



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

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

Geneva

18-20 March 2009

MEETING REPORT

Table of contents

1. Introduction	page 3
2. Main outcomes of the workshop	page 4
3. Summary by sessions	page 5
4. Closing	page 20
5. Annexes	page 21
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

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Economics and Trade Branch (ETB) organised the Third International Review Meeting for the 'Initiative on Integrated Assessment of Trade-related Policies and Biodiversity in the Agricultural Sector'¹ on 18-20 March 2009 in Geneva.

The main objectives of the meeting were to:

- (i) Share and discuss results and recommendations of the integrated assessment (IA) studies of the six country projects implemented in Cameroon, Jamaica, Mauritius, Madagascar, Uganda and Papua New Guinea.
- (ii) Identify necessary action to finalize the IA reports.
- (iii) Develop or further develop integrated policy responses.
- (iv) Identify and further develop activities to be undertaken in the next months.
- (v) Discuss the finalisation of the trade and biodiversity manual.

Summary of country projects' focus

Uganda:	Impacts of trade liberalisation in the horticulture sector following EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations
Cameroon:	Impacts of trade liberalization in the cacao sector following the 6th International Agreement on Cacao, focusing on National Law No. 2004/025 (which liberalised the cacao sector).
Jamaica:	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.
Mauritius:	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 Multi Annual Adaptation Strategy (MAAS)).
Madagascar:	Impacts of loss of trade preferences in the aquaculture shrimp sector following the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations looking specifically at the " <i>plan directeur</i> " and potential certification schemes in the sector.
Papua New Guinea:	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).

The first day was started with short overview on the status of the Trade and Biodiversity Initiative and then devoted to country presentations on the results and recommendations of the IA-studies. Country presentations were followed by discussion sessions between country teams, UNEP staff and members of the Core Advisory Group (CAG). The country project teams had submitted the final drafts of the integrated assessment studies prior to the meeting, which also provided a basis for this discussion. The second day started with presentations providing an overview on the 'Green Economy Initiative' and the study on 'The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity' meant to inform participants about new UNEP initiatives. This was followed by a presentation on the new 'Integrated Assessment guidance by UNEP', introducing the idea of building blocks as part of the integrated assessment approach. This presentation provided the starting point for the discussion on the finalization of the trade and biodiversity manual. The afternoon of the second day and the morning of the third day were spent in working group sessions. These sessions gave country

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

teams the opportunity to work with the technical advisors on issues specific to their project in a structured manner, including the finalization of the integrated assessment report as well as the development of the integrated policy response and action plan. The third day also included a summary presentation of the feedback on the achievements of the first phase of project implementation based on the results of a feedback questionnaire filled in by the country project teams prior to the meeting. The final session of the meeting allowed country teams to present the results of their working groups focusing on the next steps to complete the IA reports and the dissemination and implementation of suggested policy recommendations.

Section 2 of this report summarises the main outcomes of the workshop. Section 3 provides an overview of the sessions. The closing session of the workshop is summarized 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/2009_3rd_IRM_March.php

2. Main outcomes of the workshop

This meeting provided an opportunity to present the results and recommendations of the IA studies, to discuss the finalization of the integrated assessment reports, develop an integrated policy response based on the recommendations provided in the reports and develop an action plan for the activities in the next months.

The main outcomes of the workshop could be summarised as follows:

- For the country projects:
 - List with the most important additions and revisions needed for the integrated assessment report.
 - Outline for the integrated policy response.
 - Suggested activities for next months to be included in a small scale funding agreements with UNEP.
- Strategy for the revision of the trade and biodiversity manual

From the presentations and discussions, it can be concluded that all countries have made significant progress towards the finalisation of the integrated assessment studies and are well aware of the next steps that need to be taken to disseminate the results and recommendations of the studies. All country project teams have been able to develop and present a first draft of an integrated policy response and to identify activities to be implemented in the next months that would provide a first step of its implementation.

The presentations and discussions also revealed a few common lessons, challenges and opportunities, which could be summarised as follows:

Capacity building and sensitization: There is a general feeling that the projects have been successful in building capacity in integrated assessment and also contributed to a sensitisation for biodiversity issues, and their linkages to trade and trade policy. Building on this positive experience, several country teams have suggested national level training activities on integrated assessment (and related issues) as part of their integrated policy response to further increase the appreciation of IA of relevant stakeholders (often suggested as part of already existing training programmes).

Stakeholder consultation: While all countries have been successful in involving stakeholders in the process of the study through workshops and steering committee meetings, stakeholder consultation is still perceived as one of the major challenges. Despite all efforts, in some countries there are still key institutions that did not actively participate. Being aware of this, the country project teams can make an additional effort in the second phase of the project to specifically target

those institutions as part of their activities for the dissemination of results and recommendations and development and implementation of the integrated policy response. Now results being available, those institutions are likely to take greater interest.

Analysis and presentation of results and recommendations: Some countries noted positively that the project enabled them to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the selected sector, which earlier did not exist, involving a wide range of stakeholders and considering a wider range of policies and factors. While all countries have been able to identify environmental, economic and social impacts of the selected policy in the selected sector, efforts to quantify those impacts have been rather limited. The main reasons stated for this are lack of data (particularly with respect to biodiversity), time and budget, as well as lack of capacity to undertake valuation of biodiversity. One has to acknowledge that the objectives set by the initiative in this respect have been too ambitious. Given the limited time still available, the countries have been asked, as far as possible, to add data to substantiate certain findings or to improve the presentation of data used to achieve a consistent picture of the analysis. General recommendations to all countries include: to improve consistency in the presentation, to substantiate findings, to further synthesize the information to highlight the most important results (e.g. through comparison of impacts identified for different scenarios) and to make sure that the recommendations presented in the report are linked to the results of the study.

Timing of the studies: Since the launch of the projects in 2007, the global economy experienced a number of important changes, resulting in multiple crises (such as food crisis, energy crisis and finally the financial crisis). At the same time, change has also happened at domestic levels, following elections, etc. Some countries have perceived it as a problem to conduct the study in this changing environment (where countries are faced with ever more pressing problems). However, the current crisis could also provide new windows of opportunity to feed the results and recommendations of the study into decision making processes at national level.

3. Summary by sessions

FIRST DAY

3.1. Overview of 'Trade and Biodiversity Initiative'

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

The objective of the initiative is to support developing countries to assess, design and implement trade-related policies in the agricultural sector that safeguard biological diversity while maximizing development gains from trade liberalisation. This includes developing guidance to assess impacts of trade on biodiversity, and supporting assessment and policy development at the national level.

The 4-year initiative (mid 2005-2009), which is funded by the European Union (EU) and Sida has been extended to a duration of 5 years (up to March 2010). Activities for the next few months include the finalisation of country project reports, development and implementation of integrated policy responses, finalisation of the trade and biodiversity manual, development of a synthesis report for the initiative, evaluation of the initiative, and the final outcome meeting and launching of documents.

3.2 Country project presentations

3.2.1 Uganda

The IA in **Uganda** focuses on the potential impacts of The EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) on Uganda's biodiversity looking at the horticulture sub-sector (focusing on fresh

fruits and vegetable and flowers). The East African Community, including Uganda, signed an interim partnership agreement with the EU in November 2007, and will sign a comprehensive one in July 2009. The project aims to contribute to the development of an EPA that fully takes into account social, economic and environmental concerns on sustainable use of biodiversity; and a national integrated response and a national action plan. As the EPA negotiations are expected to provide increased market access to the EU in the horticulture sector, Uganda is exploring the economic opportunities that can be gained through increased agricultural production, value addition, and export and import of goods, and at the same time, look at the likely impacts on the nation's biodiversity due to changes in agricultural activities.

The IA study used 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, and (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 implication of each scenario on trade, employment, land conversion, use of agro-chemicals, energy and water, and biodiversity loss were explored using a set of economic, social and environmental indicators.

The assessment concludes that the best case scenario from an economic perspective, is scenario 3, the 'balanced trade scenario'; as it generates the most export revenue. However, this scenario puts high pressure on the environment and biodiversity as it requires the most water, fertilizer and land use. As more land is put under intensification the threats to agro-biodiversity increase as the traditional crop cycles are transformed to cater for the commercial production. Mitigation of these impacts could partly be reached through improved productivity and efficiency in resource use. The 'balancing trade scenario' will also benefit employment because this scenario will require more workers. In conclusion the country expects to benefit from the agreement; however, relevant interventions need to be put in place to ensure the conservation of the biodiversity. The linkages between trade, agriculture and biodiversity need to be integrated in the country's production systems. At the same time other compounding issues that will affect biodiversity (increasing population and climate change) need to be understood and mitigated.

Specific policy recommendations include the following:

- Support the valuation of biodiversity to quantify its contribution to national development (wild and agro-biodiversity).
- Enhance understanding in environmental management concepts (such as pollution tax and effluent charges).
- Research to quantify the cost and benefits of certification and effects of pollution on ecosystems services, species and habitats.
- NEMA should fully implement the National Environment Act.
- Capacity building for monitoring the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and implementation of activities to mitigate the adverse impact.
- Encourage EU to invest in sectors that support trade such as energy, water, agricultural production and productivity.
- Request EU and other development partners to provide training and capacity building on valuation of biodiversity.

In order to strengthen and enhance interventions for the conservation of agro-biodiversity, the proposed integrated response and action plan focuses on carrying out an economic valuation of agro-biodiversity in critical hotspots of productive landscapes in Uganda. The study would be based on three components, genetic diversity, species diversity and ecosystem diversity. The expected outcomes include increased capacity for valuing agro-biodiversity, contribution to the implementation of the programme of work on agro-biodiversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and a better understanding of agro-biodiversity, in general.

In addition to the valuation of biodiversity, Uganda's action plan also includes support for (i) strengthening of producer associations, (ii) support for the development of a national code of

practice (Uganda – GAP: Good Agricultural Practices to set standards for food safety, health and environmental issues), (iii) an assessment of impacts of flower production on the environment and proposed mitigation measures, (iv) setting up a comprehensive information sharing system between entities dealing with trade and those dealing with biodiversity, and (v) ensuring and promoting corporate social responsibility amongst the companies and farms encouraging them to maintain and restore ecosystems on which they depend.

The following points were part of the discussion following the presentation:

- Agro-biodiversity valuation will help the study accomplish more in the sense that the economic value could be communicated to the government as well as the link between expanding agriculture and the impacts this has to biodiversity. It may be difficult to use the concept of 'total economic value' but still all values of biodiversity are important to be considered.
- Opportunities in the flower industry to improve resource efficiency, e.g. through hydroponics) and the role of trade in stimulating these practises. The government would need more information on consequences for water of expanding production and this could be a suggestion for an additional study.
- Percentage of 1% biodiversity-loss in the report was taken from the Uganda Human Development Report 2005 (UNDP) (A new study would be needed to look at how agriculture contributes to the one percent per year loss of biodiversity).
- The impacts of implementing the preferred scenario 3 (balanced trade) need to be further discussed, also taking into account the impact of other industries on the agricultural sector and ecosystem services.
- The study did not look specifically at how horticulture would contribute to biodiversity loss, but the study can still be modified.

3.2.2 Cameroon

The main focus of the IA project in **Cameroon** is the 2004 National Law (N°2004/025 of Dec.30, 2004), which liberalised the cocoa sector. The study addresses the economic, social and environmental impacts of liberalisation and particularly aims to reveal how this law (and other related policies) affects biodiversity in the cocoa producing regions. The ex-post assessment is oriented towards identifying measures and policies capable of mitigating the negative impacts and optimizing the positive ones. The economic, social and environmental indicators used to assess the impacts included yields, price paid to producers, income from cocoa and other crops sales, contribution to local and national economies, number and types of jobs, rate and amount of forest land conversion, and agricultural and non agricultural biodiversity. Impacts are presented in relation to ecosystem services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural).

Values or trends observed included:

- Increased revenue from sales of cocoa (due to price increases), and high share in household income (cocoa sales contributing 50 to 75 percent to household income in Southern Cameroon).
- Intensive cocoa systems were found to be more profitable than other systems,
- Income from non-timber forest products and timber could contribute up to 16 to 50 percent to family income.
- Jobs being offered in the industry are on the rise.
- Cocoa is given preference to be grown on the better soils (creating problems for food security in cocoa producing regions).
- Increased cocoa production contributed to forest conversion (new cocoa plantations represent 78 percent of forest conversion).
- Cocoa hybrids (cocoa trees grown along with other fruit trees) represent 25 percent of cocoa trees.
- There were 71 tree plant species identified in forests next to cocoa plantations. Inside the cocoa plantations there were 44 tree plant species including 9 fruit tree species. The proportion of non planted tree species was 33 to 82 percent.

- Wild animals within the plantations provide 90 percent of proteins in local diets (120 species are threatened).
- Overall, the creation of cocoa agro-forests increased biodiversity, diversified revenues, and increased social, economic and environmental benefits.

The suggested policy recommendations include the following:

- Improving the laws by taking into consideration the linkages between trade and biodiversity.
- Promoting cocoa production based on agro-forestry including valorisation of local knowledge and certification.
- Intensification of cocoa production using innovations and practices in favour of biodiversity.
- Intensification of food and other crops production to spare space for biodiversity.
- Supporting producers in achieving more sustainable use of adjacent ecosystems.
- Capacity building of relevant stakeholders.
- Improving the land tenure system as to encourage investments.
- Facilitating the access to biodiversity.
- Enhancing synergy among institutions.
- Research on specific issues including: varieties improvement, ecosystem fragmentation control, pest and disease control, carbon sequestration, intensification schemes, landscape planning, etc.
- Conservation of critical forest ecosystems by establishing and/or improving the network of protected areas.

The next steps to be taken include a validation workshop for the IA study with key ministries and institutions, dissemination of the IA study report, capacity building workshops, and the development and implementation of strategic plans. These plans include cacao production based agro-forestry, intensification of cocoa production, and sustainable use of adjacent ecosystems.

The following points were part of the discussion following the presentation:

- Selection of priority recommendations were based on what could be done during the available timeframe, and the priorities of the Ministry of Trade. However, some of the policy recommendations that were not brought forward as priority items could still be brought forward as sub-priorities of the priority recommendations (ex. improving the land tenure system could be a sub priority of improving the laws).
- In terms of property rights, the government owns everything when it comes to biodiversity. However, this doesn't matter for people in rural areas so they exploit areas of biodiversity without any regulation.
- Simultaneous development of intensification and agro-forestry: Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire are two countries where intensification and agro-forestry are done. In Cameroon better management is needed to properly implement both processes at the same time.
- Importance to ensure diversity of wild animals in the ecosystem because people hunt for meat rather than pay expensive commercial prices.
- Ministry of Trade should be lobbied to bring the biodiversity measures forward, based on a clear Action Plan.

3.2.3 Jamaica

The country project in **Jamaica** focuses on the sugar industry which is not competitive in international markets but which has survived due to political influence and trade preferences provided by the EU. As a first step the study summarized the significant detrimental impacts that the sugar cane industry has had on Jamaica's ecosystems and biodiversity. Based on the phasing out of trade preferences, the IA then identified the likely costs and benefits of three different land use scenarios for areas previously planted with sugar cane.

Scenario 1 is based on the government's plan to privatize Jamaica's five public sugar cane estates, and sell them to a Brazilian firm, that would use the cane for ethanol for both the domestic

market and for export to the USA under the Caribbean Basin Initiative. However, since the development of scenario 1, the governments plan failed (July 2008) and Jamaica's sugar industry is now in significant decline. Scenario 2 factored in the possibility of the government's plan to fail, and proposed that the five public estates would be closed and the areas be allowed to naturally redevelop (natural vegetative re-growth). Despite the loss of foreign exchange and an increase in unemployment, these areas could then be used for other kinds of land uses like agriculture, development, or forestry. Scenario 3 proposes integrated high-value land use of the closed sugar can estates, including: intensive, high-value agriculture; high-value plant extracts for export and production for tourism; forestry; new housing developments; light industrial plants; green spaces; conservation, recreational, eco-tourism, heritage, health and retirement tourism areas; and 3rd generation bio fuels.

The action plan for the second phase will include trying to engage the stakeholders in a search for a viable solution. This solution is urgently needed and must be economically viable, politically acceptable, socially tolerable, and environmentally not-too-damaging.

The presentation also highlighted that the underlying assumption in the trade and biodiversity manual that there is a lack of information that an assessment can fill is not relevant in all cases. In Jamaica's case, the information was readily available; however policy options to address the situation had/have never been addressed. It was suggested that the manual should be updated to address this issue and put more emphasis on the development of policy options.

The following points were part of the discussion following the presentation:

- First generation biofuels use sugar from high content sugar plants. Second generation biofuels uses enzymes to break-up cellulose to extract sugars. Third generation biofuels are fuels from algae. This method is Jamaica's best way to avoid the trade-off of food vs. fuel; however this technology is still 3 to 5 years away from being used.
- Scenario 3 should be further developed.

3.2.4 Mauritius

The main focus of the IA in **Mauritius** is the Multi-annual Adaptation Strategy (MAAS 2006-2015) that the government has developed to ensure the commercial viability and sustainability of the sugar sector faced with loss of trade preferences with the EU. The implementation of the MAAS is being financed through the EU "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 contributes 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 2006-2015 includes eight 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) increase contribution to national electricity production; (vii) shift to ethanol production; and (viii) optimising the use of sugar cane lands. The objectives of the plan are: conversion of the sugar industry into a sugar cane cluster; establishment of a competitive, viable and sustainable sector; reduction of the dependency on the import of fossil fuels; and continuation of the multifunctional role of sugar (supporting national, environmental, and social objectives).

The methodology for the assessment of some of the policy options of the MAAS 2006-2015 included the following:

- An audit of existing national environmental/biodiversity oriented policies and relevant international trade policies
- Assessment of the impact of the MAAS 2006-2015 on the agricultural sector (using a conceptual framework based on the cause effect chains).

The IA study included 2 scenarios, scenario1: sustaining sugar production under current or modified conditions, and scenario 2: moving out of sugar cane for other activities (agricultural, non agricultural or abandonment).

The results of the IA show that under scenario 1 the sugar industry contributes 4 to 5 percent to the GDP, cogeneration of energy from bagasse produces 20 percent of the country's energy needs, and provides employment for 4 percent of the national labour force. The sugar cane also provides erosion control, requires limited amount of pesticides, creates no surface/ground water pollution, is an efficient sequester of carbon, and reduces the need to import fossil fuels. In contrast, the IA found that moving away from the sugar cane industry would result in a conversion to more profitable activities, and that abandonment or shifting to agro-forestry would positively affect surface and aquatic biodiversity.

The policy recommendations include the following:

- Accelerate the adoption of Good Management Practices (GMPs);
- Empower relevant institutions to develop, implement and enforce quality standards;
- Capacity building of growers and millers for compliance to these quality standard;
- Provide incentives to encourage environmentally sustainable production system through research, training, certification;
- Develop mechanism of legal framework to enforce and regulate certification and eco-labelling;
- Encourage regrouping of small fields in larger block with creation/rehabilitation and maintenance of ecological corridors / conservation area;
- Monitor and assess the implications of the development of integrated resorts on the local biodiversity and ecosystem services;
- Capacity building in methodologies to assess impact of introduced biological agents, bio-control agents and exotic organism on the local biodiversity services;
- Conduct an inventory of existing local biodiversity and develop an effective information system to enable sharing of information with scientific community;
- Capacity building in biodiversity valuations techniques;
- Development of a coordinated approach for management of local biodiversity;
- Integrate biodiversity in EIA for all development projects;
- Integration of strategies for sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies; and
- Sensitize the public in general on the value, management and conservation of local biodiversity.

The action plan to implement the policy recommendations included: adoption of good manufacturing practices to meet EU market requirements; encourage environmentally sustainable production; and, development of a coordinated approach for management of biodiversity, and capacity building in assessment of biodiversity.

The following points were part of the discussion following the presentation:

- Potential land-use options after sugar cane could be lychee trees, and the long-term scenario would be to use crops that would provide cover for the lychee trees.
- Sustainability of the bagasse industry (bagasse industry is fed by the growing amount of crop residue. This technology is being used by power producers and becoming more and more efficient).
- Capacity building has been helpful in solving the lack of expertise. This is a problem which several of the countries participating in the project have.
- Old data was the only information that was available; this made it difficult for the Mauritius team. The collection of new information and data would be needed to improve the report.
- Mauritius can deal with the problem of the price of ethanol currently being higher than that of gasoline (due to drop in oil price) by reducing the exports that are used for ethanol making, such as molasses.

3.2.5 Madagascar

The **Madagascar** study focuses on the impact of trade liberalisation through the Economic Partnership Agreements on shrimp aquaculture looking specifically at the national action plan for fisheries and aquaculture (plan directeur). The plan directeur includes (i) increasing the foreign exchange revenues of the State by ensuring the development and the durability of shrimp aquaculture, (ii) developing waste lands and wedged zones favourable for the activity, (iii) creating jobs, and (iv) contribution to poverty reduction.

The shrimp aquaculture sector is largely foreign owned, and is an important source of foreign exchange. Due to high production costs, without trade preferences a reduction of Malagasi shrimp exports in international markets may occur. 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 seen to be important as shrimp aquaculture has been shown to contribute to mangrove deforestation, coastal erosion, and water and soil pollution.

The IA included three scenarios. The baseline scenario represents the status quo, under the interim agreements' regime (extension to the EPAs have not been signed and the tariff preferences are still valid). Scenario 1 assumes liberalisation (EPA), which will result in an unavoidable future loss of tariff preferences (unless shrimp is classified as sensitive product). Scenario 2 assumes liberalisation (EPA) and ecolabelling. Ecolabelling is supported by WWF and GAPCM (Groupement des Armateurs à la Pêche Crevetrière de Madagascar), involving the implementation of a certification scheme, with or without government support.

The overall results of the IA included contradictory views on the integration of small-scale farming. Some results indicated that the shrimp aquaculture industry would benefit from including small-scale farmers, whereas other results indicated that small-scale farmers would cause more damage to the industry through ecosystem degradation. It was also shown that the reproduction cycle of shrimps are seriously endangered by traditional fisheries, however, despite this present crisis, one shrimp company seems to have no difficulties. The EPA regime might be avoided if Malagasy shrimps were classified "produits sensibles".

The policy recommendations include:

- Fast tracking the ecolabelling process;
- Enhancing fiscal political incentives;
- Creation of EPA related structures;
- Creation of legal norms for shrimp food's local production;
- Enhanced security of investments;
- Conduct research on local food production;
- Identification of environmental factors and farming parameters to maintain the premium character of malagasy shrimps; and
- Conduct research on involvement of small farmers.

The action plan to implement the policy recommendations include prioritizing the ecolabelling process, monitoring impacts of commercial policies on biodiversity, creating a specific shrimp component inside the new national action plan, and integrating these strategies into local development action plans.

The following points were part of the discussion following the presentation:

- Unavoidability of loss in trade preferences either way (ie. sign the EPA or not).
- Evidence for the fact that unemployment will increase damage to ecosystems (due to increased cutting of mangroves for fuel wood).
- Ecolabelling can be made accessible to farmers if certain technical issues are addressed.

- Good and Bads of shrimp cultivating for biodiversity (in Madagascar case shrimp are good for biodiversity due to use of semi-intensive system using the top salinity surface where nothing else grows).
- Difference between ecolabelling and getting into a niche market, and the likelihood of Asian producers also using ecolabelling for shrimp products. Malagasy shrimp is an endemic species (unique in size), and the ecolabelling would be specific to this and set them apart from other shrimp in the industry. A high price of Malagasy shrimp could also be a sign of this uniqueness (similar to the way cashmere is marketed and sold).

3.2.6 Papua New Guinea (PNG)

The objective of the **PNG** study is to assess the impact of the Tariff Reduction Programme (TRP) (and related policies such as economic recovery through an export driven strategy) on oil palm and coffee production and, as a second step, on the production of staple food crops - taro and sweet potato – and their diversity.

The study considered 5 possible drivers for decline in biodiversity, related either to increased production of export crop, or the competition for staple food production: (1) increased production of export crops without expansion in land (intensification); (2) increasing production of export crops by expanding the land area, (3) local production of rice and wheat, (4) marketing of preferred varieties of food crops, and (5) greater consumption of imported rice and wheat.

The team surveyed 50 farmers in the coffee-sweet potato farming system, and 50 farmers in the oil palm-taro farming system. The survey included questions on the status of the taro and sweet potato industry, the number of varieties maintained and not maintained, and the reasons for the losses in varieties.

Results of the survey showed high numbers of varieties that are not maintained, 422 for sweet potatoes and 274 for taro. The main reasons identified for the 'non-maintenance' were summarised as 'dominance of other 'superior' varieties' as well as cultural factors. In addition, the survey showed that rice had a high price elasticity (consumers are very responsive when the price changes), suggesting that rice is not a staple food. It was found that rice and sweet potato have high price-cross elasticity, meaning that when the price of one changes, consumers switch to the other, confirming the idea that the two are substitute goods.

In conclusion, the study revealed that factors other than the TRP, namely marketing of preferred varieties of food crop (driver 4), have been responsible for the 'loss' of food crop diversity. However, despite sufficient evidence that tariff reduction contributes to erosion in biodiversity, it would still be unfair to say at this stage that trade does not have any impact on the decline of agricultural food crop biodiversity (other trade policy instruments and other biodiversity beyond sweet potato and taro first need to be studied).

The policy recommendations resulting from the study included:

- focusing on revenue and combined farming systems options;
- strengthening the national (institutional) capacity (DNA finger-printing facilities, strengthening the current germplasm maintenance);
- support formulation/existence of appropriate standards on food crop and forest biodiversity;
- current export crop rehabilitation and expansion plan;
- and take stock of current Donor Assistance Projects.

The action plan to develop the policy recommendations include holding a national stakeholder workshop, the development of the identified projects (seek funding and implement), and develop an information paper for the National Executive.

The following points were part of the discussion following the presentation:

- Possibility of some potato varieties coming from outside of the country. The lack of scientific data (due to the absence of reliable study and the huge diversity of languages (820) in the country) makes this hard to determine.
- In order to improve biodiversity in the taro and sweet potato industry, ecosystem services should be considered, as well as, soil erosion reduction, improved water quality, and non-timber forestry products. In addition, the recommendations should be expanded to consider food security.

SECOND DAY

3.3 Overview on the Green Economy Initiative and the study on “The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)”

Fulai Sheng, Economics Affairs Officer, UNEP-ETB, provided a brief overview of UNEP’s GEI. In October 2008, in response to the financial and economic crisis, UNEP announced the Green Economy Initiative (GEI) to make a macroeconomic case to invest into green sectors. Past efforts of mainstreaming the environment were not always received well by politicians as communication was often centred around negative impacts of economic activities on the environment. The GEI will focus on the opportunities that the environment has to offer for economic growth and job creation, which provides a new approach to dealing with the environment. Together with a number of UN sister organizations, the GEI will motivate governments and businesses to significantly increase investment in ‘green sectors’ as a new engine for economic growth, job creation, and poverty reduction in the 21st century.

The GEI has three key elements: The Green Economy Report, the Green Jobs Report, and The Study on Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). The Green Economy report will focus on green sectors (e.g. green buildings, sustainable transport, sustainable agriculture, renewable energy, etc.) and will provide an overview, analysis and synthesis of how public policy can help markets accelerate the transition towards a green economy. The initial output of the Green Economy report, the Global Green New Deal (GGND) aims to motivate world leaders to allocate a significant amount of their countries economic stimulus packages to investing into green industries as well as helping developing countries transition towards green economies. TEEB, a report focusing on valuation of ecosystem and biodiversity and the Green Jobs Report (September 2008), that looked at employment trends in the green industry, will also feed into the final Green Economy Report.

The GEI is of relevance to the country projects because it will look at potential investments in biodiversity, ecosystems, and sustainable agriculture and elaborate the contribution of those to economic stability, poverty reduction and job creation. The country project teams are encouraged to think about how the global crisis has or will be affecting the sectors that they focused on and take this into account when developing their integrated policy responses.

Benjamin Simmons, Legal Officer, UNEP-ETB, provided a brief overview of the TEEB initiative. At the G8+5 meeting of the Environment Ministers in Potsdam, Germany, in 2007, it was determined that a study should be conducted that will demonstrate the economic significance of the global loss of biodiversity.

The goals of TEEB include demonstrating the values of ecosystems and biodiversity, showing how to capture this value in decisions and choices, assessing and communicating urgency of action to address ecosystem degradation and biodiversity loss, and meeting the “end-user” needs of policy-makers, local administrators, business and citizens.

Phase 1 of the project was conducted by the EC and the German Environment Ministry; Phase 2 is now being led by UNEP. Currently there is a call for evidence where experts can contribute their

comments and opinions. Similar to the GEI, TEEB is trying to make a compelling case and create market based mechanisms to protect ecosystems and biodiversity.

The following points were part of the discussion following the two presentations:

- Climate proofing is one of the top priorities of the GGND. The Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon is looking at the GEI to solve the climate and financial crisis.
- The challenge of providing governments with timely information can be addressed through long-term monitoring and conducting assessment on a regular basis. This is covered in the GGND as an enabling process and will also be a part of the GEI report.
- Importance of the price of oil for fluctuation in the international market as particular concern for green energy companies. In the various economic stimulus packages a large portion going into renewable energy. (At the same time it is expected that oil will be in high demand once emerging economies recover from the financial crisis.)
- Need for a short list of priorities to help the government make choices. Priorities will vary from country to country, governments will have to make these decisions based on the information available.
- Funding for the GEI: Specific funding has been received from Norwegian and Swiss governments, as well as other sources. Another dimension are the stimulus packages designed by the G20 countries to address the crisis: there is up to 3 trillion dollars in total in economic stimulus packages, and 15 percent of this is estimated to be linked to climate change. Suggestions have been made that 0.7 percent of these stimulus packages should be set aside for a vulnerability fund providing support to developing countries.
- Importance of IPCC for Stern Review and similar mechanisms to achieve consensus for the GEI and TEEB (so far GEI has mobilized 20 UN agencies and assembled eminent experts to give input, this will continue to serve as a basis for legitimacy).

3.4 Introduction to Integrated Approach to Policy Making

Jan Joost Kessler, AID Environment and a member of the Core Advisory Group, gave a presentation on "Introduction on Integrated Assessment guidance by UNEP – Building blocks for mainstreaming sustainability into policymaking". The purpose of this manual is to document and share knowledge based on experiences; make assessment less procedural and more flexible; and support policymaking for sustainable development.

Since 2005, UNEP took steps to encourage integrated policymaking for sustainable development by increasingly placing IA tasks and activities within the overall policy cycle. While IA is to be closely linked to the policymaking process, policymaking processes can contribute to sustainable development by effective use of the IA building blocks.

Four key features of the IA approach are: (i) full sustainability / economic, social, environmental (ESE) integration; (ii) integration in policymaking process (IA building blocks integrated in the policymaking process); (iii) a proactive and strategic approach; (iv) provide flexibility by building blocks (building blocks are proposed to be used in variable sequence and intensity, and tailored to different types of policymaking and planning processes).

The building blocks are developed in three main categories; (i) the process (organisation of the IA process in relation to the policymaking process), (ii) the policy institutional context, and (iii) the IA analytical content (technical part of the IA). As the building blocks presented have similar areas of focus compared with the IA process that the country project teams followed under the trade and biodiversity initiative, it is possible to make the linkage between the document presented and the trade and biodiversity manual.

The comments provided during the discussion period after the presentation are below:

- Appreciation for a more generalized approach rather than a blue print or step by step model.

- C4 in the biodiversity manual (Identification of policy options including most likely scenario to be reviewed) should be adjusted to outline the key difference between ex-ante and ex-post assessment.
- The step-by-step approach of the trade and biodiversity manual gave little flexibility, and the Building Blocks approach is a step in the right direction. However, in some cases a linear approach is useful. Particularly at the beginning, when the process is new to a country, a step-by-step approach is needed. At a later stage, a more flexible approach is possible.
- The need to distinguish policy making and conducting an integrated assessment. The trade and biodiversity manual is used as an outline to conduct IAs, not for policy making. The 'Integrated Approach to Policy Making' manual offers flexibility, but some sequence in the IA process is needed for the IA studies to make sense.
- Policy options are working towards something we know we want to achieve, scenario options are working towards the unknown (have to allow for several variables). Sometimes you need to give an answer now that is 80 percent right, rather than give an answer later that is 100 percent right
- It is important to be aware of the decision making process in order to be able to influence it.

3.5 Summary on feedback from country project teams and preparation of synthesis report

Vera Weick, Programme Officer, UNEP-ETB, presented a summary of the feedback on the initiative submitted by the country project teams.

The feedback provided indicated that the initiative contributed to an increased understanding of linkages between trade and biodiversity in the sector of focus. In addition, the majority of the IA studies have resulted in the identification of economic, social and environmental impacts of the trade policies affecting the selected sector, and, more specifically, to the identification of biodiversity impacts. The IA process has also resulted in an overall better understanding of assessment methodologies for biodiversity, biodiversity indicators, and valuation techniques for biodiversity. With respect to influencing policy, the majority of IA studies have not yet been able to influence the negotiation or implementation of EU-ACP-EPAs, or the negotiation and implementation of other trade agreements/policies, however, a number of opportunities have been identified for possible impacts in the future.

3.6 Group Work

The afternoon of the second day and the morning of the third day were devoted to group work during which country teams worked with members of the team of advisors and UNEP staff. The objectives of the group work were to discuss what needs to be done to finalize the IA studies and technical reports, determine the suggested integrated policy response, and decide which activities, contributing to the development and implementation of the integrated national response, could be implemented in the next months.

Country teams were asked to give a 10 to 15 minute presentation on the results of the working group session providing details on how to move the project forward in each country. A summary of the results of the group work and presentations is provided below.

3.6.1 Uganda

Finalization of report:

To finalize the IA report several edits and clarifications are required. These include:

- Providing more detail on the focus of the report.
- Improving linkages between the conclusions and recommendations.
- Providing more details on the different aspects of biodiversity:
 - Explain the loss of biodiversity that can be attributed to horticulture and in general go more into the specifics with respect to the impact on biodiversity;

- Strengthen methodology for biodiversity component (% estimates not enough), make reader understand local context, bridge from local production to export is missing; and
- Use table in annex to expand on methodology by making it more specific to Uganda, explain local situation and set basis for what should be monitored in the future.
- Making reference in the report to the EPA negotiations, and what impact it had.
- Elaborate incomplete conceptual framework.
- Clarifying the numbers within the scenarios (3.3.1).
- Changing the title of the Action Plan to “Valuation of Eco-system Services Supporting Uganda’s agriculture”, rather than biodiversity, as the new title includes the value of landscapes.

Integrate policy response and action plan:

The main objective of the response is to build capacity for economic valuation of ecosystems services and biodiversity supporting agriculture. The main components are: basic training on measurement of ecosystem services (building technical capacity); baseline information for ecosystem services and biodiversity; economic valuation of ecosystems under different options (ex. flower growing vs. traditional farming systems); pilot demonstration on best/good practices; communication skills for effective policy engagement; and data management. Local knowledge and traditional practices need to be taken into account in the response. Field officers, agricultural policy makers, NGOs, academics, and the applicable ministries need to be involved. NEMA will take the lead.

Barriers for implementation include: resistance for a project on capacity building, inadequate funding from UNEP, inadequate trained/qualified manpower at the national level, data gaps – lack of information, and consistent technical assistance/advice from UNEP. Resistance to capacity building can be addressed by piloting and establishing links to existing initiatives, improving what has already been done, and creating a more effective plan for agricultural development. Lack of funding can be addressed by a clear statement by UNEP on the limit of the budget, as well a clear budget from Uganda. UNEP can also help connect the team to other potential donors.

3.6.2 Cameroon

Finalization of report

The current draft of the report is very thorough and only requires small editorial changes. However, the Steering Committee has (at its last meeting) suggested several changes to be made on the content of the study, specifically to portions of sections VI (OPTIONS POUR MITIGER OU OPTIMISER LES IMPACTS) and VII (RECOMMANDATIONS DE POLITIQUES).

Integrated policy response and action plan:

The main objectives of the response is to improve the laws, decrees, regulations, and policies by taking into consideration the linkages between trade and biodiversity in the agricultural sector and developing strategic plans for sustainable cocoa production. In addition, the other main objective is developing and implementing strategic plans for promoting cocoa production based on agro-forestry, intensification of cocoa production, supporting producers in achieving more, sustainable use of adjacent ecosystems, and conservation of important sites of biodiversity.

The stakeholders of the cocoa sector, from producers to decision makers, as well as the media need to be involved in the response. The Ministry of Environment will take the lead, assisted by the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Forest.

Barriers for implementation include key ministries having different/contradictory strategies, and access to information. These can be overcome through the involvement of all stakeholders in the discussions. This would also contribute to improving the communication flow between ministries. With regards to access to information, a solution could be to ask for the information at higher levels of government where the information is more available.

The specific actions that need to be taken to further develop and implement the response involves finalizing the IA study, conducting a validation workshop of the IA study by key ministries and institutions; ceremony to present the findings and policy recommendations; capacity building workshops for partners; diffusion of the IA report (at local level); and development and implementation of strategic plans.

3.6.3 Jamaica

Finalisation of report

The finalisation of the IA report will include: changing the title to be more positive (Transition Strategies for the Sugar Industry); elaborating scenario 3 to ensure that the recommendations are explicitly linked to the analysis (where will the energy come from and what to do with the sugar industry?); emphasizing that the report is solution-oriented, that it is about the direction of change and developing 'no-regrets' strategies. In addition, write a new executive summary that is tailored for government officials, and expand the table of contents. The government is still trying to keep the industry, so the team has to find away to change the way the government thinks.

Integrated policy response and action plan

The main objective of the policy response is to address the immediate crisis in the sugar industry and the energy crisis. The secondary objective is to improve the government's ability to make good strategic decisions.

The components of the policy response that will take place in 2009 include: (i) working with the Energy Task Force to suggest 'no regrets' strategies, and study other examples from neighbouring islands (ex. St Kitts, Mauritius), and (ii) building capacity in the public sector in IA, policy analysis and scenario planning (building on existing SEA program) through the development of different training program for Permanent Secretaries, policy analysts, and desk officers.

The stakeholders that are involved include the Energy Task Force (ETF - formed by the government after the divestment plan failed), headed by the Ministers of Energy and Agriculture. The team will arrange to brief the ETF, with particular regard to the 3rd scenario (multi-dimensional optimization). The Ministers will then brief the Prime Minister (PM). The ETF will lead on the implementation, with technical support from the Institute for Sustainable Development (ISD). The program would also involve the Cabinet Office, Office of the PM, and NEPA.

In addition to the main components above, the team will also: review the existing SEA policy and associated procedures, suggest amendments as/where necessary, define roles and responsibilities, support adoption; and develop monitoring plan to report to the government and UNEP on successes/failures of the programme.

Beyond 2009, the programme intends to identify capacity and information gaps that need to be filled to improve decision-making, support initiatives to address gaps in key databases (ex. Jamaica's biodiversity), support initiatives to develop better bio-indicators, and support initiatives to develop GIS-based National Spatial Plan with zoning.

3.6.4 Mauritius

Finalization of report

To finalise the report specific qualitative and quantitative data with a sample group large enough to represent the country needs to be added for the main issues addressed. The conceptual framework should be put in the chapter explaining the methodology. The report should also include ways on how IA can be applied to other sectors in Mauritius (not only the agricultural or sugar sector). In addition, viable options that are economically and socially sustainable should be presented, as part of the re-assessment of the MAAS policy.

Integrated policy response and action plan

The MAAS is good but it can be improved in a number of ways, e.g. (i) through encouraging environmentally sustainable production systems and the use of good management practices (GMP) (involving research, training and certification), or (ii) through encouraging the regrouping of farmers into larger blocks to improve efficiency and promote biodiversity conservation.

The main objectives of the policy response are to promote capacity building in IA for policy formulation, ensure long-term sustainability of the sugar industry through adoption of good management practices and standards, and encourage environment friendly practices through incentives and support.

The main components of the policy response include:

- Government incentives and support to promote adoption of GMP;
- Creation of enabling conditions through institutional capacity building and empowerment of stakeholders;
- Establishment of laws and regulations to enforce the implementation of GMP;
- Promote sustainable intensification through regrouping through research and extension support; and,
- Sensitization through training on the benefits of adopting GMP.

The specific activities suggested include a high level stakeholder consultation workshops, capacity building at institutional and farmer level (human and infrastructural), development of a manual for GMP for sugar production, establishment of legislative framework for implementation of GMP, and support to accelerate regrouping of farmers and adoption of GMP.

3.6.5 Madagascar

Finalisation of report

To finalise the report data on important elements such as the consequences of the current shrimps breeding practices on the environment, the economy and the society and a description of the scenarios examined need to be presented in the introductory chapters. The baseline scenario needs to be further elaborated (present situation plus zero policy change). The title and subtitles of the report need to be clarified. Information gaps need to be addressed by including more on technical characteristics of shrimp farming systems (including for example a chart that demonstrates the structure of the shrimps supply-chain), impacts and environmental benefits of shrimp farming (like the protection of an endemic species and also substantiating the baseline data by adding information on semi-intensive aquaculture and, the consequences of stopping this practice), data on international markets and a description of the current eco-labelling process. As part of the results and recommendations, a discussion of AQC could be included.

Integrated policy response and action plan

The main objectives of the policy response are to improve sustainability of shrimp farming, alleviate poverty, decentralize the Economic Development Plan, and plan and implement efficient communication. The main components of the policy response include (i) streamlining the IA into incoming SEA regulation (Code de l'environnement), (ii) promoting "appellation de qualité contrôlée" (AQC) standard, (iii) decentralizing shrimp planning, and (iv) a plan for communication.

The activities expected over the next few months include dissemination of IA results, development of a AQC standard and promotion for it recognition, development of policy briefs and fact sheets; targeted sensitization of head of line ministries; organization of national information and sensitization workshops at national as well as regional levels.

3.6.6 Papua New Guinea

Finalisation of report

To finalize the IA study the following points need to be addressed:

- The summary needs to bring out the various aspects that the report has presented.
- In order to draw up further conclusions on the incentives for farmers to grow local food or export crop, and possible conversion between the two, the income figures for all crops need to be included.
- Finish the analysis and further elaborate the report based on the available data from the survey
- Better explain tables and data used in the text.
- Include information on the impact of the tariff reduction programme, and about whether the tariff reduction programme led to any kind of expansion / intensification of the coffee and palm oil sector or any changes in prices.
- Clearly state that although the survey was not able to establish a clear link between tariff reduction and export crop and loss in food crop variety it nevertheless revealed important aspects that currently could be contributing to loss in food crop variety.
- Describe the scenarios as possible drivers in the conceptual framework
- Ensure that recommendations provided in the report are linked to the results of the assessment (for this, first finish the analysis (as stated above)).

Integrated policy response and action plan

The main objective of the policy response is to improve recognition of the contribution of staple food crop to food security (85 percent of the population carry out subsistence farming) which is at threat due to extreme climatic condition and vulnerability to pests and diseases. The components of the action plan include (i) revision of the National Agriculture Development Plan (specifically the funding scheme for agricultural projects), (ii) increasing understanding of current intercropping practices and opportunities, (iii) increasing awareness of the importance to set aside land for local food crop for companies as well as for village farmers, and (iv) putting voluntary standards in place to help the sustainable growth of the exports, and (v) exploring the potential of export of staple food crop to other islands in the Pacific.

The plan of action for the next few months includes finalizing the report, briefings to agency heads (DFAT and NARI), holding the initial meeting with key stakeholders, holding a stakeholders validation workshop, and preparing information papers on the outcomes of the study. If these information papers are accepted, they would be followed by policy formulation or policy reviews, and implementation of the policy recommendations.

4. Closing

Vera Weick, Programme Officer, UNEP-ETB, wrapped up the workshop by thanking all the participants and others involved, summed up the accomplishments of the workshop, and provided information about the next steps.

Through the work that has been done on the IA reports since the last meeting in July 2008 and the active participation in the workshop the country teams have demonstrated their commitment to the project and willingness to follow through from analysis to implementation. To finalize the reports, the teams are now equipped with a list of the most important additions and revisions for the IA-studies. Given that the finalization of reports is behind with respect to original time table, the teams need to move quickly to finalize the reports, which will then go through a process of technical editing to prepare them for on-line publication. The deadline for submission of the final reports by the country project teams is 20 April 2009. (Following this submission minor changes are possible during the process of technical editing, but no major changes should be envisaged anymore). Based on the final reports, UNEP will prepare a synthesis report for the overall initiative.

Philip Bubb and Jan Joost Kessler will be working on the revision of the trade and biodiversity manual to (i) make it more consistent with the manual 'Introduction to Integrated Approach to Policy Making', (ii) incorporate country project experiences, and (iii) address other comments and suggestions. The revised draft will be circulated to all participants after 31 May.

To start the next phase of the country projects, the country project teams are asked to submit a 3-page summary of the integrated policy response and action plan based on the results of the working group. This document will serve as an annex to the small scale funding agreement that UNEP needs to sign with the project teams to provide financial support for the second phase of the projects. The small scale funding agreements will cover the activities that will be carried out in the next month to further develop and implement the integrated policy response.

A final outcome meeting will be organized at the end of 2009, or in early 2010, inviting members of the international steering committee as well as other institutions interested in the results of the initiative.

5 Annexes

Annex 5.1 List of participants

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

18-20 March 2009
International Environment House 1, 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: 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 Email: jpmvondoa@yahoo.fr
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
Madagascar	
Paulette Razanatsoa Chef de Service de l'Environnement Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage et de la Pêche BP 301, Anosy 101, Antananarivo, Madagascar Tel: +261 32 02 672 13 Fax: +261 20 22 265 61 E-mail: razanatsoa_paulette@yahoo.fr	Patrick Ranjatson Assistant de Recherche 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.: ++261320443376. Email: pranjatson@yahoo.fr
Mauritius	

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: p.seebun@yahoo.com

Indoomatee Ramma
Principal Research Scientist
Resource Management Division
Agricultural Research and Extension Unit
3rd Floor, Newry Complex
St Jean Street
Quatre Bornes
Mauritius
Tel: + 230 466 3885
Fax: +230 464 8809
Email: rmd@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

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

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

Francis Mwaura,
Research Fellow
Economic Policy Research Centre
Plot 51 Pool Road,
Makerere University
P.O. Box 7841,
Kampala-Uganda
Tel: +256-414-541023
Mobile +254-722402364
Email: mwaura@eprc.or.ug

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: 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 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: 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
Orlando Venn	International Association for Impact Assessment 32 Ashton Crescent, Braunton, Devon, EX33 1RD, United Kingdom.	Tel.: +44(0)1271 814028 Email : orlandovenn@btinternet.com
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: michel.a.bouchard@mcgill.ca
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: clive.george@manchester.ac.uk

Petra Meerkers	Senior Associate Global Sustainability Associates (BRN 53125480A) 75A Neil Road, Singapore 088902	Office: +65 6227 6247 Mobile: +65 97314134 Fax: +65 6227 6297 Email: meekerspw@yahoo.co.uk
Philip Bubb	Senior Programme Officer Ecosystem Assessment Programme UNEP-WCMC 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK	Tel.: +44 (0)1223 814662 Email: philip.bubb@unep-wcmc.org

UNEP - ETB staff

Name	Organisation and address	Contact details
Benjamin Simmons	Legal Officer	Tel.+ 41.22.917.8361 Email: benjamin.simmons@unep.ch
Fulai Sheng	Economics Affairs Officer	Tel.+ 41.22.917.8168 Email: fulai.sheng@unep.ch
Vera Weick	Programme Officer	Tel.+41.22.917.8151 Email: vera.weick@unep.ch
Edward Naval	Consultant	Tel.: +41.22.917.8487 Email: edward.naval@unep.ch
Armand Racine	Intern	Email: armand.racine@unep.ch
Gaylor Montmasson-Clair	Intern	Email: gaylor.montmasson-clair@unep.ch
Khaled Imam	Intern	Email: khaled.imam@unep.ch

Annex 5.2 Agenda of meeting

**Third International Review Meeting for the Country Projects on
Integrated Assessment of Trade-related Policies in the Agricultural Sector and
Biological Diversity**
18-20 March 2009,
International Environment House 1, Geneva

AGENDA

Wednesday, 18 March 2009 (Room 2)

Time	Session
8:30- 9:00	Registration (Room 2)
9:00-9:30	Welcome remarks Introduction to workshop (where we stand, objectives and programme) Introduction of new participants
9:30-10:00	Coffee break
10:00-11:00	Presentation and discussion of country project: <i>Uganda</i>
11:00-12.00	Presentation and discussion of country project: <i>Cameroon</i>
12:00-13:00	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
13:00-14:00	Presentation and discussion of country project: <i>Jamaica</i>
14:00-15:00	Presentation and discussion of country project: <i>Mauritius</i>
15:00-15:30	Coffee break
15:30-16:30	Presentation and discussion of country project: <i>Madagascar</i>
16:30-17:30	Presentation and discussion of country project: <i>Papua New Guinea</i>
17:30	Wrap up of first day

Thursday, 19 March 2009
(Rooms 2, 4 and 5)

Time	Session
9:00	Opening of second day (room 2)
9:00-10:15	1) Overview on Green Economy Initiative (GEI) 2) The study on “The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity” - TEEB <i>Questions and Answers</i>
10:15-10:30	Coffee break
10:30-11:00	Introduction to Integrated Approach to Policy Making <i>Questions and Answers</i>
11:00-12:00	Discussion on Finalization of the Trade and Biodiversity Manual
12:00-13:00	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
13:00-14:30	<u>Group work (1) on Integrated Assessment Studies - Finalization of reports (room 2.4 and 5):</u> Country project teams and members of core advisory group Introduction to group work Group work along guiding questions
14:30-15:00	Feedback from group work (1) Introduction to working group (2)
15:00-15:30	Coffee break
15:30-17:30	<u>Group work (2) on Integrated Policy Response and Action Plan (room 2.4 and 5):</u> Country project teams and members of core advisory group Introduction to group work Group work along guiding questions
17:30	Wrap up of second day

Friday, 20 March 2009

(Rooms 2, 4 and 5)

Time	Session
9:00	Opening of third day (room 2)
9:00-9:30	Summary on feedback from country project teams and preparation of synthesis report
	Coffee break integrated
9:30-12:00	<u>Group work (2) (continued – room 2,4 and 5):</u> Country project teams and members of core advisory group Group work along guiding questions Preparation of presentations
12:00-13:00	Lunch in cafeteria (International Environment House 1)
13:00-15:00	Presentation of group work results by country teams (room 2)
15:00-15:30	Coffee break
15:30-16:00	Presentation of group work results by country teams (room 2)
16:00-17:00	Final wrap up and closing

Questions for Working Groups

(1) Finalization of reports

What needs to be done to finalize the report of the integrated assessment (and the technical report)?

(Finalize in the sense of being ready for on-line publication)

- 1) Is important information still missing to describe:
 - a) the focus
 - b) the methodology
 - c) the results
 - d) the recommendationsof the integrated assessment in a consistent and comprehensive manner?
- 2) Which sections need to be further elaborated to better understand the above mentioned points?
- 3) Are there any inconsistencies in the report? And how could they be addressed?
- 4) Is the structure (as reflected in table of content) logic and useful to present the content of the report? Any suggestions for improvement?
- 5) Does the title of the study well reflect the content of the study? Any suggestions for improvement?
- 6) Do the headings and subheadings reflect well the content of the chapters and sub-sections? Any suggestions for improvement?
- 7) What will be done with the report at national level?

Questions for Working Groups

(2) Development of Integrated Policy Response and Action Plan

A) What is the suggested integrated policy response building on the results and recommendations of the integrated assessment study?

The integrated policy response describes the medium and longer term policy measures and other actions to be taken to address the problems and realize the opportunities identified in the integrated assessment.)

It should be an integrated response in the sense that

- It takes into account environmental, social and economic aspects,*
- It is supported by different actors and stakeholders and implemented with their involvement.*

- 1) What is the main objective of the response?
- 2) What are the main components of the response?
- 3) Who needs to be involved in the response? Who needs to receive information?
- 4) Who will take the lead?
- 5) Which barriers do you see for the implementation of the integrated policy response? How could they be overcome?
- 6) Which specific actions need to be taken to further develop and implement the integrated response?
- 7) What will be time frame and possible sequence of activities?
- 8) What will be the cost involved? What are possible sources of funding?
- 9) Which possibilities do you see to use integrated assessment, or an integrated approach to policy making, in other sectors / policy processes / negotiations in your country?

B) Which activities, contributing to development and implementation of the integrated national response, could be implemented in the next months?

(This refers to activities that UNEP could support under a small scale funding agreement.)

- 1) What is the objective of the activities?
- 2) How do they contribute to the development or implementation of the integrated national response?
- 3) Who will take the lead? Who else will be involved?
- 4) What will be the timeframe (short-term) and sequence of activities?
- 5) What are the costs involved?
- 6) What type of technical support may be needed?