375, WAIGANI, NCD, PNG.
Phone: +675 325 6047/ (675) 685 9099
Fax: +675 325 4263
Email: msmoihe@gmail.com

International Steering Committee Members

Name	Organisation and address	Contact details
Cornelius Kazoora	Director Sustainable Development Centre Makere University Campus Senate Building, Level 1, Office 3 P.O. Box 5463 Kampala, Uganda	Tel: +256 392 726253 Email: sdc@imul.com
Jan Joost Kessler	AID Environment Donker Curtiusstraat 7-523 Amsterdam, Netherlands	Tel:+31 20 581 8259 Email: kessler@aidenvironment.org
Markus A. Lehmann	Economist Social, Economic and Legal Affairs Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 413 St. Jacques, Suite 800 Montreal H2Y1N9 Quebec, Canada	Tel.: +514 287 8711 Fax: +514 288 6588 Email: Markus.Lehmann@biodiv.org
Alberto Longo	Lecturer in Environmental Economics Institute of Agri-Food and Land Use School of Biological Sciences Queen's University Belfast David Keir Building Stanmillis Road, Belfast BT9 5AG, Northern Ireland	Tel.: +44 28 909 76 537 Fax.: +44 28 909 76 513 Email: a.longo@qub.ac.uk
Joanna Treweek	Technical Program Manager Capacity Building for Biodiversity and Impact Assessment, International Association for Impact Assessment Chancery Cottage, Kentisbeare, Cullompton, Devon EX15 2DS United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 1884 266798 Fax: +44 8707 622963 Email: jo@treweek.fsnet.co.uk
Claire Brown	Ecosystem Assessment Programme UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge, CB3 0DL United Kingdom	Tel: +44 (0) 1223 277 314 (extension 237) Fax: +44 (0) 1223 277 136 Email: claire.brown@unep-wcmc.org
Ermias Biadgleng	T. Project Officer Intellectual Property and Investment South Centre 17-19, chemin du Champ d'Anier 1209 Petit Saconnex, Geneva Switzerland	Tel: +41 22 791 8162 Fax: +41 22 798 8531 Email: biadgleng@southcentre.org

Moustapha Kamal Gueye	Senior Programme Manager International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development International Environment House II, Chemin de Balexert 7, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland	Tel: +41 22 917 8754 Fax: +41 22 917 8093 Email: gkamal@ictsd.ch
Marc Hufty	Professor Graduate Institute of Development Studies (IUED) Research Group on Environment and Governance (GREG) 20 Rothschild CP 136 1211 Geneva 21 Switzerland	Tel.: +41 22 906 5961 Fax: +41 22 906 5947 Email: Marc.hufty@iued.unige.ch
Dalindyebo Shabalala	Center for International Environment Law 15 Rue des Savoises 1205 Geneva Switzerland	Tel: +41 22 321 4774 (Dalindyebo) Email: nbernasconi@ciel.org , Email: dshabalala@ciel.org
Carin Smaller	Trade Information Project Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Geneva Office 15 rue des Savoises Geneva 1205 Switzerland	Tel: +41 22 789 0734 Fax: +41 22 789 0733 Email: csmaller@iatp.org
Clive George	Senior Research Fellow Institute for Development Policy and Management University of Manchester Manchester M13 9QH United Kingdom Cambridge, CB3 0DL United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 161 275 0812 Fax: +44 161 275 0423 Email: clive.george@manchester.ac.uk
Riaz Tayyab	Third World Network Rue de Lausanne 36 1201 Geneva Switzerland	Tel: +41 22 908 35 50 Fax: +41 22 908 35 51

UNEP-ETB

Name	Organisation and address	Contact details
Hussein Abaza	Chief UNEP/ETB International Environment House 11 Chemin des Anémones 1219 Châtelaine Switzerland	Tel.+41.22.917.8179 Email: houssein.abaza@unep.ch
Benjamin Simmons	Legal Officer	Tel.+ 41.22.917.8361 Email: benjamin.simmons@unep.ch
Vera Weick	Programme Officer	Tel.+41.22.917.8151 Email: vera.weick@unep.ch
Fulai Sheng	Economic Affairs Officer	Tel.+41.22.917.8168 Email: fulai.sheng@unep.ch
Mireille Perrin Decorzent	Consultant	Tel.+41.22.917.8255 E-mail: mireille.perrindecorzent@unep.ch
Michael Chang	Consultant	Tel : Tel.+41.22.917.8487 Email : michael.chang@unep.ch
Marie Gibert	Intern	Tel.+41.22.917.1234 Email: marie.gibert@unep.ch
Sobia Zafar	Intern	Tel.+41.22.917.8695 Email: sobia.zafar@unep.ch
Natacha Benarbia	Intern	Tel.+41.22.917.8695 Email: natacha.benarbia@unep.ch
Chloe Hill	Intern	Tel.+41.22.917.8642 Email: chloe.hill@unep.ch

Annex 5.2. Agenda

Monday, 26 November 2007 (Rhin and Aare)

Time	Session
9:00- 9:30	Registration
9:30-10:00	Introduction to workshop (where we stand, objectives and programme) <i>UNEP-ETB</i>
10:00-10:30	Coffee break
10:30-11:00	Presentation of country project: <i>Jamaica</i>
11:00-11.30	Presentation of country project: <i>Mauritius</i>
11:30-12:00	<i>Discussion</i>
12:00-13:00	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
13:00-13:30	Presentation of country project: <i>Cameroon</i>
13:30-14:00	Presentation of country project: <i>Madagascar</i>
14:00-14:30	<i>Discussion</i>
14:30-15:00	Coffee break
15:00-15:30	Presentation of country project: <i>Uganda</i>
15:30-16:00	Presentation of country project: <i>Papua New Guinea</i>
16:00-16:30	<i>Discussion</i>
16:30-17:00	Wrap-up discussion and preparations for next day

Tuesday, 27 November 2007 (Rhin and Aare)

Time	Session (Room Rhin and Aare)
9:00-9:30	Registration
9:30-9:45	Welcome remarks <i>Hussein Abaza, Chief UNEP-Economics and Trade Branch</i>
9:45-10:45	Overview on implementation of UNEP's Trade and Biodiversity Initiative and the 6 country projects <i>Vera Weick, UNEP-ETB, and Country Teams</i>
10:45-11:15	Coffee break
11:15-12:00	Presentation and discussion of Trade and Biodiversity Manual <i>Mireille Perrin Decorzent, UNEP-ETB</i>
12:00-13:00	EU-ACP Negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements: update and key issues <i>John Clarke, Deputy Head, Delegation of the European Commission to the WTO</i>
13:00-14:00	Sandwich Lunch in International Environment House 2
14:00-15:00	Assessing Biodiversity Impacts <i>Discussion of main issues and challenges</i> <i>Facilitator: Vera Weick, UNEP-ETB</i>
15:00-15:30	Coffee break
15:30-16:30	Integrated assessment and impact on policy and decision-making <i>Discussion of main issues and challenges</i> <i>Facilitator: Fulai Sheng, UNEP-ETB</i>
16:30-17:00	Wrap-up discussion
17:00-17:45	Bilateral with Jamaica

Wednesday, 28 November 2007

Morning: IEH 2 - Rooms Rhin and Aare
Afternoon: IEH 1 - Rooms 4 and 5

Time	Session
9:30-9:45	Programme and objectives of the day <i>UNEP-ETB</i>
9:45-10:30	Measuring Biodiversity and Socio-Economic Impacts – Selection and Use of Indicators <i>Jan Joost Kessler, AIDEnvironment</i>
10:30-10:45	Coffee Break
10:45-11:30	Valuation of Biodiversity and Biodiversity Resources and Functions <i>Markus Lehmann, CBD Secretariat</i>
11:30-12:15	Scenario Development – The Case of the SIA of the EMFTA <i>Clive George, University of Manchester</i>
12:15-13:15	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
IEH 1	Bilaterals – Room 4
	Working Groups – Room 5
13:15-14:00	Bilateral: Mauritius
	<u>Working groups:</u> Papua New Guinea + Uganda (13:15-15:15 and 16:15-17:00) Cameroon + Madagascar (13:15-14:00 and 15:30-17:00)
14:00-14:45	Bilateral: Madagascar
14:45-15:30	Bilateral: Cameroon
	<u>Working Group:</u> Jamaica+ Mauritius (14:00-17:00)
15:30-16:15	Bilateral: Papua New Guinea
16:15-17:00	Bilateral: Uganda
	Coffee Break (served outside meeting rooms at 15:00)

Annex 5.3. Working group sessions

5.3.1. Instructions

The group work sessions will take place as follows:

- Papua New Guinea + Uganda (13:30-15:30)
- Cameroon + Madagascar (13:30-14:30 and 15:30-16:30)
- Jamaica+ Mauritius (14:30-16:30)

Please document the results of your group work on a piece of paper to be handed in to UNEP at the end of the session.

Task 1: Planning for First National Review Workshop and identification of important project activities' milestones in 2008 (approx. 1 hour)

Develop an outline for the first national review meeting of the project (for both countries) by taking into consideration the following questions:

1. What is the objective of the workshop?
2. What do you expect to get out of it (i.e. expected results)?
3. What would be a good timing for the workshop in your country?
4. Who will take the lead at organising the workshop, what will be presented and by whom?
5. Who will be invited and how many people will you invite?
6. What input do you expect from the stakeholders invited?
7. How can you ensure that stakeholders are able to provide the desired input?
8. How could you make sure that all the stakeholders involved will have a similar level of understanding of the project (not all may have been involved to the same extent in the process)?
9. Do you see any issues that could be controversial during the workshop? (Will certain stakeholders pursue special interests? Are they likely to be disagreement about findings of the study? etc.)
10. What would be the most important actions following the workshop? Please identify important milestones in project activities for 2008 leading to the finalisation of the assessment study.

Task 2: How to make an impact on decision-making? (approx. 1 hour)

In this brainstorming exercise, we would like you to reflect on the impact that your project and the related study will have on decision-making in your country (for both countries). For this you could consider the following questions:

1. From where you stand at the moment in the project, what is your feeling: Will the study have an impact on decision making in your country?
2. What would be the expected impact?
3. What are the most critical decisions/negotiations/policies that need to be influenced?
4. Who are the decision-makers that would benefit from the results of the project/study?
5. Which problems do you see in this respect?
6. Which institutional, political and/or economic factors could prevent relevant decision-makers from considering the findings and implementing the recommendations?
7. What can you do in the next months to make sure that the project/study will have an impact on decision-making?
8. What can you draw from this discussion for next phase of the project (following the finalization of the integrated assessment), which will include the development of a national action plan and its implementation?

5.3.2. Group work: Jamaica and Mauritius

Jamaica will officially launch its country project followed by a national workshop provisionally arranged for March 2008. The rationale behind the scheduled date reflects all the preparation needed in order to ensure that the event will attract most attention and receive utmost input from key stakeholders both in the private and public sectors, as well as key research institutions. As the current status quo appears untenable, there is likely to be a particular focus on various biofuel and other land-use options, and the environmental implications of each option.

Mauritius will have a country workshop in the first quarter of the following year. The workshop is planned after a series of local festivals in Mauritius. The workshop will incorporate all the relevant stakeholders from the ministries, NGOs, the private sector and research institutes. While it may be difficult to keep all participants on the same level of knowledge about the project *per se*, emails and posts containing all the relevant documents, assessment work and workshop logistics will be sent prior to the workshop. This will ensure that all the participants can have as much information as possible before coming to the workshop.

When discussing how the Initiative overall, and the country projects in particular, will affect their national policies, both countries stated that it will depend on a variety of different factors. Some of these factors include, among others, the government's own agenda, potential gains from the EC trade negotiations, the degree of private sector lobby and the domestic political climate. It is therefore safe to say that the various factors influencing policy making will go beyond simply economics.

An important distinction between the two island states lies in the nature of farmers' employment in the sugar industry. While the majority of employees in the Jamaican sugar industry are cane-cutters with limited alternative expertise, in Mauritius farmers are mostly dependent on other sources of revenue than sugarcane. The Mauritius country team suggested that this part time employment structure render the capture of some important socio-economic indicators and data particularly challenging.

Moreover, both countries claim to have the capacity to obtain quantitative data on their production of sugar and to a lesser extent the level of local biodiversity on the islands. The tricky question is how to use these existing data in the context of a predetermined environmental valuation technique in order to assess the impact on biodiversity loss. The assessment progress is also hampered by dynamic changes in international trade policy, which may lead to compounding effect in the study.

Finally, both countries reaffirm their strong desire to have a real policy impact through their current and upcoming country project activities. Their desires correspond directly with the planned second phase of the initiative that will focus on the actual implementation with real policy impact on the ground.

5.3.3. Group work: Uganda and PNG

Part 1: Planning for First National Review Workshop and identification of important project activities' milestones in 2008

What is the objective of the workshop?

Uganda: to update the project

Receiving feedback from the participants on the draft report

PNG: review and update the project

What do you expect to get out of it (i.e. expected results)?

Uganda: receiving inputs from stakeholders

What would be a good timing for the workshop in your country?

PNG: organizing the workshop in April 2008

Uganda: organizing the workshop in March 2008

Who will take the lead at organising the workshop, what will be presented and by whom?

PNG: NARI will take the lead. The study will be presented by NARI

Uganda: NEMA will take the lead. EPRC will present the study

Who will be invited and how many people will you invite?

PNG: 30-40 people will be invited.

People who will be invited: the core group who can give feedback, representatives from Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Commerce and Industry, private sector, NGOs, media, National Economic Council in the PM Cabinet (NECPM), NARI, National Research Institute, Academic institute (Vudal Agricultural University), farmers groups, Commercial Statutory Authorities (CSAs), National Planning and Monitoring Department, Coffee and oil palm representatives.

Uganda: Max 40 people will be invited.

People who will be invited: people in the capacity building workshop, representatives from Ministry of Trade, Finance, Agriculture, Environment, Tourism, Energy and Water, Technical Committee on biodiversity, Steering Committee, Research institutions, private sector, NGOs, CSO, Bureau of standards/statistics, media.

What input do you expect from the stakeholders invited?

PNG: criticisms, inputs, finding consensus

Uganda: corrections, additions/inputs, agreement/endorsement

How can you ensure that stakeholders are able to provide the desired input?

PNG: Draft report to be circulated to stakeholders and NSC for comments before review workshop, Anticipating the comments. Getting pre-comments of the workshop

Uganda: circulate the paper beforehand. Finding a facilitator. Getting specific answers on specific issues

How could you make sure that all the stakeholders involved will have a similar level of understanding of the project (not all may have been involved to the same extent in the process)?

PNG: Invite people who were in the capacity building workshops.

Do you see any issues that could be controversial during the workshop? (Will certain stakeholders pursue special interests? Are they likely to be disagreement about findings of the study? etc.)

PNG: Entrenched views between people promoting trade on one hand and people trying to conserve biodiversity on the other hand. There may be also fear among oil palm and coffee industry feeling that the study will have a negative impact on their expansion (growth of their sectors)

Uganda: Flower sector. Pollution. Wages. Use of agrochemicals

What would be the most important actions following the workshop? Please identify important milestones in project activities for 2008 leading to the finalisation of the assessment study.

PNG: The core team will take comments from the meeting. Try to make new recommendations.

Submit draft copy of the report to UNEP

Uganda: Address comments. Finalize the draft report. Hold a Steering Committee and present the draft report. Submit the draft report to UNEP. Development of the National Action Plan.

Part 2: How to make an impact on decision-making?

From where you stand at the moment in the project, what is your current feeling: Will the study have an impact on decision making in your country?

PNG: The study might have some impacts on trade policies, especially on the Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS) (the next revision will be done in 2010). Possible influence on NBSAP, Strategic Plans of the Oil Palm and Coffee Industries,

Uganda: They hope that the study will contribute to a better understanding/knowledge of the issue. The study may cause some effects on the decision-making and it will be especially due to previous studies that were already presented. It also may influence the NBSAP.

What would be the expected impact?

PNG: limited impacts but hopefully there could be some positive replications on other sectors.

Uganda: Hard to tell. Hope that people will realize the importance of the impacts of the implementation of the EPAs on the flower sector.

What are the most critical decisions/negotiations/policies that need to be influenced?

PNG: EPAs, PACER, PICTA, MSG, bilateral trade agreements, corporate plans for coffee and oil palm (2005-2010)

Uganda: implementation of the EPAs, PEAP revision process, NBSAP, WTO negotiations, bilateral Trade Agreements, Water and Energy policies

Who are the decision-makers that would benefit from the results of the project/study?

PNG: Decision makers in Trade and Agriculture

Uganda: Ministries of Trade, Environment, decision makers in the agriculture sector

Which problems do you see in this respect?

PNG: The issue of timing will be problematic

Uganda: Cabinet delays, cabinet approval

Which institutional, political and/or economic factors could prevent relevant decision-makers from considering the findings and implementing the recommendations?

PNG: Turnover in Ministries. Staff changes. Problem of continuity and consistency

Uganda: Problem of funds, political will, turnover in ministries, staff changes, incoherence of policies.

What can you do in the next months to make sure that the project/study will have an impact on decision-making?

PNG: Sharing the information with people who will support the recommendations. It is also recommended to explore the following three options in terms of focus of the IA study:

- (i) keep the current project focus and objectives and identify advantages and disadvantages of the Tariff Reduction Policy and make recommendations on sector policies related to environmental conservation and protection (NBSAP), trade (National trade policy still under formulation) and agriculture (National Agriculture Development Plan 2007-20016).
- (ii) Look at MTDS and see which area of MTDS the IA study will influence (very broad policy).
- (iii) Try to influence the Oil Palm and Coffee Industry Strategic Plans.

Uganda: looking for new opportunities, sharing information with the people they would like to influence

What can you draw from this discussion for next phase of the project (following the finalization of the integrated assessment), which will include the development of a national action plan and its implementation?

PNG: Getting full involvement of the stakeholders. A better coordination among them. Getting data collection in environment

Uganda: Need for time, resources. Finding the right allies to influence. Getting primary data in their sector. Selling the project to national working groups (sector of environment and natural resources, agriculture, economic services).

5.3.4. Group work (Madagascar and Cameroon)

▪ Madagascar :

La méthodologie a été établie et des débuts de test de celle-ci sur le terrain ont eu lieu. L'organisation de différents ateliers a permis de mettre à jour de nouvelles idées, venues compléter les recherches bibliographiques entreprises. Concernant la restitution des résultats, 2 réunions majeures sont prévues en 2008 :

- une réunion de restitution au milieu de l'année
- une réunion de validation nationale en fin d'année.

Madagascar assure qu'il est prévu d'envoyer l'étude aux différents acteurs avant l'atelier de restitution pour permettre d'avoir une base de discussion et d'amendements avec les membres du comité de pilotage, des experts et quelques décideurs. Nous leur demandons si un membre de l'UNEP serait souhaitable aussi. La réponse est unanime car cette réunion est jugée clef. A la suite de ces remarques, il apparaît que cette réunion clef, et dont les commentaires seront si importants pour améliorer le rapport par la suite, correspond tout à fait à l'esprit du National Review Meeting.

Dès Décembre 2007 ou Janvier 2008, l'équipe du projet va envoyer à l'UNEP une première version améliorée du rapport envoyé en novembre 2007 sur la base des commentaires de l'UNEP, obtenus avant le meeting de Genève. 3^{ème} semaine de janvier : réunion avec le comité de pilotage avec les mêmes objectifs que celle prévue au Cameroun. Cette réunion est censée donner des orientations plus précises sur l'étude (draft assessment study) et au technical report. Il s'agit aussi de définir les outils en plus du cadre de la méthodologie et de les utiliser sur le terrain.

Des contributions reçus après la tenue de l'atelier de Genève indiquent que l'agenda des activités pourrait se dérouler comme suit:

- Semaine du 16 décembre 2007: restitution des acquis de Genève.
- Semaine du 23 décembre ou 1^{ère} semaine de janvier 2008: validation de la version améliorée du rapport élaborée par l'ESSA/Forêts et envoi au PNUE de ce rapport validé par le Point Focal.
- Avant les réunions de restitution et validation de l'étude, il est important de finaliser les études de terrain et d'organiser les différentes réunions/discussions relatives aux études de cas.

Les principales difficultés rencontrées :

- La difficulté tient au fait de devoir lier les termes clefs mais contradictoires de conservation des écosystèmes face à l'élaboration d'une politique commerciale. Conservation versus valorisation.
- Les difficultés sont aussi inhérentes au terrain de recherche : les mangroves, qui sont des espaces fragmentés où se concentrent les problèmes.
- Problèmes de coordination entre les membres de l'équipe du projet qui sont reconnus et devraient être résolus notamment grâce au manuel de procédure établi.

▪ Cameroun :

Pour le Cameroun, le travail d'évaluation et de rédaction de l'évaluation intégrée prend plus de temps que ce qui avait été prévu au départ. Les enquêtes de terrain prennent beaucoup de temps et le consultant vient juste de démarrer. De fait, pour le moment, les données disponibles sont surtout issues du travail de recherches bibliographiques. Grâce au meeting genevois qui s'achève, la country team estime cependant que les nouvelles méthodes acquises vont permettre de relancer les recherches et de modifier et d'améliorer le travail de terrain. Le Cameroun a d'ailleurs prévu la tenue d'une réunion avec le comité de pilotage pour faire un compte rendu du meeting de Genève.

La country team du Cameroun souhaite clarifier à nouveau l'agenda de 2008 et redéfinir chacune des étapes attendues et les objectifs associés :

Au terme de l'échange il est conclu que :

- la 3^{ème} semaine de janvier aura lieu une réunion de restitution des acquis de Genève avec les membres du comité de pilotage. Cette réunion a un double objectif :

1/ Relancer le processus de recherche et de travail de terrain, destiné à l'élaboration de l'étude d'évaluation intégrée qui a pris du retard. La question de la méthodologie surtout doit être centrale, c'est un point difficile qui freine le déroulement de l'étude pour le moment.

2/ Présenter l'agenda de l'année 2008 avec les différentes étapes à venir et les objectifs associés

- de janvier à mai : les recherches doivent être menées par le consultant sur le terrain, un travail précis d'analyse de ces données doit être conduit afin d'avoir dès mi-mai une première mouture du rapport avec des conclusions précises et chiffrées et déjà une ébauche concernant les réponses politiques possibles.

- mi-mai, une fois cette première mouture de l'étude achevée, il est nécessaire de l'envoyer à tous les participants du National Review Meeting qui doit se tenir un mois après environ.

Des doutes sont émis sur le fait que les politiques invités liront ce rapport. Il est proposé alors, pour contrer ce problème, d'envoyer le rapport accompagné d'une note ferme, exigeant l'envoi par mails de feedbacks et commentaires. Le message doit faire comprendre que toute personne n'ayant pas manifesté son intérêt n'aura pas sa place au Meeting. On souligne également l'importance de l'informel au Cameroun et le fait de parler du projet et de l'avancée du rapport en différentes occasions. Ce travail préliminaire de réseau semble essentiel. L'équipe annonce avoir également rendez-vous en janvier directement avec des ministres (forêt et faune, et environnement) pour faire le point sur l'avancée du projet. Le ministre du commerce n'a pas encore été contacté, cette question devient urgente.

- fin juin/ début juillet : tenue du National Review Meeting.

Objectif : Il s'agit de présenter les résultats de l'étude et des premières propositions de réponses et de débattre pour proposer des améliorations. Le pays réaffirme le besoin de la venue d'un membre de l'UNEP et d'experts internationaux pour donner leur point de vue technique. L'équipe exprime aussi son souhait de pouvoir envoyer le rapport au préalable à l'UNEP, pour commentaires critiques et évaluation.

Il est suggéré de miser sur un seul jour de meeting mais avec un travail préliminaire soutenu, de contact avec les participants et de circulation du document. Les avis sont partagés car les acteurs lisent rarement le dossier au préalable et préféreraient deux jours de meeting avec une présentation in extenso du rapport, ce qui reviendrait presque à une lecture en commun pour être certain que tout le monde est informé. De plus, la question essentielle des réponses politiques risque de n'être abordée qu'en fin de journée et donc de ne pas être traitées.

→ 30 personnes sont attendues environ, dont les 15 membres du comité de pilotage (dont certains représentent la société civile et les ONGs)

- juillet/octobre : phase de finalisation du rapport, en y intégrant les apports du National Review Meeting. Les réponses politiques proposées (policy design) doivent aussi être affinées à ce moment là.

- octobre : envoi du rapport finalisé aux différents acteurs

- novembre : organisation du meeting de validation du projet, avec le poids important des acteurs politiques, avec qui le contact a dû être ininterrompu, afin de les tenir au courant de l'avancée du projet et de les intégrer constamment.

La country team exprime vivement le souhait de la présence d'un membre de l'UNEP à nouveau pour cette étape de validation politique. Selon l'équipe, sans cette présence, le projet resterait très marginal dans le pays. Si la présence de l'UNEP au National Review Meeting de juin/juillet est jugée technique, la présence en novembre, à la réunion de validation, est jugée stratégique. Seule cette présence est capable de donner de l'ampleur au projet.