

Producing a 'User Guide' to effective tools and methods for integrating environment and development

Project Document

(IIED, 16 July 2007)

Summary

The challenge to integrate environment into 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 IIED has begun an initiative to produce a **'User Guide' to environmental mainstreaming**, steered by an international **Stakeholders Panel**. The current paper is a rolling project document – to be periodically revised as the initiative progresses. This version is based on earlier 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 following a first meeting of a project Working Group in London in March 2007, and subsequent identification on initial country surveys. IIED's preliminary work has been supported by Irish Aid and DFID.

The international Stakeholders Panel will comprise 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. The initial task for this Panel will be to steer and oversee the production of a 'User Guide' to the large array of tools and methods 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.

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 and methods. Some tools and methods 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 tools themselves – as opposed to taking what others want or suggest/promote.

Therefore the initiative will aim to identify which tools work best, for what purpose and for which user. This guidance will be based on evidence submitted through a series of regional and country-based stakeholder/user consultations and workshops, and the Panel's own experience.

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

A core of about 30 such tools will be profiled and reviewed according to common criteria. The user-driven approach means that the Guide is likely to include an expanded set of tools and approaches, beyond those that tend to be emphasised by technical experts, e.g. those used for civil society/business action. A decision-making 'tree' will be offered 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 will also be prepared, to guide further tool development.

The Panel's work will 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 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 .

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)

- 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 tools meet this challenge, particularly tools 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 tools. 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 and consultation tools) 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 a '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) – have 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 proposed '*Stakeholder Panel*' would help to promote approaches that work better in those circumstances.³

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.

- 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 proposed ‘User Guide’ to practical, affordable integration tools and other methods 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. Both the proposed ‘Stakeholder Panel’ and ‘User Guide’ will therefore draw on a wide range of people and sources.

3. Why is a ‘User Guide’ needed?

To cope with increasingly rapid and diverse changes: A ‘User Guide’ is 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 User Guide 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 each tool’s implications and to reduce risks of inappropriate use: Without good information on such ‘tools’, 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
- 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' tools and resources* that may suit the local institutional context better
- Successively applying *clashing/duplicating tools* to meet the changing requirements of several external agencies – creating inefficient, unharmonised outcomes
- *Asking too much of any one tool*, 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 how will their varied needs be met?

National and local organisations in developing countries and countries in transition: The immediate target of the User Guide 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 tool 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 tools, 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 will be:

- *independent* of the agencies that promote particular tools;

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.

- based as far as possible on real *experience* of different ‘users’ of the tools, 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 tools* (e.g. clean air and water);
- concise and *easy to use*.

5. What guidance will the ‘User Guide’ offer?

The Guide will describe the range of tools and tactics (section 4.1) in ways which help people in different situations to select the right tool and use it appropriately (section 4.2). 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 ‘tools’. The word ‘tool’ is used here as a shorthand term, to summarise the wide spectrum of approaches – 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).⁷

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

The Guide will profile an initial core set of tools (in the region of 30), presented in a common format (see section 5.2), although further tools might be included in less detail or referenced. We will include tools that are commonly used by particular actors, notably those that tend to be obligatory. We will also include the ‘nice-to-do’ tools 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 tools for integration, with special value to the tasks of environmental mainstreaming, e.g. many deliberative tools. Others would be environment-specific e.g. EIA. Some may be ‘indigenous’ to only a few contexts, having been ‘surfaced’ through the planned in-country consultations and Panel work – see below.⁸ Finally, the Guide will point to promising new approaches e.g. the upcoming Ecosystem Assessment Manual.

Box 1 lists a range of selected tools to indicate (only) what the Guide might include, 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 generated from the ‘best practice’ approaches to some of the generic tools listed, e.g. cumulative impacts assessment.

⁷ We recognise that the term ‘tool’ does not always find favour, as it tends 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 tools are used by ‘searchers’ (as opposed to ‘planners’)? PEP members have already surfaced some, such as the work of Calabash in Southern Africa

Box 1 is presented as a simple typology of tools. In the Guide, tools will also be presented in relation to particular 'tasks' in the decision-making cycle.⁹

Box 1: Illustrative range of tools for possible inclusion

(B) 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,

(C) 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 NCSD; 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

(D) 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 'tools 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 'tools'.

The *format of the Guide* is still to be decided. But we envisage perhaps three main parts:

- *Introductory sections* that set the scene and deal with overarching issues:
 - (a) concepts and frameworks (e.g. the social, economic, environmental and institutional '*pillars*' of sustainability, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Agenda 21, sustainable livelihoods, happiness/wellbeing index, security and vulnerability);
 - (b) outline the developmental '*cycle*' within which environment needs to be mainstreamed (e.g. awareness-raising, analysis, debate, planning, decision-making, monitoring, reporting);
 - (c) a typology of different kinds of influence that tools can exert (e.g. informational, political, financial);
 - (d) and perhaps some commissioned '*essays*' on issues connected to tools
- *Profiles of the selected core tools* – the heart or engine of the Guide – see below
- *Supporting materials* on other non-core tools, as well as annexes (e.g. sources of further information).

Profiles of the selected core tools will comprise several elements: ¹⁰

- A non-technical *summary sheet* (1 page);
- A *technical description* of the tool (e.g. background/origins, main steps, costs, skills, illustrative case box(es) (2-3 pages);
- A *user perspective* (pros and cons) (1-2 pages), with user testimonies on using the tool;
- A *decision tree* – to help decide whether the tool is appropriate for a specific task, problem or context, perhaps with information on system development and missing tools (1-2 pages);
- Links to *references/resources* describing how to use the tool, i.e. pointing to tool kits rather than offering a new one.

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

- a) Asking a wide range of users to identify the (at least) '*top five tools*' they believe have been most effective in environmental mainstreaming and why they are effective; as well as the '*top five problems*' associated with tools in general. Feedback from these questions will help prepare the *user perspective* on each tool
- b) From this, identifying *candidate tools* to include in the Guide, as well as the '*user criteria*' (perspective) for describing selected tools
- c) Preparing a *profile* of the selected individual tools

Tentatively, therefore, each significant tool 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 tool best or least suited for? By developmental '*cycle*' stage
- b) How far does the tool address the social, economic, environmental and institutional '*pillars of sustainability*? (1 pillar, 2 pillars, 3 pillars, 4 pillars...)

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.

- c) What is the *political economy* associated with the tool? e.g.
 - Who are the typical *promoters* of the tool?
 - Is the tool 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 tool most suited to? e.g. community planning or national treasuries
- d) What are the *tool's demands on* skills, finances, data, time, political will, and organisational capacity?
- e) What *prerequisites* or *complements* help to make this effective e.g. what other tools is the specific tool sometimes/often used with (in combination or parallel)?
- f) How *flexible/adaptable* has the tool 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 could be asked about the set of tools as a whole:

- How to put different tools *together* into a system e.g. for an MDG-based strategy¹¹
- What key tools 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 'User Guide' be put together?

6.1 International Working Group Meeting

An international Working Group meeting has already been held at IIED on March 28-29 2007, with support from DFID and Irish Aid. The meeting considered the scope of the Guide and provided rich material to prepare this current version of the project document. 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 meeting considered:

- The purpose of the Guide, and other possible products;
- The landscape of possible tools for inclusion (highlighting a range of probable 'must have' tools);
- Possible membership of the Panel;
- Modalities for undertaking country surveys and consultations on tools;
- 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.

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

6.2 Setting up the International Stakeholder Panel on Mainstreaming Environment in Development'

The next stage will be to organise an initial set of three country surveys (elaborated in section 6.3):

- Chile (also with a regional dimension) – managed by RIDES
- India – managed by Development Alternatives
- South Africa – managed by the Development Bank of Southern Africa

An option for additional early country surveys is currently being discussed with the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI).

These initial surveys will aim to secure user on-the-ground feedback about the scope of the project, the challenges they face, their needs related to integrating tools, and their perspectives of which tools they find useful or not.

Once these first country surveys have been completed, a Panel of experienced development stakeholders will be appointed to help steer the project. This is likely to include both practitioners engaged in the initiative directly (eg through conducting country surveys) and agencies providing financial support. Some members of the March 2007 Working Group are likely to become Panel members.

The *First Panel meeting* will address several related issues, at the same time as building broader ownership of the initiative:

- The on-going *design and conduct* of the initiative, and building effective links to other related initiatives;
- The general role and *modus operandi* of the Panel itself. It will be most effective if it has a strong sense of purpose. Some may be motivated by the opportunities for a broad environment-development learning group; others by the effort to identify and promote effective mainstreaming tools that have not had much 'airing' to date. Based on feedback from the initial country surveys, the specific *task of the Guide* and the *scope of 'tools'* to be included
- Agreeing *how the included tools will be profiled* and how that information will be organised (probably through a task/problem orientation) and presented. The role(s) and contribution(s) of *Panel members*.

Second Panel meeting: this will review the draft guide (6.4 below).

Third Panel meeting: this will (a) consider comments on the draft guide from a broader set of reviewers, (b) identify how to respond to users' recommendations on missing/weak tools, (c) determine how to finalise the guide, and (d) consider possible follow-up work of the Panel. ¹²

¹² PEP has already identified several further activities that could flow from this work (or into it), noting its programmatic nature e.g.:

- Developing missing/weak tools or frameworks, such as IIED's Sustainability Assessment framework proposal discussed with the EC
- Setting up a more permanent User Guide process (following feedback)
- The Stakeholder Panel taking on more of an advocacy/quality control role
- Capacity development programmes e.g., South-South mentoring

Other meetings may be organised between these two main meetings (funds and opportunities permitting), but as far as possible we will adopt a 'low-carbon' way of working through email and video conferencing (where possible).

6.3 Country surveys and gathering perspectives/information on tools

User perspectives/criteria and baseline information on tools will be harnessed through a range of mechanisms:

- **A simple generic questionnaire** has been developed by IIED to guide diagnostic work and dialogues to identify top tools and top problems with tools (based on 5.2). Partner organisations managing in-country surveys will use this questionnaire and customise it to add questions that have particular domestic relevance or importance.

The questionnaire will also be placed on IIED and partner websites to enable public contributions to the development of the User Guide.

- **Background surveys** will be conducted in up to 10 countries to identify environmental integration 'tools', focusing on the 'top five tools' that have been found to be the most effective in environmental mainstreaming and why they are effective; as well as the 'top five' problems associated with tools.

These surveys – to be conducted by partner organisations/consultant teams – will comprise a mix of literature review, semi-structured interviews, round tables and workshops. Countries will be selected based on geographical spread and governance type. Three main approaches are suggested, with IIED coordinating them:

- *Country surveys run by the UNDP/UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) focal country programmes.* It is hoped that up to ten surveys can be done this way. **PEI feedback is sought**
 - *Regional/country surveys commissioned by IIED* (IIED has sufficient funds available to fund up to six of these, depending upon precise requirements and opportunities). **Organisations interested in undertaking a country survey will be invited to make a proposal to IIED** setting out how the survey will be conducted with a modest budget. Partners might be able to supplement these funds from other available funds.
 - *Further country surveys* might be undertaken by PEP members as part of other initiatives, e.g. the work of IUCN Regional or Country Offices, or UK-BRICS Sustainable Development Dialogues. **PEP members' feedback is sought**^{13 14}
- **Regional assessment workshops** might also be organised where there is interest and sufficient funds: (a) in countries actively developing PRSs and/or MDG-based strategies, or with active National Councils for Sustainable

¹³ The PEP working group at the Washington meeting (June 2006) suggested a programmatic approach, which can build on PEP members' existing in-country activities.

¹⁴ UK Sustainable Development Dialogue countries are Brazil, India, China, South Africa, Mexico

Development, and/or (b) internationally - with key environment and/or development 'user' communities e.g. IUCN members.

- **Supplementary mechanisms** will also be pursued where possible to use to enable 'stakeholders' to offer insight on tools, propose further tools 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 Schedule for producing the guide

The following are the key **elements** of the process and will be reviewed by the First International Panel Meeting.

- Production of the Guide coordinated by IIED
- 'Experts' commissioned to prepare draft technical sections.
- Experienced practitioners called upon to give evidence on selected tools (a framework/format for this will be developed)
- First draft of Guide prepared by IIED
- First draft guide reviewed by the International Stakeholder Panel
- Draft Guide (revised as needed) available for comment by: PEP members and associates, volunteers from wider reference group of 'users', and 'experts' (identified through regional and international consultations 5.3 above), and then revised
- Third Panel meeting to respond to comments; determine how to finalise guide; and consider follow-up work
- Production and dissemination of User Guide

The following is the suggested **schedule for FY2007 and FY2008:**

| | 2007 |
|--|-------------|
| | |
| Finalise revised project document and budget | By mid May |

| | |
|---|---|
| Identify possible initial country surveys (target: 3 countries) – solicit proposals | By mid June |
| Commission 3 initial country surveys/workshops | To be undertaken during June – December |
| Identify possible members of International Panel | May-July |
| Appoint International Panel | By end July |
| Commission technical sections for key tools | August – October |
| Establish proto website (design, initial information) | June – September |
| 1 st International Panel meeting | Early December |
| 3 more country surveys/workshops | January – March |
| | |
| | 2008 |
| | |
| Preparation of 1 st draft of User Guide | February – June |
| 2 nd International Panel Meeting (in developing country) | July |
| Period for comments | August-September |
| 3 rd International Panel meeting (in developing country) | October |
| Finalise User Guide | November-December |
| | |
| | 2009 |
| Production/publication | January– March 2009 |
| | |
| Website – updated and developed on continuing basis throughout project | |

6.4 Presenting the ‘User Guide’

The User Guide will be presented in several formats, including:

- A website,
- CD Rom
- Hard copy book

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 provide sufficient funds to undertake a baseline set of activities as set out in the work schedule, including up to six country surveys.

IIED welcomes IUCN’s interest in facilitating regional reviews (IUCN Senegal in the first instance – see 6.3).

The interest of UNDP/UNEP in helping convene country reviews in PEI countries, as well as regional meetings, is also welcomed (see 6.3)