



# 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

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

Geneva  
1-3 July 2008

## MEETING REPORT

### Table of contents

1. Introduction	page 3
2. Issues covered in workshop and main achievements	page 3
3. Summary by sessions	page 5
4. Conclusions	page 9
5. Annexes	page 12
Annex 5.1. List of Participants	
Annex 5.2. Workshop Agenda	
Annex 5.3. Guidelines for Working Group Sessions	



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



## **1. Introduction**

UNEP's Economics and Trade Branch (ETB) organised on 1-3 July 2008 in Geneva the Second International Review Meeting for the Initiative on Integrated Assessment of Trade-related Policies in the Agricultural Sector and Biological Diversity.<sup>1</sup>

The main objectives of the meeting were:

- (i) To review progress of the six country projects implemented in Cameroon, Jamaica, Mauritius, Madagascar, Uganda and Papua New Guinea.
- (ii) To discuss major challenges and opportunities encountered during the integrated assessment (IA) process, including data collection and methodologies, stakeholder consultations, development of policy recommendations and influencing decision-making.
- (iii) To provide the opportunity to share information and experiences among country project teams and with international experts of the Core Advisory Group (CAG).
- (iv) To identify specific actions needed to complete the IAs by the end of 2008 and to prepare for the implementation phase in 2009.
- (v) To discuss and obtain feedback on manuals on integrated and biodiversity assessment developed by the project.

The first day and a half of the meeting was devoted to country presentations of the IAs. Country presentations were followed by discussion sessions including country teams, UNEP ETB staff and members of the CAG. There was also a session to obtain feedback from country teams on the guidance provided in the Manual 'Incorporating Biodiversity into Integrated Assessments of Trade Policy in the Agriculture Sector'. The afternoon of the second day and the morning of the third day were spent in working group sessions. These sessions gave country teams the opportunity to work with technical advisors on issues specific to their project in a structured manner. The final session of the meeting allowed country teams to present the results of their working groups focusing on the next steps forward to complete the IAs and the policy recommendations.

Section 2 of this report summarises the main issues discussed during the workshop and key achievements. Section 3 provides an overview of the sessions. Conclusions are provided in section 4. Section 5 contains annexes including the agenda, participants' list, and guidelines for the working group sessions. All presentations given at the meeting can be found at:

[http://www.unep.ch/etb/events/2008\\_ReviewMtgBiodiv1-3July.php](http://www.unep.ch/etb/events/2008_ReviewMtgBiodiv1-3July.php)

## **2. Issues covered and achievements of workshop**

This meeting provided the opportunity to review the status of the IA studies, to provide guidance on how to overcome challenges constraining progress in the assessments and, in some cases, to use the findings of the assessment to develop policy recommendations. Presentations by country teams demonstrated clear progress in different aspects of the assessment process:

**Stakeholder Consultation.** Since the last meeting at the end of 2007, the projects have successfully undertaken stakeholder consultation at the national level through national review meetings and/or stakeholder consultation workshops in the spring of 2008. The success of stakeholder consultation differs across countries and depends on high-level involvement, timing, developing a well formulated strategy for disseminating the findings of the IA and getting support.

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information about this initiative, please see: <http://www.unep.ch/etb/areas/biodivAgriSector.php>

**Integrated Assessment method.** Progress in the focus of the IAs, conceptual frameworks, indicators, data collection, and assessment has been good in most cases. The development of a small number of specific and quantifiable indicators to assess impacts seemed to still present a challenge to some teams and the working group sessions addressed this issue. Analytical methodologies and data collection tools were discussed and efforts were made to simplify assessments to what can realistically be achieved in the time remaining.

**Biodiversity measurement.** There is continued difficulty to obtain biodiversity data and to develop biodiversity indicators in the projects despite additional guidance developed by the advisors after the first international review meeting (a focused manual on biodiversity assessment was distributed in January 2008). Project teams will focus on this component in order to complete the IAs.

**Scenarios.** The use of scenarios (or assessment components) has been helpful in structuring the IAs and in encouraging project teams to formulate likely situations for which to develop policy recommendations. As they guide the assessment, it is important that these scenarios are realistic and achievable, that they provide a range of outcomes, and that they allow trade offs to be considered and selected.

**UNEP support.** Country studies have progressed at different rates and further technical advice may be required for those studies encountering difficulties. The participation of UNEP staff and consultants in the national review meetings and stakeholder consultations in the spring of 2008 was considered to be extremely valuable. UNEP participation served to assist in the general understanding of the IA process and working out technical and methodological issues on the ground; it also provided critical political support in ensuring attendance at stakeholder meetings and encouraging longer term involvement of stakeholders.

#### **Box. Summary of country projects' focus**

<b>Jamaica:</b>	Social, economic and environmental costs and benefits of changes in the sugar cane industry due to the loss of trade preferences following reform of the EU-ACP Sugar Protocol.
<b>Mauritius:</b>	Social, economic and environmental impact of changes in the sugar cane industry due to the loss of trade preferences following reform of the EU-ACP Sugar Protocol (via the MultiAnnual Adaptation Strategy (MAAS)).
<b>Cameroon:</b>	Impacts of the national law (No.2004/025) which liberalised the cacao sector.
<b>Madagascar:</b>	Impacts of national plan (the Plan Directeur currently being negotiated) in response to loss of trade preferences with EU in the aquaculture shrimp sector and the potential of certification schemes.
<b>Uganda:</b>	Impacts of trade liberalisation (EU-ACP negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements) on the horticulture sector, land use and biodiversity.
<b>Papua New Guinea</b>	Impacts of trade liberalisation measures (tariff reduction) on the production of major export crops (coffee and palm oil) and two major staple food crops (taro and sweet potato).

### **3. Summary of sessions**

#### **FIRST DAY**

##### **3.1. Overview of Trade and Biodiversity Initiative**

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

Activities for the next few months include completion of the IA studies by the end of 2008 in order to allow country teams to focus on implementing policy recommendations in 2009, the final year of the project. Final draft IAs should therefore be submitted by the end of October 2008 for review and comments. As it is not clear what activities will be included in the implementation phase, UNEP hopes to organise a meeting early in 2009 to assist project teams to work out strategies and activities for implementation of policy recommendations.

##### **3.2 Cameroon**

The main focus of the IA project in **Cameroon** is the 2004 National Trade Law which liberalised the cocoa sector, and the economic, social and environmental impacts of liberalisation. The study addresses the effect that liberalisation has had on the area under cocoa plantations (data on land use and satellite imagery are still being collected) including whether the expansion of cocoa farms is at the expense of natural forest land or land used for the production of other crops. The preliminary findings are that most expansion is on forest land and that habitat fragmentation and biodiversity loss are significant.

The proposed scenarios to be assessed include (1) increased production through intensification on existing farms, (2) expansion based on organic production methods, (3) expansion based on agro-forestry and (4) expansion based on conventional extensive production systems. The impacts on biodiversity, carbon sequestration, other ecosystem services, and cocoa revenue will be quantified for each scenario when data collection is complete. Organic cocoa production currently does not appear promising in Cameroon given the fact that cocoa produced in forestry areas requires significant amounts of pesticide to guarantee adequate productivity levels.

The discussion session addressed the issue of changes in cocoa prices since liberalisation (as increased cocoa prices are the main incentive for expansion of production) and what impact rapidly increasing commodity prices are currently having in Cameroon. Despite liberalisation, it seems that cocoa prices to producers in Cameroon are variable and rather low. There is evidence, however, that expansion of cocoa production is occurring and that this expansion is based on the conversion of forest land; satellite imagery will be used to identify the rate of conversion in the coming months. Specific information on biodiversity is currently being gathered. The conceptual framework indicates that there are opportunities to implement policy recommendations promoting cocoa plantation expansion based on agro-forestry models of production.

##### **3.3 Uganda**

The IA in **Uganda** aims to assist the Government to put in place policies that minimise biodiversity loss due to the expansion of the horticulture sector resulting from the policies based on the EU-ACP negotiations on EPAs. The EPA negotiations are expected to provide increased market access for the horticulture sector to the EU. Increased trade will potentially produce incentives for increases in land conversion and in the use of agro-chemicals, water and energy. The IA study is based on three scenarios: (1) 'business as usual' where Uganda maintains the current trading

pattern and continues to run a large trade deficit with the EU; (2) 'exponential trade growth' in which Uganda increases the contribution of trade to GDP from 39 to 80 percent by 2025, (3) 'balanced trade' under which Uganda equalises the value of exports to the EU with the value of imports from the EU by 2025. The implications for trade, employment, land conversion, agro-chemical, energy and water use, and biodiversity loss are explored for each scenario. The assessment concludes that the best scenario from an economic perspective is that which balances trade; however, this scenario has the greatest negative impact on the environment and biodiversity. The development of policy recommendations will further investigate how best to assess trade offs between growth and the environment.

The environment's capacity to absorb a significant expansion of the horticulture sector was questioned in the discussion. The targets for water, agro-chemical and energy use in the IA are ambitious and may be too costly or difficult to achieve. In this case, it may be useful to discuss alternatives to horticultural expansion. Another issue raised was whether the scenarios and the assumptions used were based on Uganda's situation and objectives or on the content of the agreement between Uganda and the EU currently being negotiated. Other issues discussed include the critical need to develop water treatment facilities in Uganda where water supply is currently not a constraint and the potential of organic production methods for the horticulture sector. An important question for the project team was precisely how biodiversity loss is linked to land use – the IA assumes a national rate of biodiversity loss from land conversion without taking account of the types of land being converted to different uses. It was highlighted that there are different ways of expanding the horticulture sector and care should be taken in directing that expansion onto land which minimises biodiversity loss. A recurring issue was the need to obtain biodiversity data and how to value that biodiversity.

### 3.4 Jamaica

The country project in **Jamaica** focuses on the sugar industry which is not competitive in international markets but which has survived due to the political environment and trade preferences with the EU. With the phasing out of trade preferences, the IA focuses on identifying the likely costs and benefits of different land use scenarios for areas previously planted to sugar cane. If the current plan for diversification into ethanol production succeeds (scenario 1), sugar cane production would continue at current levels or increase, imports of fossil fuels would be reduced, and employment in the sector would be maintained or increased; however, the impact on the environment and biodiversity would be negative. If the plan fails (scenario 2), there would be a loss of foreign exchange and an increase in unemployment. However, land would be available for other uses; further research is being undertaken to explore these options. One option is to rehabilitate land and restore it to its previous state. Alternatively, the development of a cellulosic ethanol industry would be based on reforestation and sustainable management of forests (with climate change mitigation benefits). Both these options provide opportunities for significant environmental benefits. The third scenario is that the industry contracts and becomes competitive in response to the loss of trade preferences. This would have positive economic effects with some unemployment. The environmental impact would be positive with production concentrated on efficient estates; some land taken out of sugar cane production would be available for other uses.

Sugar has been grown in Jamaica for five centuries, so the main biodiversity loss due to the conversion of forest land to sugar cane production took place hundreds of years ago. This study will assess land use options which would either maintain or improve current levels of biodiversity and environmental quality (in some cases there might be a small negative effect). The project team seems to have an opportunity to promote improved land management either through the rehabilitation of land or the promotion of eco-tourism which is an important sector for the economy. It was pointed out that although terrestrial biodiversity is not currently being lost, the water turbidity resulting from sugar cane processing is damaging coral reefs and has negative impacts on marine biodiversity. Discussion also covered the need for Jamaica to develop a sustainable energy policy due to a rapid growth in energy consumption in the face of little growth in productivity and GDP.

However, the production of sugar cane, whether for sugar or ethanol, will likely never be competitive with producers like Brazil. Land use options should consider tourism and forestry for cellulosic ethanol/butanol/octanol production. Jamaica had good success in the stakeholder consultations and attributed this to opening up the decision-making process and careful timing throughout the assessment process.

### 3.5 Mauritius

The government of **Mauritius** has developed a Multi-annual Adaptation Strategy (MAAS) to ensure the commercial viability and sustainability of the sugar sector faced with loss of trade preferences with the EU. The MAAS is being financed through the European Union “accompanying measures” negotiated in conjunction with the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements. Revenue from sugar exports is equal to 17 percent of foreign exchange earnings and up to 4.5 percent of GDP. The 36 percent reduction in sugar prices received from the EU will have a significant impact (unlike in Jamaica where the sugar sector contributes little to the economy). The MAAS includes six policy options: (i) regrouping small farmers; (ii) sustaining difficult areas under sugar cane; (iii) moving out of sugar cane; (iv) centralisation; (v) adjustment of the labour force; (vi) shift to ethanol production.

The IA study reviews these six options using two types of focus groups: small farmers and large corporations. The objective is not to choose between options which are intended to be different components of the adaptation strategy. Many of the larger industrial sugar producers in Mauritius have already begun to adapt to price changes by exploring the production of refined sugar in Mauritius and the potential for increasing production of sugar-based ethanol. Currently, the assessment team is considering the following potential scenarios for responding to challenges facing the sugar sector:

- Diversification to other foods crops (fruit and vegetables)
- Development of land into real estate
- Conversion of land for use with livestock
- Conversion of land to forests
- Abandonment of land

### 3.6 Session on Feedback on Manual

Nathalie Olsen, Consultant, UNEP-ETB, provided a brief overview of the written guidance that has been provided under this initiative. The Manual on ‘Incorporating Biodiversity into Integrated Assessments of Trade Policy in the Agriculture Sector’ which was prepared in the first year of the project by international experts is currently in two volumes. Volume I is a practical step-by-step guide outlining the main stages of IA, sub-divided into actions and action sheets to help guide users. Volume II is a supplementary reference document which includes chapters on the relationship between agricultural trade and biodiversity, the trade policy making process, stakeholder participation, the conceptual framework, valuation and other tools, and a glossary of terms related to integrated assessment. Additional guidance on biodiversity assessment was requested at the first international review meeting in 2007; the team of advisors prepared a ‘General Guidance on Assessment of Biodiversity’ which was circulated to country teams in January 2008.

The objective of this session was to gather feedback from users on which to base the revision and further development of these manuals. The general feeling was that the manual was useful and provided good guidance on the necessary steps of an IA (Volume I) and necessary background information (Volume II). However, it was felt that unless people had a background in IA, some of the material was difficult to understand. There seemed to be a misunderstanding that the Manual should be discussed with and used by stakeholders in the consultation process. While the

approach of the Manual is clear, the inclusion of specific examples of high quality IAs would assist teams to understand how to apply given procedures.

The step by step approach of Volume I was found to be somewhat rigid and country teams stressed the need for flexibility in the process of IA. The very structured approach was found difficult to adapt in some country situations. It was mentioned that UNEP is currently working on an Integrated Policy Manual based on building blocks which does not require a sequential process. It was also felt that inclusion of guidance on how to assess the policy context in order to adapt the process and timing of the IA to bring on board as many stakeholders as possible and to minimise resistance was needed. Further guidance on how to place the assessment process in the political context was requested. In fact, such guidance has been included in previous UNEP assessment material and UNEP will address the issue of incorporating this topic into the current Manual.

When the Manual was being developed, it was decided to produce a manual that provides steps and activities rather than general instructions. This decision was based on feedback received from 35 countries in which assessments have been undertaken in the past few years with support from UNEP. The need for flexibility has to be balanced with the need to provide sufficient information on conceptual issues and the minimum methodological steps required to complete a useful IA. The Manual should be a resource for countries in the assessment process when no external funding or technical guidance is available.

Volume II was seen to provide good background material to understand the subject area and the process of IA, particularly the conceptual framework and trade and biodiversity links. The 'Tools' section was somewhat difficult to understand; too many tools were presented with little guidance on how and when to apply them. A number of advisors also felt this section needed further work to be useful for practitioners with limited resources. Markus Lehmann has already committed to revising the section on valuation based on his experience working with the Cameroon project.

The manuals are available at:

<http://www.unep.ch/etb/pdf/UNEP%20T+B%20Manual.Vol%20I.Draft.June07.pdf>

<http://www.unep.ch/etb/pdf/UNEP%20T+B%20Manual.Vol%20II.Draft%20June07.pdf>

## SECOND DAY

### 3.7 Madagascar

The **Madagascar** study focuses on the impact on shrimp aquaculture of the 'Plan Directeur' which promotes increased agricultural production and exports in face of lost trade preferences with the EU. The shrimp aquaculture sector is largely foreign owned, but is an important source of foreign exchange. Due to high production costs, without trade preferences Malagasi shrimp exports are not competitive on international markets. For this reason and to minimise the environmental impacts of aquaculture, a certification scheme is considered which would allow exporters to charge a price premium based on either sound environmental production methods or superior quality. Sound management and regulation are important as shrimp aquaculture has been shown to contribute to mangrove deforestation, coastal erosion, and water and soil pollution.

The first scenario considered is liberalisation plus weak commitment by the state which would result in a drop in production and exports, unemployment and mangrove degradation as international production standards no longer apply and resources become overexploited. The second scenario involves implementation of a certification scheme, with or without government support. If a government supported certification scheme were successful exports and employment would increase while the mangroves would be protected under strict management programmes and illegal exploitation would be punished.

The Madagascar study is in the early stages and data and evidence are still being collected. There has been some difficulty gaining access to information as the shrimp sector is not forthcoming with the information it has. The study focuses on the national plan rather than external trade policies as the national plan can be influenced and adjusted based on policy recommendations.

### 3.8 Papua New Guinea

The objective of the **PNG** study is to assess the impact of the expansion of oil palm and coffee production on the production of staple food crops - taro and sweet potato – and on their agro-biodiversity, as a result of the Tariff Reduction Programme (TRP) of the late 1990s. 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 study has made progress in linking trade policies to land use changes and the team is looking at whether the expansion of export crops is onto subsistence garden land, forest land, or is pushing subsistence crop cultivation into new areas (forest land). While the focus of this IA is on agro-biodiversity of subsistence crops, if cash crop expansion is primarily at the expense of forest, further research on wild biodiversity would be useful. The PNG study is in the early stages of the IA due to research team changes and lack of data.

### 3.9 Working group sessions

The afternoon of the second day and the morning of the third day were devoted to group work. Country teams worked with members of the team of advisors and UNEP staff. The objectives of the group work were to:

- Identify areas of the integrated assessment that need to be further developed and steps to complete the assessment (including the substance and analysis as well as the structure of the report)
- Reflect on the results of the stakeholder consultations and identify necessary actions in the next months
- Discuss the (preliminary) policy recommendations and how to implement them

Country teams were asked to give a 10-15 minute presentation on the results of the working group session providing details on how to move the project forward in each country. This included actions required to complete the integrated assessment, to ensure stakeholder consultation and buy-in and to develop, disseminate and implement policy-recommendations. Guidelines for the working group sessions are described in Annex 5.3.

Bilateral meetings were held in parallel with the working group sessions. These brief meetings between country teams and UNEP staff discussed administrative and financial matters.

## **4. Conclusions**

This first International Review meeting proved highly valuable to all parties participating in this initiative, notably country teams, members of the CAG and UNEP-ETB staff. In particular, the exchange of views, experience and information amongst country teams, and between project teams and advisors (i) allowed each team to precisely identify areas/components requiring further work to complete the IA; (ii) permitted teams who are not far advanced in the IA process to learn from the studies and experience of IAs closer to completion, and (iii) enabled teams and advisors to address challenges commonly encountered by IA teams, e.g. obtaining biodiversity data and

developing indicators, timing stakeholder involvement to manage politically difficult situations, choosing appropriate analytical tools.

The main outcomes and achievements of the meeting include:

First, clarification and discussion of some of the conceptual and methodological issues encountered by project teams in the assessment process, i.e. (i) trade and land use linkages; (ii) methods, tools and techniques for assessing biodiversity and the impact of changes in land use on biodiversity; (iii) developing well defined quantitative and verifiable indicators, and (iv) developing scenarios to allow comparison of the implications of different policy options.

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

-> ***Project implementation:***

As time is short, priority must be given to the completion of the IA studies, to the development of a few simple and strong policy recommendations based on the IA, and to gaining stakeholder buy-in to prepare for the process of prioritising and implementing selected policy recommendations.

-> ***Methodology:***

For those countries still collecting data and which have not completed the assessment, it was recommended to select more simple methodologies and to reduce the number of indicators. To supplement field work, IAs should undertake literature reviews, look at national environmental plans (for sustainability and biodiversity indicators) and use studies and information from other countries (e.g. Madagascar could look at studies in Asia on the environmental impact on mangroves of shrimp aquaculture, Cameroon is looking at a valuation study of the total economic value of cocoa plantations in Ghana). It is important to understand the triggers and drivers of land use change and to identify current trends if data is scarce. In this context, studies should be transparent about data and research used.

-> ***Stakeholder participation:***

The importance of being strategic about stakeholder consultation was much discussed at the meeting. Jamaica seems to have the most experience and has been the most strategic in ensuring stakeholder buy-in, in large part because the political situation there has been so difficult. It is important to be clear about the objective to achieve and the process to achieve it. Timing and sequencing were critical. The need for further guidance on how to manage the process of disseminating the findings of the IAs and how to effectively promote implementation of policy recommendations was discussed.

-> ***Positive policy options:***

Discussions at the meeting illustrated how the process of undertaking IAs had actually shown that there are positive opportunities for environmental gains as well as opportunities to mitigate environmental and biodiversity losses associated with land use changes. In Jamaica and, to a lesser extent, Mauritius there is scope for reintroducing biodiversity lost many years ago when land was first converted to sugar cane production, either through reforestation for the production of cellular ethanol or landscaping for eco-tourism purposes. In Cameroon there is an important opportunity to support the implementation of agro-forestry systems which involve only small losses in forest canopy and biodiversity for cocoa production. To the extent possible, by identifying win-win solutions, country teams can maximise opportunities to incorporate environmental and biodiversity concerns into trade and agricultural policy making.

Finally, the meeting was useful in helping country teams prepare for the implementation stage of the project although much more preparation and work is required to identify key activities in 2009. 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



# 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

### Annex 5.1

### List of participants

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

1 – 3 July 2008

International Environment House 2, Geneva

#### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

##### Participants from Country Projects

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: <a href="mailto:eassoumou2000@yahoo.ca">eassoumou2000@yahoo.ca</a>	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 Email: <a href="mailto:jpmvondoa@yahoo.fr">jpmvondoa@yahoo.fr</a>
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: <a href="mailto:anthony.clayton@uwimona.edu.jm">anthony.clayton@uwimona.edu.jm</a>	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: <a href="mailto:amckenzie@nepa.gov.jm">amckenzie@nepa.gov.jm</a>
Madagascar	
Ms Veromanitra Raozivelomanana Chef de Service de l'Environnement Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage et de la Pêche 390 Cité Analamahitsy	Mr Patrick Ranjatson Assistant de Recherche Département des Eaux et Forêts de l'Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques (ESSA Eaux & Forêts) :

101 Antananarivo, Madagascar  
Tel : +261 (0)20 22 355 69  
Mobile : +261 33 14521 00  
Fax : +261 20 22 265 61  
E-mail: raozivelomanana@yahoo.fr,  
Email : [panjarama@wanadoo.mg](mailto:panjarama@wanadoo.mg)

Université de Antananarivo  
Boite Postale 175  
Antananarivo, Madagascar 101  
Tel.:++261320443376.  
Email: [pranjatson@yahoo.fr](mailto:pranjatson@yahoo.fr)

### Mauritius

Ms. Padmini Seebun  
Research and Development Officer  
National Plant Protection Office  
Min of Agro Industry and Fisheries  
Reduit, Mauritius  
Tel +230 465 4902  
Fax +230 465 9591  
Email: [pseebun@yahoo.com](mailto:pseebun@yahoo.com)

Raj Kumar Ramnauth  
Principal Biometrician  
Biometry and Statistics Division  
Agricultural Research and Extension Unit  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Newry Complex  
St Jean Street  
Quatre Bornes  
Mauritius  
Tel: + 230 466 3885  
Fax: +230 464 8809  
Email: [biometry@areu.mu](mailto:biometry@areu.mu)

### Papua New Guinea

Clifton Gwabu  
Agriculture and Resource Economist  
National Agricultural Research  
Institute  
Dry Lowland Program  
P.O.Box 1828, PORT MORESBY 121  
National Capital District  
Papua New Guinea  
Telephone: (675) 323 5511  
Fax: (675) 323 4733  
Email: [clifton.gwabu@nari.org.pg](mailto:clifton.gwabu@nari.org.pg)

Magdalene Moi-he  
Acting Assistant Director  
Trade Development Branch, Trade Division  
Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade  
PO Box 244, WAIGANI, NCD, PNG.  
Phone: +675 325 6047/ (675) 685 9099  
Fax: +675 325 4263  
Email: [msmoihe@gmail.com](mailto:msmoihe@gmail.com)

### Uganda

Onesimus Muhwezi  
Director, Environmental Monitoring  
and Compliance  
National Environment Management  
Authority (NEMA)  
Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road  
P.O. Box 22255  
Kampala, Uganda  
Tel: +256-414-251064/5/8,  
+256-312-108849  
Email: [omuhwezi@nemaug.org](mailto:omuhwezi@nemaug.org),  
[omuhwezi@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:omuhwezi@yahoo.co.uk)

Alice Ruhweza  
Consultant  
Economic Policy Research Centre  
National Environment Management  
Authority (NEMA)  
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: +256 414 235539  
Email: [aruhweza@nemaug.org](mailto:aruhweza@nemaug.org)  
[aruhweza@hotmail.com](mailto:aruhweza@hotmail.com)

## Members of Core Advisory Group (CAG)

Name	Organisation and address	Contact details
Cornelius Kazoora	Director Sustainable Development Centre Makerere University Campus Senate Building, Level 1, Office 3 P.O. Box 5463 Kampala, Uganda	Tel.: +256 392 726253 Email: <a href="mailto:sdc@imul.com">sdc@imul.com</a>
Jan Joost Kessler	AID Environment Donker Curtiusstraat 7-523 Amsterdam, Netherlands	Tel:+31 20 581 8259 Email: <a href="mailto:kessler@aidenvironment.org">kessler@aidenvironment.org</a>
Markus A. Lehmann	Economist Implementation and Technical Support 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: <a href="mailto:Markus.Lehmann@biodiv.org">Markus.Lehmann@biodiv.org</a>
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 href="mailto:a.longo@qub.ac.uk">a.longo@qub.ac.uk</a>
Orlando Venn	International Association for Impact Assessment 32 Ashton Crescent, Braunton, Devon, EX33 1RD, United Kingdom.	Tel.: +44(0)1271 814028 Email : <a href="mailto:orlandovenn@btinternet.com">orlandovenn@btinternet.com</a>
Michel A.Bouchard	McGill-UNEP Center in Environmental Assessment McGill University, Macdonald Campus Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Department of Natural Resource Sciences 21,111 Lakeshore Road Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, Québec, Canada	Tel.:+1 514 999 6088 in Tunisia.: + 216 21 336 355 E-mail: <a href="mailto:michel.a.bouchard@mcgill.ca">michel.a.bouchard@mcgill.ca</a>
Clive George	Senior Research Fellow Institute for Development Policy and Management University of Manchester Manchester M13 9QH United Kingdom	Tel.: +44 161 275 0812 Fax: +44 161 275 0423 Email: <a href="mailto:clive.george@manchester.ac.uk">clive.george@manchester.ac.uk</a>

## UNEP - ETB staff

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: <a href="mailto:hussein.abaza@unep.ch">hussein.abaza@unep.ch</a>
Benjamin Simmons	Legal Officer	Tel.:+ 41.22.917.8361 Email: <a href="mailto:benjamin.simmons@unep.ch">benjamin.simmons@unep.ch</a>
Vera Weick	Programme Officer	Tel.:+41.22.917.8151 Email: <a href="mailto:vera.weick@unep.ch">vera.weick@unep.ch</a>
Nathalie Olsen	Consultant (replacing Vera during maternity leave)	Tel. : +41.22.917.8255 Email : <a href="mailto:nathalie.olsen@unep.ch">nathalie.olsen@unep.ch</a>
Bente Everts	Intern	Tel.: +41.22.917.8695 Email: <a href="mailto:bente.everts@unep.ch">bente.everts@unep.ch</a>
Edward Naval	Intern	Tel.: +41.22.917.8487 Email: <a href="mailto:edward.naval@unep.ch">edward.naval@unep.ch</a>
Theresa Schmitt	Intern	Tel.: +41.22.917.8695 Email: <a href="mailto:theresa.schmitt@unep.ch">theresa.schmitt@unep.ch</a>
Bin You	Intern	Tel.: +41.22.917.8686 Email: <a href="mailto:bin.you@unep.ch">bin.you@unep.ch</a>

## Annex 5.2 Agenda of meeting

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

1-3 July 2008,  
International Environment House 1, Geneva

#### Tuesday, 1 July 2008 (Room 2)

Time	Session
9:00- 9:30	Registration
9:30-10:00	Welcome remarks Introduction to workshop (where we stand, objectives and programme) Introduction of new participants
10:00-10:30	Coffee break
10:30-11:15	Presentation of country project: <i>Cameroon</i>
11:15-12:00	Presentation of country project: <i>Uganda</i>
12:00-13:00	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
13:00-13:30	<i>Discussion (Cameroon and Uganda)</i>
13:30-14:15	Presentation of country project: <i>Jamaica</i>
14:15-15:00	Presentation of country project: <i>Mauritius</i>
15:00-15:30	<i>Discussion (Jamaica and Mauritius)</i>
15:30-16:00	Coffee break
16:00-17:00	Feedback on the manual from country project teams
17:00-17:15	Wrap up of first day

### Wednesday, 2 July 2008

<b>Time</b>	<b>Session</b>
9:15-9:30	Opening of second day
9:30-10:15	Presentation of country project: <i>Papua New Guinea</i>
10:15-10:45	Coffee break
10:45-11:30	Presentation of country project: <i>Madagascar</i>
11:30-12:00	Discussion ( <i>Papua New Guinea and Madagascar</i> )
12:00-13:00	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
13:00-16:30	<u>Group work:</u> Country project teams and members of core advisory group  Introduction to group work Group work along guiding questions
	<u>Bilateral meetings:</u>  Bilateral: 14:00-14:45 - PNG Bilateral: 14:45-15:30 - Madagascar Bilateral: 15:30-16:15 - Mauritius
	Coffee break (integrated)
16:30-17:15	Preliminary feedback from working groups and wrap-up of second day

## Thursday, 3 July 2008

Time	Session
9:15-9:30	Opening of third day
9:30-12:00	<u>Group work (continued):</u> Country project teams and members of core advisory group
	Group work along guiding questions Preparation of presentations
	<u>Bilateral meetings:</u> Bilateral: 9:30-10:15 - Jamaica Bilateral: 10:15-11:00 - Uganda Bilateral: 11:00-11:45 - Cameroon
	Coffee Break (integrated)
12:00-13:00	Lunch
13:00-15:30	Presentation of group work results by country teams
15:30-16:00	Final wrap-up and closing
16:00	Coffee Break



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



## Annex 5.3

### Guidelines for Working Group Sessions

2<sup>nd</sup> International Review Meeting for the Country Projects on  
Integrated Assessment of Trade-related Policies in the Agricultural Sector  
and Biological Diversity

Wednesday, 2 July 2008 13:00-17:15  
Thursday, 3 July 9:30-12:00 / 13:00-15:30

#### I Objectives of the group work:

- To identify areas of the integrated assessment that need to be further developed and to identify steps to complete the assessment (including the substance and analysis as well as the structure of the report) (Task 1)
- To reflect on the results of the stakeholder consultations and identify necessary actions in the next months (Task 2)
- To discuss the (preliminary) policy recommendations and how to implement them (Task 3)

#### II Instructions for group work:

Please follow the sequence of the tasks and questions provided below, and complete task 1 (or 2, respectively) before moving on to the other tasks.

#### Presentation of group work results

On Thursday after lunch, you will be asked to give a 10-15 min presentation on the results of your working group session providing details on how to move the project forward in your country

This may include:

- Actions required to complete the integrated assessment
- Actions required to ensure stakeholder consultation and buy-in
- Actions required to develop, disseminate and implement policy-recommendations.

#### Steps and timing of the group work:

##### Wednesday, 2 July, 13:00-17:15

- 1) Introduction to group work in plenary
- 2) Breaking into 6 groups (one group per country team working with an advisor and UNEP staff)
- 3) Discussion in the groups along the guiding questions (*Note: During this time, 3 country project teams will have bilateral meetings with UNEP to discuss administrative issues and interrupt their group work for 45 min.*)
- 4) Preliminary feedback from working groups in plenary (by tour de table) to see how far discussion has advanced and share the main points identified so far (16:30-17:15)

##### Thursday, 3 July, 9:30-12:00

- 5) Continuation of group work to address remaining tasks (*Note: During this time, 3 country project teams will have bilateral meetings with UNEP to discuss administrative issues and interrupt their group work for 45 min..*)
- 6) Preparation of presentations

##### Thursday, 3 July, 13:00- 15:30

- 7) Presentation of group work results
- 8) Wrap-up

### **III Guiding questions:**

#### **Task 1: Content and structure of the draft assessment studies**

1. Which sections or components of the assessment are missing or need further work?
2. What steps are required to complete the integrated assessment?
3. Is the focus of the assessment relevant to current policy issues in your country? If not, what needs to be adjusted?
4. Is the conceptual framework (i.e. the linkages between trade, agriculture, land use, environment and biodiversity) clear and used consistently throughout the report? If not, what needs to be done to improve it and better reflect it throughout the report?
5. Is the impact on biodiversity clearly analysed and presented? If not, what needs to be done?
6. Is the report well structured and informative while being brief and clear? If not, what needs to be done to better present the objectives, methodologies, results and recommendations?

#### **Task 2: Stakeholder consultations**

1. What have been the results of the stakeholder consultations? Have stakeholder consultations been successful in getting input and acceptance (buy-in) from the main stakeholders?
2. Have all relevant groups been involved or are further consultations necessary to inform certain groups, receive inputs and ensure acceptance of the report?
3. Who would you need to approach and involve in the next months?
4. What difficulties do you expect in the dissemination of the report and policy recommendations? Do you expect resistance or strong reactions from certain groups?
5. What can you do to maximise the likelihood of the recommendations being accepted by relevant stakeholder groups and considered and adopted by decision-makers?

#### **Task 3: Policy recommendations and their implementation through national action plans**

1. What is the main message of the integrated assessment?
2. Are the (preliminary) policy recommendations based on the results of the assessment?
3. Which policy or decision-making process will the recommendations feed into? Who is affected and who should be involved?
4. How will you communicate the recommendations to the relevant target groups?
5. What will be the process to select the recommendations that will get priority for implementation?
6. How do you envisage implementation of the recommendations? What will be the first steps? Who should be involved and who should lead this process?