

**Producing a ‘User Guide’ to Effective Approaches to Environmental Mainstreaming –
Tools and Tactics for the Real World
Project Document**

(IIED, 10 October 2008)

Summary

The challenge to integrate environment and development has never been more urgent. Infrastructure and agriculture must be climate-proofed. Industry must be energy- and water-efficient. Poor people’s environmental deprivations must be tackled in development activity. Their environmental rights must be recognised and supported. Environmental institutions need to work more closely together with other institutions – for too many of which the environment is treated as an externality.

Change will be slow without adequate stakeholder pressure to link institutions and learning from experience of ‘what works’ for environmental mainstreaming. There has been little sharing of experience on conducting ‘environmental mainstreaming’ tasks in advocacy, analysis, planning, investment, management, and monitoring. In contrast, there is too much untested guidance on how to go about the tasks.

This is why, in early 2007, IIED began an initiative to produce a *‘User Guide’ to Effective Approaches to Environmental Mainstreaming* steered by an international *Stakeholders Panel*.

Explanation of key terms

Environmental mainstreaming / integration

Understanding of what environmental mainstreaming (or integration) means or entails varies considerably. In this initiative, we take these two terms to mean the same thing - encompassing the process(es) by which environmental considerations are ***brought to the attention*** of organisations and individuals involved in decision-making on the economic, social and physical development of a country (at national, sub-national and/or local levels), and the process(es) by which environment is ***considered in taking those decisions***.

Approaches

A variety of approaches can be used to carry out the above processes. They include:

- broad tactics (ways of raising issues and making a case/getting heard);
- specific instruments, technical tools and analytical methods (eg for gathering information, planning and monitoring);
- methods for consultation and engaging stakeholders; and also
- a range of more informal, voluntary and indigenous approaches.

The current paper is a rolling project document – to be periodically revised as the initiative progresses. This initiative emerged from discussions at meetings of the Poverty Environment Partnership (PEP) in Washington (2006) and Nairobi (February 2007), with a range of developing country stakeholders and PEP members, and was given further focus following a meeting of a project Working Group in London in March 2007, and subsequent identification

on initial country surveys. IIED's preliminary work is being supported by Irish Aid and DFID.

In mid 2007, an *International Stakeholders Panel* was established, comprising a mix of decision-makers and practitioners in government, business, development assistance and civil society who are faced with the task of linking environment and development interests. One of the key tasks for this Panel (which adopted terms of reference at its first meeting in January 2008) was to steer and oversee the production of a 'User Guide' to the large array of approaches (tools, methods and tactics) available for 'environmental mainstreaming', building on stakeholders' experiences of the range from technical approaches such as EIA to more political approaches such as citizens' juries. But, based on feedback from country surveys (see below), the Panel agreed to a change of emphasis for the Guide which will now focus more on contextual and institutional issues.

Our contention, reinforced through several consultations to date, is that environmental mainstreaming capacity will be much stronger if stakeholders are able to select appropriate tools, methods and tactics. Some of these are widely used and others still in development; some are easy to do and others demanding of skills and money; some are effective but others are not. Too many tools are being 'pushed' by outside interests, and too few locally developed (and more informal, or less expensive) approaches are widely known. There is not enough 'demand-pull' information from potential users. Neither is there enough information available that helps them to *select* the right approaches themselves – as opposed to taking what others want or suggest/promote.

Therefore the initiative set out to identify which approaches work best, for what purpose and for which user. The aim was to base guidance on evidence submitted through a series of regional and country-based surveys and dialogues with stakeholder/users, and the Panel's own experience. Each used a standard questionnaire to structure consultations, workshops, focus group sessions and individual interviews.

The focus was put on those approaches *which directly help to shape policies, plans and decisions*; **NOT** the wider array of secondary approaches applied downstream of decision-making (eg market delivery mechanisms and instruments, field management tools)

The idea was that a core of about 30 such approaches would be profiled and reviewed according to common criteria. Because a user-driven approach was adopted, it was expected that the Guide would include an expanded set of approaches, beyond those that tend to be emphasised by technical experts, e.g. those used for civil society/business action. A decision-making 'tree' (guide to choosing tools) would be included to help users select the approach that is right for particular problems or tasks. And an overview of areas for which all tools tend to be weak or missing would also be prepared, to guide further tool development.

But during the country survey work, it proved harder than originally envisaged to secure focused user perspectives on particular approaches/tools. In general, respondents were more exercised on issues of context – drivers and constraints to mainstreaming, rather than the ins and outs of individual tools. As a result it was difficult to achieve the original intention of identifying the most favoured approaches/tools. Despite this, the survey work revealed rich information on institutional and contextual challenges which represent a major issue in the struggle to achieve environmental mainstreaming.

Therefore, it was decided to change the emphasis of the Guide. Part 1 will now analyse these contextual and institutional issues in some depth and provide a broad perspective on the challenge of environmental mainstreaming. Part 2, we discuss the broad range of mainstreaming approaches/tools related to particular challenges and decision-making tasks, provide some guidance on when particular approaches might best be used, and profile a few

key approaches/tools that are most commonly used in environmental mainstreaming. The re-structured scope of the Guide will be of interest and use to all those who are struggling to address environmental issues in development policy-making and decision-taking.

In the second phase of this initiative, starting in 2009, we will develop a *Sourcebook on Environmental Mainstreaming*, partly modelled on the IIED sourcebook for national sustainable development strategies (2002). This will provide more in-depth analysis of the above elements. It will also contain guidance on, for example, a framework for mainstreaming (eg concepts, principles, key steps, entry points for mainstreaming in development decision-making and investment), communication requirements and approaches, approaches to capacity-building, illustrative case studies, a wider range of profiled approaches/tools, monitoring, sources of information and support.

The developing the sourcebook will be supported and complemented by targeted work in selected countries and amongst communities/networks of approach/tool expert networks to deepen our understanding of when and how particular core approaches/tools can best be used and the challenges they face can best be faced/overcome.

The work of the International Stakeholder Panel's will aim to help people to make more informed choices, whether they are working on internationally recognised initiatives such as MDG-based national strategies, or national budgetary processes, or local level plans. It will also inform development assistance agencies, researchers and others who are in the business of tool development and promotion, by offering much-needed 'demand-side' information.

The net result of the user-first approach will be more empowered stakeholders, who are able to develop a stronger change strategy in their own circumstances.

1. The case for mainstreaming environment

In 2005, IIED worked with the Poverty Environment Partnership (PEP) in a high-profile series of activities for the 2005 UN World Summit.¹ The result was a strong case that:

- *Investment in environmental management* can generate significant returns, much of this benefiting poor people
- *Local organisations* are key policy drivers of environmental integration into development, and can be highly effective and equitable at the operational level
- *National environment and development authorities* need to become much more closely linked in their planning, budgeting and operations
- *Development cooperation agencies* could do much more to support and scale up good practice in integrating environment and development²

Most countries have committed to and become signatories to a range of *international agreements* which set both obligations and challenges. Many of these provide an unofficial 'mandate' for taking forward this initiative to develop a User Guide to effective tools and methods for integrating environment and development:

- The *Millennium Development Goals* (agreed at the UN General Assembly in 2000) provide a framing focus for development planning and assistance. To be effective, they

¹ PEP is a group of donor agencies, multilaterals and some research-focused INGOs. See <http://www.povertyenvironment.net/pep/> for some information on the PEP and <http://www.undp.org/pei/peppapers.html> for the papers produced by the PEP.

² This is now acknowledged in the OECD Development and Environment Ministers' 'Framework for Common Action Around Shared Goals' (OECD: Paris, 4 April 2006)

need to be integrated into national and local policy-making, decision-taking and planning processes. MDG7, in particular, calls for the “integration of the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes”.

- The *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI)* agreed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 stressed the importance of “strategic frameworks and balanced decision making ... for advancing the sustainable development agenda”. Given many different circumstances and contexts, this demands a range of tools .
- The *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* (adopted in 2005) commits development agencies to reform the way in which aid is delivered and to work in closer harmony to enhance development efficiency and effectiveness. It also emphasizes the need for donor agencies to better align behind the priorities of developing countries and their strategies to address these priorities. The proposed User Guide will help donors and developing country decision-makers and development practitioners alike to identify the appropriate approaches to meet this challenge, particularly those that are used effectively and valued by developing country users themselves.
- *Capacity challenges* need to be addressed if the above international agreements concerned with environmental issues are to be implemented effectively. This is recognised by the Paris Declaration, which calls for building country systems for environmental integration. Capacity development and effective tools go hand in hand. The User Guide will provide a key source for a wide range of actors who will have to address environmental mainstreaming, from senior decision-makers to development practitioners, indicating the tools available for particular tasks and contexts, and identifying the skills required.

Furthermore, in all countries there is a range of *domestic national (and more local) strategies, policy-making and planning process* covering environment and/or development (eg poverty reduction strategies, sustainable development strategies, sector-based policies and plans) as well as legislation, institutional procedures and voluntary arrangements. Some specify the use of particular tools (eg EIA) but many are not well implemented, in part because stakeholders lack effective approaches. All those involved in such processes (whether as senior decision-makers or development practitioners) will benefit from the User Guide: it should assist both process development (e.g. analysis tools and consultation approaches) as well as implementation and monitoring.

There is also a range of market and civil society drivers which can be considered to provide a more ‘informal mandate’ for developing the User Guide, eg the pressure for companies to be competitive and secure market access, and to adopt ethical approaches to environmental management and social improvement.

2. How will an ‘International Stakeholders Panel’ help to mainstream environment in development?

PEP meetings in Ottawa and Washington, and subsequent discussions led by IIED – notably an international workshop in London (March 2007) – confirmed that appropriate action on the four opening conclusions under 1 above, at a significant scale, is unlikely unless:

- a) *Southern governments, businesses and civil society organisations take an active lead in environmental mainstreaming.* To date, the more assertive, well-resourced environmental leaders tend to have been based in the OECD and international organisations. This has resulted in a range of approaches, some of which do not always fit Southern circumstances

well. The establishment of the '*Stakeholder Panel*' aims to help to promote approaches that work better in those circumstances.³

- b) *Southern stakeholders have the right tools that equip them to act with a clearer voice, a stronger case on what to do, and robust activities to achieve it.* PEP itself has a significant record of work on tools and methods. This now needs to face a stronger demand-test from Southern stakeholders. The '*Guide to environmental Mainstreaming*' and the '*Sourcebook*' that to follow will - covering practical, affordable integration approaches (tools, methods and tactics) - could play such a role – and more.
- c) *Further work on environmental mainstreaming brings together Northern and Southern stakeholders for mutual learning, on an equitable basis.* Many issues surrounding environmental mainstreaming concern the integration and trade-off between global public goods, national public goods and private goods. In addition, innovations in North and South have wider implications. Thus a and b above, while calling for more Southern input, cannot be achieved effectively with *only* Southern input. The '*Stakeholder Panel*' the '*Guide to Environmental Mainstreaming*' and the '*Sourcebook*' will therefore draw on a wide range of people and sources.

3. Why are a 'Guide to Mainstreaming' and a 'Sourcebook' needed?

To cope with increasingly rapid and diverse changes: A 'Guide' and 'Sourcebook' are needed to help people make smart decisions on how to link environment and development. Given increasing dynamics – in water insecurity, climate change, the growth in ecosystem markets, the rapid expansion of biofuels, etc – such decisions cannot afford to be poorly made, or taken too late. The Guide and Sourcebook will therefore benefit a wide range of audiences who have to keep up with such environmental and developmental dynamics and respond appropriately.

To reshape 'supply-driven' approaches to toolkits through stronger Southern voices: There is a surfeit of mammoth 'manuals', 'toolkits' and labyrinthine websites describing tools, methodologies, protocols, and services for integrating environment into development. These have their own utility. But there is also a strong flavour of 'supply push' behind much of this. Most environmental integration tools are produced by planners and experts for use within their own disciplines/activities – yet there are many other actors who need to be involved in integrating environmental concerns. Many tools are promoted by donors and other external agencies, e.g. EIA, SEA, CBA, wealth accounts, genuine savings, poverty monitoring, etc – sometimes as conditionalities. Where some organisations use the same term for different approaches or, conversely, different terms for the same approach, this only adds to confusion.

To improve understanding of the implications of each approach and to reduce risks of inappropriate use: Without good information on such tools and tactics, potential users face a number of risks, e.g.:

- Not understanding their often significant *resource implications* – finance, skills, and time requirements for using the approach effectively. Sometimes, resource-intensive approaches are employed when a quick, simple decision-making framework would help – or vice versa;
- Using approaches that are not well *proven* – many tools are still at the research or experimental stage, but are nonetheless heavily promoted;

³ It was also observed that PEP should consider promoting a Southern equivalent of itself. The proposed '*Stakeholder Panel*' could, in part, be a first step in this direction.

- Using approaches that are not *appropriate to local users and conditions* – some have been developed in the North and are now being promoted for use in the South where they may not necessarily help (at least not in their original format), e.g. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA);
- Ignoring *'home-grown' approaches and resources* that may suit the local institutional context better;
- Successively applying *clashing/duplicating approaches* to meet the changing requirements of several external agencies – creating inefficient, un-harmonised outcomes;
- *Asking too much of any one approach*, e.g. poverty and social impact assessment (PSIA) is dominant in the development of PRSPs but takes little account of the environment – another tool is needed for this;
- Adopting an *overly technocratic approach* to environmental integration, which is in large part a political and governance issue;
- Adopting approaches that do not offer adequate *transparency* on environmental mainstreaming⁴.

4. Who will be the main users of the Guide and Sourcebook – and how will their varied needs be met?

National and local organisations in developing countries and countries in transition: The immediate target of the Guide and Sourcebook is the large number of national, regional and local groups who will need to ensure that 'MDG-based' national plans, PRSPs, their local equivalents, sector strategies, climate change plans, and associated investments *both* mainstream environment *and* are led by stakeholders within the country or locality, as appropriate. Within this key target group will be an array of 'approach' users - within government, private sector, and civil society. These include policy-makers, planners, development practitioners, law-makers/MPs, the judiciary, commercial banks and financial institutions, private investors and multi-national companies, NGOs/CBOs and rights organisations, academics, the media – informal and formal, etc.

Multilateral and bilateral development agencies, UN and international organisation: A key secondary target is those agencies that support the above national and local organisations in their development work. Many of these are currently in the process of putting together, or revising, 'tool kits' variously for MDG-based national plans (e.g. UNDP), climate-proofing national development plans (UNEP), integrated ecosystems assessment (e.g. UNEP), or developing 'country systems' for environmental appraisal and scrutiny (e.g. World Bank).⁵ This would meet the need identified by OECD environment and development ministers in their 'Framework for Common Action Around Shared Goals' (2006) to promote good-practice environmental mainstreaming instruments.

Policy/research groups: Development of the guide would also provide essential 'user' information to enrich the further development of integration approaches, e.g. IIED's own planned work to develop and test a framework for sustainability appraisal.⁶

To meet the needs of these diverse stakeholders, the Guide and Sourcebook will be:

⁴ Governments will increasingly need to be as transparent on their environmental mainstreaming performance as on their support to human rights and other social issues.

⁵ The proposed work could, therefore, overtly address one or more of these current international initiatives, without losing its independent, user-engaged character. **PEP advice is sought**

⁶ IIED defines sustainability appraisal as a generic process that provides for (a) some form of integrative analysis of the economic, environmental and social aspects of development actions, and (b) an evaluation of their effects with regard to agreed aims, principles or criteria of sustainable development.

- *independent* of the agencies that promote particular approaches;
- based as far as possible on real *experience* of different ‘users’ of the approaches, as well as independent technical experts;
- inclusive of *informal or traditional* approaches and *private sector and voluntary* innovations (not only governmental or regulatory);
- inclusive of the varied *needs and contexts* in resource-poor, time-short, capacity-short developing countries and countries in transition;
- therefore *focused on the ultimate use of the approaches* (e.g. clean air and water);
- concise and *easy to use*.

5. What guidance will the ‘Guide’ and ‘Sourcebook’ offer?

The *Guide to Environmental Mainstreaming* will focus mainly on the main contextual and institutional issues challenging and providing opportunities for environmental; mainstreaming (Box 1 outlines draft contents). Part 2 will included a limited set of profiles of key tools commonly used for environmental mainstreaming (eg EIA, SEA)

Box 1: Guide to Environmental Mainstreaming: Draft Contents

Acknowledgements
Executive Summary
Preface

Part 1: Mainstreaming the Environment: A Perspective on the Contextual and Institutional Challenges

1 *Introduction:*

- 1.1 Why do we need to ‘mainstream’ the environment?
- 1.2 What is environmental mainstreaming?
- 1.3 Who should be concerned about environmental mainstreaming?
 - 1.3.1 The actors in environmental mainstreaming
 - 1.3.2 Responses and international mandates for environmental mainstreaming

2 *The challenges of environmental mainstreaming*

- 2.1 The institutional context for environmental mainstreaming
- 2.2 Drivers of mainstreaming
 - 2.2.1 Major drivers of mainstreaming from IIED’s country surveys
 - 2.2.2 Moderately important drivers of mainstreaming from IIED’s country surveys
 - 2.2.3 Other drivers of mainstreaming from IIED’s country surveys
- 2.3 Constraints to environmental mainstreaming

3 *Effective mainstreaming; what it takes*

- 3.1 A framework and indicators of effective environmental mainstreaming
- 3.2 Capacity for environmental mainstreaming
- 3.3 Work towards a systematic approach
- 3.4 Communications
- 3.5 Building a platform
- 3.6 Basic steps in environmental mainstreaming

References

Part 2 Profiles of key approaches

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 4 | A roadmap to approaches for environmental mainstreaming |
| 4.1 | What approaches are available? |
| 4.2 | Choosing appropriate approaches |
| 5 | Profiles |

Annexes

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Some international initiatives in environmental mainstreaming |
|---|---|

The *Sourcebook on Environmental Mainstreaming*, to be produced in 2009-10 will be modelled on the sourcebook for national sustainable development strategies (2002). This will provide more in-depth analysis of the above elements. It will also contain guidance on, for example, a framework for mainstreaming (eg concepts, principles, key steps, entry points for mainstreaming in development decision-making and investment), communication requirements and approaches, approaches to capacity-building, and illustrative case studies, monitoring and sources of information and support. It will also profile a wider range (than the Guide) of profiled approaches, tools and tactics (see section 5.1) in ways which help people in different situations to select the right approach and use it appropriately (section 5.2). It will present a range of practical existing approaches, rather than (as is normally the case) proposing an ideal, brand new approach – although it would point to new and upcoming initiatives. It will summarise each approach from a user perspective, and provide references and links, but it will not itself comprise a ‘toolkit’.

5.1 A catalogue of integration ‘approaches’. The word ‘approach’ is used in this document as a shorthand term, to embrace the wide spectrum of processes, techniques and tools⁷ – from highly technical methodologies to highly political tactics – that support *analysis, debate, planning and decision-making* on environmental mainstreaming (rather than environmental management in the field).

The focus will be those approaches which *directly help to shape policies, plans and decisions*; **NOT** the wider array of secondary approaches applied downstream of decision-making (eg market delivery mechanisms and instruments, field management tools)

The Guide and subsequent Sourcebook will profile key approaches in a common format (see section 5.2), although some approaches might be included in less detail or referenced. We will include approaches that are commonly used by particular actors, notably those that tend to be obligatory. We will also include the ‘nice-to-do’ approaches that stakeholders favour most. The majority will be readily available – even if they are not always considered amongst the toolkits offered, which have tended to be too technical in focus. Some will be generic approaches for integration, with special value to the tasks of environmental mainstreaming, e.g. many deliberative approaches. Others would be environment-specific e.g. EIA. Some may be ‘indigenous’ to only a few contexts, having been ‘surfaced’ through the country surveys and Panel work – see below.⁸ Finally, the Sourcebook will point to promising new approaches e.g. the upcoming Ecosystem Assessment Manual.

Box 2 lists a range of selected approaches to indicate (only) the range that might be included in either the Guide or Sourcebook, focusing on those which the March 2007 Project Working Group considered to be candidates for a ‘must include’ list. A more detailed list could also be

⁷ The term ‘tool’ is often taken to imply a highly technocratic approach, which will not always be appropriate where the task is more of a political one.

⁸ In William Easterly’s terms, what approaches are used by ‘searchers’ (as opposed to ‘planners’)? PEP members have already surfaced some, such as the work of Calabash in Southern Africa

generated from the ‘best practice’ approaches to some of the generic approaches listed, e.g. cumulative impacts assessment.

Box 2 is presented as a simple typology of approaches. In the Guide, integration approaches will also be presented in relation to particular ‘tasks’ in the decision-making cycle.⁹

Box 2: Illustrative range of integration approaches for possible inclusion

(A) Information tools:

Economic and financial assessment: cost-benefit analysis/ IRR; public (environmental) expenditure review; ‘green/natural resource/environmental – accounting’

Impact assessment and strategic analysis: EIA and EHSIA; SEA; country diagnostics (eg state of environment report, country environmental assessment); social impact assessment and variants (eg PSIA, HRIA, assessment of indigenous peoples, vulnerability, gender, livelihoods, etc), PPA; regulatory impact assessment ; poverty monitoring; business approaches (eg production assessment, Natural Step, life cycle analysis, Equator Principles, Global Compact)

Spatial assessment: poverty mapping; land use planning (including bioregional planning, landscape value, cultural heritage assessment, and sectoral variants).

Monitoring and evaluation: SD indicators + variants (e.g. poverty-environment indicators, MDGs); census and household surveys (including specific sampling surveys); audits and administrative reporting; sustainability reporting – national (CSD), business (CSR - obligatory and voluntary, GRI tools)

Policy analysis: stakeholder, institutional, governance and policy mapping,

(B) Deliberative tools and tools for engaging:

Participation and citizen action: participatory learning and action (PLA), PPA; citizen movements and fora/dialogues/juries/ scorecards; multi-stakeholder fora and processes, inc NCSO; consultation methods inc focus groups

Political analysis and action: Discourse-shaping, coalition-forming and common programme, tactics for making a case inc trade-off matrix, political/election manifestos, dual-track diplomacy (para-diplomacy), white papers, green papers, commissions and hearings

Conflict management: dispute resolution, arbitration

(C) Planning and organising tools:

Legal tools: public interest litigation; legal instruments that derive from MEAs, rights regime, etc

Visioning: scenario development

Management planning and control: QMS/EMS + ISO family of similar tools; risk assessment/management, threshold analysis, precautionary tools e.g. hotspot strategy

⁹ Further ways to construct a hierarchy of ‘approaches for ‘integration’ may be considered, e.g. (1) principles and frameworks, (2) procedures and methods, (3) tools and techniques, and (4) norms and practices

5.2 *User and technical profiling of the catalogue of ‘approaches’.*

The sourcebook will use a **standard profile** of approaches (tools, tactics, methods)¹⁰ :

- Non-technical *summary* (1 page);
- *Technical description* (2-3 pages) (e.g. background/origins, main steps, costs, skills, illustrative case box(es);
- *User feedback* (pros and cons) (1-2 pages) with user testimonies on using the approach;
- *Decision tree* (1-2 pages) How to decide if the approach is appropriate for task, problem or context, and perhaps information on system development and missing approaches;
- Links to *references/resources* describing how to use the tool (pointing to tool kits rather than offering a new one).

Use might be made of pictures/images/symbols in the non-technical summary to convey key factual points – e.e. \$ – \$\$\$\$ for costs, i – iiiii for information requirements, similar for time and professional qualifications – but not ‘star-rating’ judgements (eg * – *****) about approaches, which depends on contexts

There will be *three steps to the profiling process*:

- a) Using feedback from the country surveys, country teams and International Panel to identify the most valued and used approaches that appear to have been most effective in environmental mainstreaming and why they are effective; as well as the main ‘problems’ associated with integration approaches in general. Responses to these questions will help prepare the *user feedback* section on each approach.
- b) From this, identifying *candidate approaches* to include in the Guide and subsequently in the Sourcebook, as well as the ‘*user criteria*’ (perspective) for describing selected approaches.
- c) Targeted work in selected countries and amongst communities/networks of approach/tool expert networks to deepen our understanding of when and how candidate approaches can best be used and the challenges they face can best be faced/overcome.
- d) Preparing a *profile* of the selected individual approaches.

Tentatively, therefore, each significant approach would be described according to its ability to *perform a given use* and to *suit a specific type of user*, with testimonials solicited (to a broadly common format), e.g.:

- a) What *task(s)* is the named approach best or least suited for? - by developmental ‘cycle’ stage
- b) How far does the approach address the social, economic, environmental and institutional ‘*pillars*’ of sustainability? (1 pillar, 2 pillars, 3 pillars, 4 pillars...)
- c) What is the *political economy* associated with the approach? e.g.
 - Who are the typical *promoters* of the approach?
 - Is the approach closely *linked to* (inter)national legal requirements or policy commitments, or key aid instruments, research groups, or community groups?
 - What ‘*user*’, ‘*entry point*’ and *level* (national to local) is the approach most suited to? e.g. community planning or national treasuries
- d) What are the approach’s *demands on* skills, finances, data, time, political will, and organisational capacity?

¹⁰ Page lengths are indicative. Some may be a little longer (eg for complex tools such as SEA), other less. Suggestions assume A4 sheets with 10-11 pt font.

- e) e) What *prerequisites* or *complements* help to make this effective e.g. what other approaches is the specific approach sometimes/often used with (in combination or parallel)?
- f) How *flexible/adaptable* has the approach proven to be?
- g) *Overall commentary*. Perhaps by reference to simple ‘pros and cons’; or ‘included best-practice features’; or ‘user feedback on effectiveness’; or ‘must-have’ / ‘nice-to-have’ / ‘waste of time’.

Two further questions will be asked about the set of approaches as a whole:

- How to put different approaches *together* into a system e.g. for an MDG-based strategy¹¹
- What key approaches seem to be *weak or missing*, but also correspond to real demand, suggesting further development could be valuable?

6. How will the ‘Stakeholder Panel on Mainstreaming Environment in Development’ and the ‘Guide’ and ‘Sourcebook’ be put together?

6.1 International Working Group Meeting

An international *project Working Group* meeting was held at IIED on March 28-29 2007¹², with support from DFID and Irish Aid. The meeting considered

- The purpose of the Guide, and other possible products;
- The landscape of possible approaches for inclusion (highlighting a range of probable ‘must have’ tools);
- Possible membership of the Panel;
- Modalities for undertaking country surveys and consultations on approaches;
- Interest in further involvement in the project (i.e. in undertaking country surveys);
- How the project can best link with and build on a range of other initiatives, as well as influence them;
- Future development of the User Guide project.

6.2 Country surveys

During September 2007 – April 2008, ten regional and country surveys were commissioned and led by partner organisations, each following a similar methodology. These were selected based on geographical spread and governance type:

- **Chile** (also with a regional dimension) – managed by Research and Resources for Sustainable Development (RIDES);
- **India** – managed by Development Alternatives;
- **South Africa** – managed by the Development Bank of Southern Africa; The Caribbean (with a focus so far on Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago – and hopefully extended to Anguilla and Montserrat) (led by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI);

¹¹ This is one of the aims of IIED’s planned work to develop a framework for sustainability appraisal.

¹² Some 20 individuals participated including development practitioners from government at national and local levels (in both developed and developing countries), NGOs, private sector and donors/development banks. They included both users and developers of environmental integration approaches, covering a range of activities with variously a technical, political or institutional development focus.

- The *Philippines* (led jointly by the Earth Council Asia-Pacific and ICLEI (Southeast Asia));
- *Ghana* (led by the Environmental Protection Agency);
- *Croatia and Czech Republic* (led by Integra CS in Czech Republic);
- *Kenya and Uganda* (led by the UNEP-UNDP Poverty-Environment Initiative).

These surveys comprise a mix of literature review, semi-structured interviews, round tables, focus groups and workshops. They secured user on-the-ground feedback about:

- the scope of the project,
- their perspectives on the opportunities, drives and constraints to environmental mainstreaming;
- the challenges faced by ‘approach’ users,
- their needs related to integrating approaches,
- their perspectives of which approaches they find useful or not (identifying approaches that have been found to be the most effective in environmental mainstreaming and why they are effective; as well as the problems associated with integration approaches),
- baseline information on integration approaches

A *simple generic questionnaire* was developed by IIED (and revised following experience with its use in the three initial surveys) to guide diagnostic work and dialogues with users. Some partner organisations customised the questionnaire to add questions that have particular domestic relevance or importance.

6.3 *Other contributions*

Supplementary mechanisms will also be pursued where possible to use to enable ‘stakeholders’ to offer insight on integration approaches, propose further approaches that work, and give examples of their use. This will require a well-networked Stakeholders’ Panel and resources for IIED to negotiate arrangements to develop opportunities as they arise, e.g.

- professional associations for the various environmental and development disciplines (such as IAIA),
- Southern multi-stakeholder networks for key user groups (such as the Ring for policy),
- regional governmental fora for environment and development policy (such as NEPAD for Africa),
- development assistance e.g. through PEP and the OECD DAC Environet as well as in-house (such as DFID’s planned environmental mainstreaming guidance for country offices),
- ‘tool kit’ assemblers (such as UNDP, UNEP, UN regional commissions and others who aim to support MDG-based strategies),
- environment/development networks (such as IIED International Fellows and LEAD Fellows), and
- research groups reviewing tool use and developing upcoming ‘improved’ tools (such as WRI, IIED and others).

Literature assessment to identify and assess similar/overlapping products, such as UNEP’s work on a manual of ‘integrating’ tools; tool kits of various multilaterals, professional associations, etc, both published and web-based.

6.4 *Setting up the International Stakeholder Panel*

Following the launch of the country surveys, a Panel of experienced development stakeholders was appointed to help steer the project. This includes a mix of practitioners engaged in the initiative directly (eg through conducting country surveys), agencies providing financial support to the project, and independent individuals (senior decision-makers from government, private sector, international organisations and/or NGOs in developing countries).

The *First Panel meeting* was held on 14-15 January 2008, in London. It adopted terms of reference and addressed several related issues, at the same time as building broader ownership of the initiative (see Box 2). Further consultations have been held with Panel members individually and in groups (via telephone conferences)

Box 2: Summary of First Meeting of International Stakeholder Panel

The International Stakeholder Panel on Environmental Mainstreaming met for two days. It reviewed the outcomes and lessons from country surveys of stakeholder opinion on tools, tactics and approaches that are useful for integrating environment and development. These surveys had been conducted so far in South Africa, Kenya, India, Chile (with a regional coverage in addition), Trinidad, Jamaica and Barbados. They revealed the significance of (1) country context, (2) precise mainstreaming goal, and (3) type of stakeholder in determining the choice and utility of (4) individual tools or tactics and their combination. These four factors will be used to (a) inform the final write-up of the country reports, (b) the conduct of future survey work about to start in the Philippines, Ghana and possibly some countries in transition, and (c) the design of the User Guide to tools and tactics for Environmental Mainstreaming – enabling various entry points to the guidance.

Given the urgency and diversity of ‘mainstreaming’ challenges e.g. to tackle climate change and growing pressures on resources in ways that secure ecosystem services, the Panel emphasised the need for the User Guide to meet many needs and circumstances. However, they stressed that the User Guide would likely have most impact if – at least initially – it were aimed at ‘change agents’ who have the drive and opportunity to improve environmental integration in decision-making, but who may lack the guidance. In addition, IIED was challenged to think about how a basic User Guide ‘platform’ could be established – and gain widespread acceptance or mandate – so that various tailored ‘products’ might be based upon it and rolled out soon after the basic guide has been prepared.

The Panel gave detailed guidance on the content and structure of the guide, and suggestions for communications and rollout strategy. IIED was encouraged to take up a key opportunity to ‘embed’ the User Guide in the donor policy agenda, through engaging in the multi-agency Poverty Environment Partnership and DAC Natural Resource Governance and Environment Capacity Task Team.

The next meeting of the International Stakeholder Panel on Environmental Mainstreaming will be organised after feedback has been analysed from reviews of the first draft of the User Guide – in late 2008.

6.5 Schedule for producing the Guide and Sourcebook

	2007
Project document and budget finalised	By mid May
Initial set of country surveys (Chile, India, South Africa)	August – December
First PEI survey (Kenya)	November-December
International Stakeholder Panel appointed	August

Project website established	October
Second set of country surveys/workshops (Caribbean, Philippines, Ghana, Croatia, Czech Republic)	November 2008 – April 2008
	2008
1 st International Panel meeting	January
Second PEI country surveys (Uganda)	February-March
Complete all country survey	End April
Caribbean regional meeting (addendum to 'country' report)	April/May
Develop proto text for Guide to Environmental Mainstreaming	July- September
Prepare draft Guide	October – December
Develop proposal for Phase 2 (Sourcebook) + fund raise	October – December
	2009
International Panel and wider reference group to review draft Guide	January
Finalise Guide and publish	February-March
Draft outline for Sourcebook	February – March
Drafting Sourcebook	April - October
Consultations with tool specialists and country 'deepening' work	April-October
Review of Sourcebook – International Panel and other reviewers	November-December
	2010
Finalising Sourcebook manuscript	January-March
Sourcebook publication process (Earthscan) –hard copy	April-August
Develop web-based version of Sourcebook	September-Deceber
Website – updated and developed on continuing basis throughout project	

6.6 Presenting the ‘Guide’ and ‘Sourcebook’

The Guide will be published in hard copy and as a downloadable pdf on the website (www.environmental-mainstreaming.org)

The Sourcebook will be presented in several formats, including:

- Hard copy book (in English, and also in French and Spanish subject to funding)
- A website format (available on www.environmental-mainstreaming.org)
- CD Rom

The Sourcebook should provide a platform/chassis for building on and to stimulate other products/activities

6.8 Roll-out strategy

A roll-out strategy for the Guide and Sourcebook and associated products will be developed: Opportunities will be used, where possible, to organise events and provide briefings, information and showcase illustrative proto-products (tasters) at various upcoming events – to raise interest

- UNCSD- 2009
- IAIA’09 in Ghana (late May 2009) - possible opportunity for a showcase launch
- Key champions may be engaged to present the Guide and Sourcebook at events
- The option to develop a training course/materials related to the Guide and Sourcebook might be explored.
- Options to establish monitoring of Guide and Sourcebook uptake (‘implementation’) will be explored.
- It will be important to identify, integrate and embed the Guide and Sourcebook with key national drivers, projects, donor procedures and safeguards
- There may be merit to develop an accompanying facilitation guide (eg how run a workshop for change)

7. Resource requirements

IIED is convinced of the potential of this work and has committed strategic programme resources from DFID and Irish Aid support, which together have provided sufficient funds to undertake Phase 1 9country surveys and production of the Guide to Environmental Mainstreaming)

The helpful contribution of UNEP/UNDP in conducting contributing country surveys reviews in two PEI countries (Kenya and Uganda) is warmly acknowledged (section 6.2).

IIED will be seeking further funding to enable Phase 2 (development of Sourcebook) to be undertaken.