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# Annex 1: *Jamaica – SEA of the implementation of the Multi-Annual Adaptation Strategy (2006-2015)*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interviews held with : Federico Berna (EU Delegation, Kingston), George Callaghan (Head of Sugar Transformation Unit, Kingston).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Background and Context:**  SEA commissioned by the EU Delegation in partnership with the Sugar Transformation Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture. Scoping phase conducted in January 2009. According to the ToR, 2 people with a total 67 person days were available for the assignment.  Other documents consulted : Jamaica Country Strategy for the Adaptation of the Sugar Cane Industry 2006-2020 (2009), Multi-Annual Indicative Plan for the Allocations 2011-13.  **Overall** –Interviewees felt that the SEA had been a useful process in raising environmental awareness. Through stimulation of debate about key issues eg ground water salinisation, water efficiency, green cane harvesting the SEA was able to strengthen the case for greater consideration of environment issues in the JCS and MIP. It is important to note that these issues were already being discussed prior to the SEA and the SEA assisted by formalizing the debate and documenting it. | | |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | YES – The programme is a significant agri-business proposal with potentially significant environmental impacts (both positive and negative).  However given that this was one of approximately 11 SEAs undertaken under the MAAS support and that many of the “sugar SEAs” provided conclusions & recommendations of a similar nature a valid question is whether a more cost effective approach to promoting environmental integration in MAAS could have been undertaken eg provision of strategic guidance plus support for in-country implementation. |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs? | a) PARTIALLY – Broadly complies with TOR in terms of final report but misses sections on alternatives, institutional capacity etc.  b) PARTIALLY – As above. |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | YES/PARTIALLY – The report is well presented and good analysis is provided together with sound recommendations. Stakeholders however believe that greater focus on condensing the most relevant information and production of an action plan and “next steps” would have been beneficial. (I-EU-FB & I-LC-GC). |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | YES – Recommendations are derived from a logical assessment of the key environmental issues. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | PARTIALLY – A section does describe the methodology but does not identify why the proposed approach was adopted and for instance why no alternative approaches were explored (albeit that this may have proved difficult to do). |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | NO. These are not set out in this report. |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & Economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-Economic dimensions of the proposal? | a) Partially. Overall the focus is primarily on addressing environment issues and there is less attention to socio-economic dimensions especially issues of poverty, livelihoods etc.  b) PARTIALLY – A number of very sensible recommendations regarding energy and water efficiency, promotion of renewable energy, waste management etc are proposed and presented as environmental opportunities eg to reduce pressure on groundwaters. These could also have been presented as opportunities to improve the efficiency, profitability and competitiveness of the sugar industry which might have generated more Government buy in. |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | YES – Covered adequately. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | YES – Scoping conducted Jan/Feb 2009. Scoping report not provided or reviewed but 4 priority issues emerged – pressure on groundwater, land degradation, water contamination & atmospheric pollution. Good overview of state, pressures & trends issues, impacts and links to sector priorities. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | YES – Good overview of key baseline for prioritized issues and relationship to the sugar industry. Some baseline rather “geography style” description which is probably not necessary and lengthens the report eg description of climate, soil types, highest peaks, numbers of endemic species etc which is not subsequently used. Overall a useful overview . |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | NO – Focus is very much upon the Jamaica Country Strategy and its implementation identifying how to integrate environment within this. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | YES. Includes some quantification eg estimates of the amount of “dunder” (organic by-product of ethanol production) produced as a result of the JCS although no estimate of the impact upon water quality. Explores other key issues eg inefficiency in water usage and concerns regarding land degradation following abandonment for sugar cane production.  Importantly the SEA does identify positive environmental impacts arising from the programme including scope for privatization to promote better environmental performance by bring in external funds and capacity eg more efficient irrigation systems, introduction of renewable energy. Also identifies opportunities for interventions such as fair trade and access to carbon credits under the CDM. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | YES – Overall sensible recommendations proposed, some of which, have featured in the MIP and revised JCS. Over 35 recommendations made targeted at EC and/or Government. However it was stated that the recommendations would have benefitted from being prioritized, costed, more focused on “adding value” and presented in a “stand alone” action plan.(I-EU-FB & I-LC-GC) |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | YES – The JCS proposed indicators were reviewed against sustainability criteria and deemed to largely ignore environment. Proposed indicators on %irrigated land, % green cane harvesting & compliance with environmental regulations at sugar, rum and ethanol factories were proposed and are likely to feature in the JCS. Whilst not a “M&E” framework as such the approach taken by the consultants in recommending just 3 implementable indicators is sensible. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | PARTIALLY – The SEA has had influence upon the JCS & MIP. The SEA should have started in 2006 but funds only became available in 2007 with the SEA finalized in 2009. The Delegation believes it would have been better if the SEA had started and reported earlier. (I-EU-FB). |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | No – Part 1, section 2 on policy, legal and institutional framework is only descriptive and does not address the capacity of key institutions and stakeholders to implement the sea nor their institutional incentives/disincentives for change. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | YES – A number of key plans and policies are identified in Table 2 with their links to the sugar sector. Some linkages between these and SEA recommendations are made eg Energy Policy targets for co-generation and access to carbon finance through renewable energy production. |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | PARTIALLY – Access to carbon credits is identified in Part III Section 15 which is identified as an opportunity for the Jamaica sugar industry. The commentary is however quite generic and could have been made more specific to Jamaica including some initial quantification and specific next steps to be taken. |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | YES - Some 25 people were consulted individually and about 50 participated in a scoping workshop in Feb 09  A good level of consultation and attempts by consultants to ensure a range of stakeholders were involved. (Q-EU-FB).  Once the SEA reported a wider audience could have been involved in discussing the SEA results than the one seminar allowed. Sugar is a politicized and emotive issue in Jamaica with many people involved/interested and some post-SEA follow up would have widened debate (eg.to involve more subsistence farmers) and interest. (I-LC-GC) |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | UNCLEAR – EC and Government officials interviewed believe that there was good consultation and commitment by consultants to gain wide stakeholder participation but not possible to tell from the report alone. |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanism in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | NO. Whilst stakeholders interviewed broadly supported the recommendations it was felt that a short action plan with priorities, responsibility and costs would be useful to maximize scope for implementation. (I-LC-GC). |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | PARTIALLY – For some recommendations an institution is mentioned but for others it is not meaning some recommendations may “fall between the cracks”. Recommendations stating “the Govt of Jamaica should…” are similarly too vague to ensure ownership of the recommendation & need specific ministries, departments and possibly names. |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | NO. |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EUD support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | YES – The Jamaica Country Strategy for Sugar Adaptation 2006-20 & Multi-Annual Indicative Plan (2011-13) include some commitments proposed in the SEA to promote green cane harvesting (to prevent cane burning) and drip irrigation (to prevent salinisation and promote water efficiency). These will be supported through concessionary loans available under the Cane Expansion Fund. The MIP (draft) indicates potential funding for renewable energy & energy saving, water resources management and support for access to carbon credits.  The SEA alone did not bring about these changes but formalized the issues and contributed to increased awareness and discussion which facilitated action. (Q-EU-FB). |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | YES – Primarily increased awareness and consideration of environment issues in the sugar industry. The issues of sugar cane burning were well known but the SEA helped to document and formalize the issue. On salinisation of ground water resources the SEA helped to bring attention to a less well known issue. (I-LC-GC). |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | UNCLEAR – Timing of the final reports of the SEA and the MAAS suggest not. |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | YES – Government (Head of Sugar Board) involved in recruitment of SEA consultants, review of documents & some oversight of SEA.  Government & EU Delegation have taken on board some key recommendations set out in the SEA eg promotion of drip irrigation, some environment indicators in the new MIP. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * A more manageable 58 page report, 123 including annexes. * More information on **costs in monetary terms** to the sugar industry of environmental degradation would be helpful. Also some of the issues could be presented less as environment and more as economic issues. Drip irrigation is advocated by the SEA. At present 55% of water is lost between abstraction and reaching the sugar cane fields, drip irrigation would reduce loss to 5% and if this had been presented in monetary terms it would have been very powerful. (I-LC-GC). * An **Action Plan** for implementing the SEA would have been very helpful. (I-LC-GC). * More emphasis on **environment as an entry point for increasing competitiveness** would have been a useful approach (I-EU-FB). |

# Annex 2: *Mauritius – Implementation of the Multi-Annual Adaptation Strategy for the Mauritian Sugar Cane Cluster (2006-15)*

**Sources of information:**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key:

Q = Questionnaire;

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation;

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interviews held with: Tjasa Zivko (EU Delegation, Port Louis), Dr Kassiap Deepchand (Mauritius Sugar Industry Research Institute & formerly with the Mauritius Sugar Authority).

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  The EU Sugar Protocol provided access to EU market for specific quantities of sugar at a guaranteed price. A WTO ruling required the EU to reform this subsidy amounting to a 36% reduction in sugar prices. To counter the potentially significant socio-economic impacts of this reform the EC undertook to support countries affected through the transition from subsidised to non-subsidized sugar production. The adaptation to sugar reform programme presented potentially significant environmental impacts eg land use change, pollution control and the EC agreed to support SEAs as appropriate.  This SEA covers the Multi Annual Adaptation Strategy (MAAS) for the Sugar Cane Cluster 2006-2015. EC provision of financial support for the MAAS is through its Improving Competitiveness for Equitable Development Phase II programme which is included in the Delegation and GoM Annual Action Plan which disburses through General Budget Support according to Financing Agreements with key targets and indicators.  Key components of the MAAS include improved competitiveness of the sugar milling sector through centralization of mills from 11 to 4; mechanization of field operations, installation of new power plants in mills, production of 30 million litres of ethanol from sugar molasses and managing 5000 ha of difficult areas (including measures to support continued sugar cultivation in some areas, restoration to forests, other agriculture uses or Integrated Resort Schemes in others). The MAAS was finalized when the SEA began and the SEA was conducted in order to influence MAAS implementation.  The SEA was completed by a team of 4 experts (covering SEA & EIA, the Mauritius sugar industry & tropical agriculture) over a period of 6 months from Jan to June 2007. A scoping report was submitted Feb 2007. The institutional home for the SEA was the Ministry of Agro-Industry & Food Security. According to the initial ToR 191 person days were allocated to the process.  SEA experience in Mauritius is limited with one conducted on marinas in 2007. The Environmental Protection Act 2002 (Schedule 1) refers to SEA indicating its potential application for major plans and programmes including master plans, solid water and waste management plans and the National Physical Development Plan however no definition or detail is provided. The Southern Africa Institute for Environmental Assessment Handbook on EIA (2009) states that “the institutional and procedural mechanisms for ensuring coordination and consistency in enforcement by the EPA appear to lack high level support and significant influence”.  Environment issues e.g. waste management & air quality in the sugar industry have been debated for some time including links to World Bank loans in the 1980s/90s and more recent Global Environment Facility funding. The SEA stimulated increased interest in addressing key environment concerns in the sugar industry.  A key contextual issue is that alongside economic importance the sugar industry is culturally and politically significant in Mauritius with vested interests sometimes reluctant to accept change in the industry. This sets a critical backdrop for the SEA and potentially limited its scope.  **Overall** – A good SEA process in which the consultants engendered positive interest in environment issues in the sugar industry and raised awareness and debate. Supported the adoption of some targets on green cane harvesting. The influence of the SEA was however affected by a lack of Government ownership and implementation. Sound recommendations could have been better presented in some form of action plan to facilitate their implementation with more focus on added value. |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? |  |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs? | a) PARTIALLY – Overall the ToRs are complied with but final report omits some key sections or analysis required in the ToR such as discussion of alternatives and sufficient detail of the broad institutional and policy framework in which recommendations will be need to be implemented.  b) PARTIALLY – Generally ToR follow the EuropeAid Guidance so issues as above. |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | PARTIALLY/YES – Information and analysis is generally thorough although it has a bio-physical focus with less attention to social and economic linkages. An action plan/next steps for implementing recommendations would have been helpful to encourage Government action. Acronyms list incomplete.  To date Government implementation of recommendations has been limited. (I-EU-TZ) |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | YES – Recommendations regarding mitigation are logically argued. No recommendations put forward regarding alternatives. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | YES – Brief description is described with a focus on “trend analysis” to determine environmental impacts for key issues over time identifying key drivers, main trends, spatial impact and key concerns. |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | NO. |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | a) PARTIALLY – In some instances eg links between environmental performance to reduced reliance on oil imports and on the production of ethanol from molasses the economic benefits in terms of increased revenue and competitiveness is recognized. In other instances e.g. recommendations for regulatory powers to prevent farmers ploughing against the contour, whilst technically very sensible, ignores the potential socio-economic implications of such approaches for smaller farmers not to mention the challenges for government to enforce more regulations.  b) PARTIALLY – Some recommendations which will have significant social or economic benefits eg installation of clean technology in sugar mills are presented. They are mainly however presented as solutions to address environmental problems than to add social or economic value to the MAAS “add value” . This is a question of presentation but one with implications for the take up of recommendations by Government and the EU. |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | YES. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | YES – Scoping Report produced Feb 2007 outlining key issues focused around sugar cane production, sugar milling, energy, ethanol and land degradation. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | YES – Contained in annexes as part of analysis of key issues eg sugar cane burning, air emissions. |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | NO – This was perhaps covered in earlier reports but not included in the final SEA as required by the ToR. The timing of the SEA is clearly critical to this but at least some explanation of the process to identify any suitable alternatives to implementation of the MAAS could have been provided. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | YES – Does identify both negative and positive impacts. Some indirect impacts considered eg resort development on abandoned agricultural land and provided with “flanking recommendations” to support the main ones. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | PARTIALLY – A large number of recommendations are provided. Most are sound and sensible recommendations. However they are not prioritized nor costed and institutional responsibility for their implementation is not always clear. They are spread over pages 15-48 but not brought together in one place in a summary of key recommendations. The summary does provide an overview of key issues and recommendations but again they are not presented in a manner which facilitates easy and immediate understanding of priority recommendations.  An Action Plan would have been welcome. (I-LC-KD) |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | PARTIALLY - 23 Monitoring indicators are proposed to support MAAS implementation. There is no elaboration of a framework to support their implementation including issues such as responsibility, likely costs of their implementation nor which are higher priority than others. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | NO – The MAAS programme runs from 2006-2015. MAAS was already designed when the SEA began in January 2007. The focus was thus to influence implementation of the MAAS rather than its design.  Timing may have contributed to a lack of Government interest in implementation of the SEA.(I-EU-TZ) |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | NO – Attention to institutional issues is largely descriptive and does not consider capacity – or indeed institutional desire or interest - to implement the SEA recommendations. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | YES – Identifies linkages with the ICED II support package for the Energy Sector and recommends EC support to promote appropriate energy mixes including co-generation and renewable.  Recognises conflict for scarce water resources between agriculture and other users and some recommendations on water efficiency proposed. |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | NO – CC was not referred to in the ToRs. However there are potential CC issues relating to the impact of CC upon sugar cane production eg water resources availability, crop resistance to changes in rainfall and also to mitigation in terms of the role of renewable energy production and access to carbon finance. The SEA does provide recommendations around renewable energy production and energy efficiency and framing this within the scope to access carbon finance could have been an opportunity for the SEA to significantly “add value” to the MAAS. |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | YES – Stakeholder Engagement Strategy developed. Six workshops during Scoping phase for some 80 participants including Government, research institutions, civil society, private sector followed by 4 more specific workshops eg on air quality post scoping. Individual consultations with “experts” also conducted.  Consultation stimulated lively debate in a manner which had not occurred before. (I-LC-KD) |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | UNCLEAR – It is not possible to determine from the final report what was integrated or not but given overall positive sentiment about the SEA from interviewees it is assumed that stakeholder inputs were integrated. |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | PARTIALLY – Overall the recommendations are sound but their presentation does not facilitate implementation. The MIP (currently draft) will likely support implementation of some recommendations. |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | PARTIALLY – In some cases clear links between the recommendation and implementing institution are made but in many cases this is omitted. |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | NO – Given the number of recommendations and proposed monitoring indicators it is likely that there could be some considerable costs in their implementation albeit that some would introduce efficiencies which provide cost savings (over time). |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | PARTIALLY – Finance agreements between the Government and EC include targets on green cane harvesting with annual targets for reductions in land area experiencing sugar cane burning initially set at 0.5% and now 1.5% .  However Government implementation of the recommendations has been weak and little evidence of take up of the key findings of the SEA other than on green cane harvesting. (I-EU-TZ). |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | YES – SEA raised awareness and level of debate about environment in the sugar industry. It helped to formalize the debate and the role of “international experts” added credibility to the idea that environment is an issue for consideration. (I-EU-TZ).  The SEA also put “discipline” into consideration of environment issues in the sugar industry.(I-LC-KD). |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | N/A – The MAAS was finalized once the SEA team began. |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | PARTIALLY – The Delegation claims to have been pushing the SEA recommendations forward for action but Government buy-in is limited. In part this reflects limited ownership of environment issues across Government as a whole.  It is important to recognize the political nature of sugar in the Mauritian economy and culture with significant vested interests reluctant to facilitate change. This is an important contextual issue impacting upon the potential for the SEA to have influence. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * More emphasis on providing outputs which could show benefits to both the environment and the national economy would have helped win more support for implementation of the SEA. (I-LC-KD) * The team was very experienced in environmental and agriculture issues. Expertise on energy issues (a key concern to the sugar industry) would have been very beneficial. (I-LC-KD). * Mauritius has an established EIA system. EIAS will still be required for certain individual components of the MAAS and the additional costs of an SEA alongside EIAs does call into question the value for money of an SEA. (I-LC-KD) |

# Annex 3: *Tanzania – SEA of the Sugar Reform Accompanying Measures (2007-2010) (Final Draft)*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire;

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation;

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Supporting information by email from Ana-Margarida Mariguesa (EU Delegation, Dar es Salaam) and questionnaire and interview from, Matthew Kombe (CEO, Sugar Board of Tanzania).

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  Support for an SEA was provided under the aegis of the multi-annual adaptation strategy to assist certain ACP countries to increase the competitiveness of their sugar industry following the withdrawal of preferential trade arrangements with the EU. EU support for the Tanzania Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol Countries is an indicative amount of €6 million over the period 2007-13.  The Final Draft SEA was produced in June 2007 but neither EC officials nor the Tanzania Sugar Board are aware of a Final document. The Final Draft is thus assumed to be the final document although it should be noted that the reviewer believed that there must be some other documentation to support this short SEA report. No record of the level of resource input or details of team composition for this SEA is available.  Some of the Final Draft’s recommendations have been included as indicators in the EC-Government of Tanzania Finance Agreement for 2007 Funds. It should be noted that in written correspondence the Tanzania Sugar Board indicated its understanding that no SEA had been undertaken. It is not clear if a Scoping Report was produced although this was required under the ToR.  SEAs are required under the Environmental Management Act 2004 Part VII for any bills, policies or programmes which are likely to have any effect on the management, conservation and enhancement of the environment or impact upon the sustainable management of natural resources. However application of this legal requirement has largely been un-implemented (Source Southern Africa Institute for Environmental Assessment Handbook on Environmental Assessment 2009).  **Overall** – This was a surprisingly slim SEA at just 35 pages including annexes. Whilst shorter SEAs are to be welcomed this did appear to be lacking in sufficient background and detail for some issues. Overall this SEA presented as a collection of EIAs for individual sugar production areas and factories. Most main recommendations were taken fully into the EC-Government 2007 Finance Agreement. Institutional ownership by key stakeholders appears weak and actual implementation of the SEA recommendations poor. The Sugar Board of Tanzania states that it did not receive the SEA final draft report having understood that the scoping report concluded that there were no significant environmental impacts to pursue. |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | YES – Reform and transformation of the sugar sector has potentially significant environmental impacts (both negative and positive) which justify application of SEA. |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs? | a) PARTIALLY – The key requirements of the ToR are all included but many are very cursory, often with insufficient detail to justify further actions.  b) PARTIALLY – The SEA meets the letter but perhaps not the spirit of the SEA requirements set out in EuropAid’s Guidance. |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | PARTIALLY – The brevity of this SEA report makes it easier to identify key issues and the proposed recommendations although the background and justification for recommendations is sometimes insufficient. |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | PARTIALLY – Some key issues receive cursory attention. For instance the SEA notes “salinisation leading to loss of arable lands was observed at one sugar company” but there is no further data or information as to scale or severity of impact. Recommendations of “promoting reclamation experiments” and “ control of upstream/downstream pollutants” are not sufficiently detailed to ensure follow up. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | PARTIALLY – Very limited outline of methodology is presented in the final report. |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | NO. |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | a) NO.  b) PARTIALLY – This is one of the only “Sugar SEAs” reviewed to identify occupational health issues eg unsafe application of chemical treatments although the discussion is cursory and recommendation limited to an “awareness programme for workers”. In part this may because the ToRs specifically cited this issue. |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | PARTIALLY – The purpose is clearly set out and a listing of key legislation etc provided. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | UNCLEAR – A scoping report was required under the ToR but it is not clear whether this was produced. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | PARTIALLY – The approach taken is minimalist. This does mean that, unlike other SEAs, there is no lengthy description of lots of environmental issues with minimal linkage to the programme but it also means that the basis for recommendations is very limited. |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | NO – Section 6.2 states that no alternatives were identified but it appears that the approach was very limited. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | NO – Whilst a range of impacts are identified and, in part, described there is little attempt to quantify or qualify these. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | PARTIALLY – Overall the thrust of the recommendations eg “control of upstream and downstream pollutants”, “effective land use planning” and “integrated water resources management” etc is sound but the wording of these is somewhat generic and insufficient to guide non-specialist decision-makers as to what needs to be done, when, by whom etc. |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | PARTIALLY – Some clear indicators are provided eg “owners of irrigation systems monitor abstraction rates”… However it is not stated nor clear how such data should be used. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | PARTIALLY – The SEA reported after the Sugar Reform Measures Programme had been designed but was able to input to its implementation.. |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | NO – There is no analysis of institutional issues, simply listing or description of key legislation, policies and institutions. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | NO. |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | NO – Potentially this could have been an interesting issue to explore in the SEA as the sugar factories could have benefitted from analysis and technical support on issues such as energy from waste through cogeneration and possible access to carbon finance. It should however be noted that the ToR did not require any consideration of climate change. |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | PARTIALLY – A “list of people met” is provided as an annex but it is not clear that there were any interactive processes to ensure stakeholder input to the SEA other than meetings. |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | UNCLEAR – There are no clues in the report that suggest that stakeholders inputs have been actively adopted in the SEA final report. |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | NO – The recommendations are not presented in any form of action plan or next steps. |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | NO – Most recommendations are presented without explicit identification of who is the key implementing institution. |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | NO. |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | PARTIALLY – Some SEA recommendations were included in the Finance Agreement between the EC and the Government for the disbursement of 2007 Funds e.g. for FA 2007 Funds Results 3 requires that 50% of SEA recommendations on factory practices are applied by 2009”. (email-EU-AM). There is however little evidence of real commitment on the part of Government to implement the SEA. The SEA states (p6) that it influenced the log-frame for the Feasibility Study for 2007-10 Accompanying Measures.  The Tanzania Sugar Board claims not to have received the SEA report but nonetheless was able to specify key activities it is undertaking (with EC support) which address key environmental concerns including a Water Resource and Efficiency study at the TPC sugar plantation where water efficiency programmes are now in place and a €80,000 Surface and Ground Water Availability study at Kilombero to explore irrigation options. (I-LC-MK). |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | NO. |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | NO – The timing of the SEA and the Accompanying Measures design programe meant little or no interaction. |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | NO – Changes of personnel in both Government and the EU Delegation mean that the SEA has become somewhat “institutionally lost” since its preparation in 2007. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * Specificity in the ToRs can be helpful – The ToR specifically stated that a key output of the SEA should be delivery of indicators for the Accompanying Measures 2007-10 Feasibility Study Log Frame. This gave focus to the consultants as the output and its application were clear and tangible. * Staff changes in EU Delegations can lead to lack of continuity and loss of institutional memory making follow up on the SEA difficult to achieve. |

# Annex 4: *Trinidad & Tobago – SEA of the implementation of the National Sugar Adaptation Strategy*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire;

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation;

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interviews were held with: Kathrin Renner (EU Delegation, Port of Spain); Deosaran Jagroo (Chief Executive Officer, Caroni 1975 Ltd); Marisa Clarke Marshall (Trinidad & Tobago Environmental Management Authority).

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  Caroni (1975 Ltd) is a former state sugar industry for Trinidad & Tobago (T&T). It was closed at the end of 2007 as cane production was not economically viable. Alternatives to cane production were considered by the Government including agriculture to meet food security demands, residential developments and industrial estates. These alternatives were incorporated into the National Sugar Adaptation Strategy (NAS) which was included within Vision 2020, the country’s National Development Plan to become a developed nation by the year 2020.  The EU Delegation, in agreement with the Government of Trinidad & Tobago, commissioned an SEA to examine, within the NAS, the net environmental, social and economic negative impacts and positive effects of the planned activities in the development of the properties of Caroni (1975) Ltd, and the related areas. The SEA contract was awarded to NIRAS in 2009. The SEA was carried out by two consultants (one environmental expert and one agricultural economist/sugar sector expert) between January and May of 2009 (138 man-days).  In Trinidad & Tobago, the Environmental Act of 2000 empowers the Environmental Management Authority (EMA) within the Ministry of Planning, Housing and Environment to conduct SEAs. In this regard, an SEA (now called Strategic Environment Management) Unit[[1]](#footnote-1) has been established in August 2004 as part of the Technical Services Department of the Environmental Assessment Unit of the EMA to provide strategic assessment and planning guidance when processing Certification of Environmental Clearance applications[[2]](#footnote-2). Whereas the SEA of the NAS was not the first SEA to be done in the country it was the first one being undertaken on such a large scale, involving so many communities/stakeholders and sectors (ie agriculture, residential and industrial). (I-LC-DJ, I-LC-MCM).  The Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources (MALMR) – Planning Department, was responsible for coordinating the SEA at the Government level (I-LC-MCM). The EMA (Environmental Assessment Unit) was then invited to assist (technically) the MALMR in its functions (I-LC-MCM).  The draft SEA report reviewed for this assignment (2009) and considered as Final Report by the EU Delegation in Trinidad & Tobago was preceded by a stakeholders engagement plan (January 2009) and a scoping report (February 2009).  **Overall** – This SEA is recognized as an exercise of good quality by all the stakeholders interviewed. Quality of the consultants hired to carry out the assessment and good collaboration of the Government have been identified as key factors of success (I-EU-KR). The SEA led to various positive outcomes: it provided the EU Delegation with a more credible dialogue with the Government (I-EU-KR), helped to make the strategy more tangible by identifying concrete issues and measures to consider when implementing it, and helped to refine (fine tune) the NAS (I-LC-DJ, I-EU-KR). The Government indicated its interest to implement SEA recommendations according to the various implementation phases that characterize the NAS (I-LC-DJ). |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | **Y** – The NAS matches several requirements to determine the need for SEAs in Annex 3 of the Environmental Integration Handbook for EC Development Co-operation (2007).Types of projects/measures under the NAS (agriculture, residential developments, industrial estates) could have negative significant environmental impacts and could influence other environmentally sensitive sectors (e.g. climate change). |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs?  *For questions a) and b) specify which ToRs’ requirements (if any) are not met.* | **a)** **P** – Broadly, the SEA complies with its ToRs but some aspects are not clearly addressed eg national budget availability to address environmental issues in the NAS; summary of the key environmental issues for the sector(s) involved (as part of the conclusion); format of the SEA report (the SEA report slightly exceeds 100 pages but others requirements regarding the report format are respected).  **b) P** – Same as for 1.2a) |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | **P** – The report is well written and clear. Information provided in the report looks sufficient to support informed decision-making. However, the Executive Summary could more detail SEA recommendations and describe briefly key environmental and socio-economic impacts of the NAS. Moreover, date of submission of the report (at least month and year) should clearly appear on the cover page of the report as well as correct status of the report (draft or final). |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | **Y**– Recommendations are very well justified: for each mitigation and enhancement measure (described in p. 80 and following of the SEA report), the reasons of taking these measures, the benefits of these measures and the costs of (issues encountered if) not taking these measures are outlined. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | **P**– The methodological approach used to carry out the SEA is properly described but reasons that justify use of this approach are not clearly mentioned. |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | **Y** – Uncertainties and assumptions are briefly but clearly presented (e.g. uncertainties linked to a lack of comprehensive historical environmental information to inform the full baseline study). (see p. 27 of the SEA report). |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | **a) Y** – Linkages & trade-offs are often assessed and are generally well balanced (e.g. the SEA report recognizes that the preparation and implementation of an Integrated Water Resource Management Strategy would not only improve ecosystem health but also extend viability of energy resources, improve public health and minimize losses and costs to infrastructure due to damage caused by leakages).  **b) Y** – Recommendations that enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the NAS are often outlined (e.g. establishment of apiculture that will cater to the need for more pollinators, will help replenish the biodiversity of the area, and will create a great economic potential for the country as importation of honey is not allowed in Trinidad & Tobago - p. 46 of the SEA report). |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | **Y** – Purpose of the SEA is mentioned (p. 5) and linked to existing planning, policy and programmatic objectives of the Government of Trinidad & Tobago. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | **Y** – A scoping phase that identified key issues and impacts was undertaken. Approach adopted to carry out the scoping is briefly but clearly outlined in the SEA report. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | **Y** – Good overview of environmental and socio-economic concerns relevant to the sugar sector is provided. Baseline is described for pre-NAS (prior to closure of Caroni (1975) Ltd properties), and after the closure of Caroni. |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | **P** – The SEA assesses the three main alternative use plans for Caroni (1975) Ltd which were under development when the SEA was carried out: development of agricultural uses, residential uses and industrial development. However, the SEA does not propose other alternatives that could be relevant to consider. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | **Y** – Impacts on environmental and socio-economic concerns are assessed for each of the three main alternative use plans defined in the NAS. In addition to the negative and direct impacts, positive impacts and opportunities are assessed (eg cultivating more than 20 000 acres of land on Caroni (1975) Ltd properties could have positive influence on the issue of food security). Indirect impacts as well as cumulative impacts are also outlined (e.g. construction of additional desalinisation plants in Trinidad and in Tobago that could cause cumulative negative environmental impacts to coastal and marine ecosystems). Severity of environmental and socio-economic impacts (high, moderate, low) is analysed. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | **Y –**Several mitigation and enhancement measures are recommended for each land use alternative considered in the NAS. Three macro-level recommendations (across the board recommendations related to intersectorsal concerns that aim to enable Trinidad & Tobago to most effectively and efficiently develop the planned alternatives) are also proposed. Recommendations sound generally implementable. |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | **P –** Recommended indicators that may be useful in setting priorities and developing strategies for meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 are outlined in the SEA report. However, implementation details (who, how, when) would be useful to increase implementation potential. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | **P –** The SEA has been carried out at the implementation phase of the NAS because preparation of the NAS was a pre-condition to get support from EC (notably in terms of SEA) (I-EU-KR). Therefore the SEA outlined mainly measures/recommendations to mitigate and enhance impacts of the NAS. Measures (at least some of those) are likely to be implemented by the Government (see answers to questions 3.3 below). |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | **P –**For the 3 macro-level recommendations described in the SEA report,institutional analysis is well done as it outlines what are the capacity needs, where and how capacities should be reinforced. Elsewhere in the report, analysis seems not to be enough detailed to really identify institutional constraints and opportunities. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | **Y –**Synergies are addressed between the NAS and other sectoral policies (e.g. National Housing Policy). Conflicts are also outlined (e.g. between the agricultural development planned in the NAS that will require irrigation, and the Water and Sewage Authority strategy which does not address the need to make water available to the agricultural sector). |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | **P –**Issues of climate change are generally well addressed in the assessment. Climate change impacts on the NAS and of the NAS are outlined. Appropriate recommendations are formulated regarding low carbon development and mitigation (eg encourage the inclusion of crop species with good Carbon sink potential in cropping systems), as well as adaptation (e.g. establish wetland farms that serve as a source of income and for agro tourism for agricultural lots located in close proximity to rivers, streams and areas that are prone to flooding). However, scope and opportunities for access to carbon financing which could increase profitability in the NAS seem to be ignored. |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | **Y –**One of the main strength of the SEA was its ability to incorporate views ofstakeholders from various communities and sectors (I-LC-DJ). According to the list of stakeholders consulted, more than 30 stakeholders were consulted and engaged in the SEA process, including less powerful stakeholders (e.g. representative from the wide cane farmers association). Stakeholders engagement characterized various stages of the SEA process and took different forms including: interviews with primary stakeholders; workshops aiming to present the findings of the scoping and of the SEA reports; extensive meetings (eg with the staff of Caroni (1975)). Project documents and presentations related to the SEA were posted on a blog specific to the SEA of the NAS (<http://seaforttnas.blogspot.com/>). |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | **Y** – According to Government Official (I-LC-DJ), stakeholders inputs have been incorporated in the SEA report . The SEA report (p. 25) also mentions that considering that many stakeholders interviewed during the SEA were willing to share their perspectives, a great deal of information that is in the report is drawn from interviews with participants during the SEA. |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | **P –**The SEA report gives some details about how recommendations of the SEA should be implemented (e.g. what should be done to implement these measures, which institutions/organizations should be involved). However, this is only done for a few recommendations of the report. |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | **P –**In the SEA report**,** responsible bodies/parties are identified for implementing each of the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures (recommendations). However, those are identified at Ministry level and are probably too general to ensure responsibility for specific recommendations. In practice, several authorities will be in charge of implementing SEA recommendations, depending on the nature of those recommendations (eg the Ministry of Agriculture responsible for implementing recommendations related to agriculture) (I-LC-DJ). Obligation to deliver a certificate of environmental clearance that authorizes implementation of some of these recommendations will be attributed to the EMA (I-LC-DJ, I-LC-MCM). |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | **U** –The Government indicated its interest to implement SEA recommendations according to the various implementation phases that characterize the NAS (I-LC-DJ). It seems likely that resources will be available for implementation. However this cannot be confirmed based on the information collected during this assignment. |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | **P** – The SEA helped to refine (fine tune) the NAS (I-EU-KR, I-LC-DJ) and helped to make the strategy more tangible by identifying concrete issues and measures to consider when implementing it (I-LC-DJ). |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | **Y –** The SEA provided the EU Delegation with a more credible dialogue with the Government of T&T regarding, inter alia, environmental and socio-economic considerations to take into account when implementing the NAS (I-EU-KR). On the Government side, it helped bring all the pieces of the NAS together (eg by highlighting links between the 3 sectors covered by the strategy as well as their impacts and related management measures) (I-LC-DJ). Finally, it increased awareness of the stakeholders consulted about the social, environmental and economic implications of the NAS. (I-LC-DJ). |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | **Y –** There was a good cooperation and information sharing (through meetings, discussions, etc.) between the SEA consultants and the stakeholders in charge of developing and implementing the NAS (I-LC-DJ) (eg SEA consultants shared key SEA documents with EMA representatives and other Government officials for comments, and the EMA representatives shared data, provided comments and participated to SEA meetings) (I-LC-MCM). |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | **Y –** The Government of T&T was very collaborative (I-EU-KR) and various Ministries representatives were actively involved during the SEA process (I-LC-DJ). Moreover, the EU Delegation invited stakeholders including key governmental officials to participate to the exercise at an early stage of the assessment process (eg the Environmental Assessment Unit of the EMA reviewed the ToRs, helped identifying SEA consultants)  (I-LC-MCM). This early involvement of the stakeholders and other factors (eg quality of consultants hired to carry out the SEA, recognition of the importance of taking into account environmental considerations by the Government) probably helped increase ownership. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * Quality of the consultants hired to carry out the SEA is important for the success of the approach. In T&T, the consultants were very knowledgeable, devoted, dynamic, had good skills in managing communication and consultation which contributed to increase the credibility of the approach (I-EU-KR). * Capacities of Government officials to participate to and follow up on SEA should be increased as Officials’ agendas and to do lists are already full. Therefore, this is sometimes difficult to manage additional requirements/tasks related to SEA (I-LC-MCM). |

# Annex 5: *Zambia – SEA of the Sugar Sector (Zambian National Sugar Strategy – ZNSS)*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interviews held with :Matthew Brooke (Head of Section - Regional co-operation, EU Delegation, Lusaka), Stéphanie Rousseau (Programme Officer - Regional Cooperation/Sugar Accompanying Measures, EU Delegation, Lusaka), Hillary Kumwenda (Zambian Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry).

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  The SEA contract was awarded to Agreco Consortium in September 2009 and SEA completed in January 2010. The SEA was carried out by three consultants (1 expert in environmental and policy management, 1 agronomist and 1 socio-economist) with 148 man-days to enhance environmental performance of the Strategy.  Although Zambia is characterized by a well established EIA regulatory system (formalized through the EIA statutory instrument no 28 of 1997 and managed by the Environmental Council of Zambia), SEA is a new approach for the country: the SEA of the ZNSS was the first conducted in Zambia (I-EU-SR, I-LC-HK). This posed challenges in terms of awareness, buy-in, capacity, and resource availability. (I-EU-MB). However, the Zambia Government is currently processing a new SEA legislation and capacity is increasing as more SEAs are being commissioned in the country by the EC (one on roads and another one on agriculture). (Q-EU-MB, I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR).  The Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry was designated as responsible for the coordination and for the management of the SEA process at the Government level as this latter was already chair of the AMS accompanying committee. (I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR). Technical environmental support was provided by the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR), especially the Environmental Council of Zambia (ECZ- an institution under the MTENR). (I-EU-SR).  **Overall** – The SEA was considered of good quality by the stakeholders interviewed. SEA results were able to influence contents of the new version of the ZNSS 2010-2015 (I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR) and to raise environmental awareness and understanding within the Government and stakeholders consulted. However, implementation of SEA recommendations at the Government level is challenged by very little financial resources, time and capacity. On the EU side, the SEA has been reflected in the MIP 2011-2013 which will include funding for implementing SEA recommendations (I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR). |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | **Y** – This SEA is justified. The ZNSS matches several requirements to determine the need for SEAs in Annex 3 of the Environmental Integration Handbook for EC Development Co-operation (2007). Types of projects/measures under the NAS (eg expansion of sugar production throughout-grower schemes; improvement of the transport network and services) could have significant environmental impacts and could influence other environmentally sensitive sectors (e.g. water). |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs?  *For questions a) and b) specify which ToRs’ requirements (if any) are not met.* | **a)** **P** – The SEA generally fulfills its ToRs but the following aspects are not clearly addressed: determination of the significance of the impacts (in terms of duration, probability, magnitude, mitigability and reversibility); indication of possible costs of the proposed performance indicators; assumptions that have influenced the orientation and/or effectiveness of the SEA; format of the SEA report (*all the components that should appear in the SEA report are in the report but they do not follow exactly the order of presentation requested by the ToRs*).  **b) P** – Same as for 1.2a). |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | **P** – The SEA report is not always easy to read because of the use of small font and very dense text, is sometimes repetitive and its presentation could be improved to help the reader find information needed (eg annexes numbers referred to in certain sections of the SEA report – eg section 2.8 – do not fit with the corresponding annexes at the end of the report). The information included in the report is probably enough to support decision-making but could be more detailed on certain aspects (eg the report recommends development of additional hydropower capacity in alternative locations but does not indicate where these might be nor recommend a mechanism to aid their identification). |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | **P** – Recommendations are generally, but not always, justified in the main text of the report. For example, in addressing gender imbalance issue in the sugar industry, the report states (p. 52) that “recommendations on the development of sugar out-grower schemes covering organization arrangements and implementation modalities made by Struyf and Chuba (2009) should as much as possible be followed” without specifying what these recommendations are and their significance. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | **P** – In the main text of the report – section 2.8, the methodological approach is properly, but briefly described. With the exception of very specific aspects of the methodological approach (eg bilateral interviews, on site visit during the SEA scoping phase) reasons which justify the choice of the approach are not clearly presented. More details and justifications are provided in Appendix 9. Section 2.8 should therefore refer the reader to this appendix for more details. |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | **N** – Not really. A section called: “Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints of the SEA” is included in section 2.11 (p. 9) of the SEA report but this section focuses only on constraints which characterized the SEA process (eg difficulties to get data). |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | a) **Y** – Impacts of the ZNSS on social issues (eg gender, HIV/Aids) are thoroughly assessed. Moreover, the SEA report often outlines the socio-economic dimensions of the environmental measures it recommends (eg links production and commercialization of gel fuel -a mix of ethanol and starch “less pollutant” than burning of firewood and charcoal in the households – with potential socio-economic impacts on people engaged in producing and commercializing charcoal).  b) **Y** – Ways of enhancing the socio-economic dimensions of the ZNSS are relatively often identified (eg SEA report proposes to develop framework of incentives to attract potential investment into the ethanol production for fuel blending - product which has potential positive impacts in terms of carbon emissions reduction). |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | **P** – The purpose of the SEA is mentioned (p. 1) but not clearly linked to specific regulations, policies, directives or guidelines. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | **Y** – A scoping phase was carried out (date scoping report was submitted is not provided in the SEA report) to identify and prioritise key issues and impacts of the ZNSS. Those are well summarized in the SEA report. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | **Y** – The environment baseline is briefly but well described. The SEA report refers to specific documents related to the state of the environment for more details. |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | **P** – The ‘zero alternative’ (corresponding to the assumption of no implementation of the ZNSS) was considered in addition to the ZNSS per se but other alternatives might have been more relevant to consider as the ZNSS was already in place when the SEA was carried out. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | **Y** – Significant environmental (direct) impacts are described and assessed for the ZNSS and the ‘zero alternative’. This includes negative and positive impacts as well as opportunities (eg employment opportunities for men and women provided by development of new sugar estates). Indirect impacts (caused for example by upgrading/building roads and upgrading/expanding the railway system) as well as cumulative impacts (e.g. emissions of dioxins and furans linked to sugar cane cultivation in different parts of the country) are also assessed. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | **P** – Recommendations look sound. However, as mentioned in questions 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 above, more details or justifications would be needed to facilitate their implementation. Also, although recommendations are prioritized according to high, medium and low priority issues the list is long (33 specific recommendations and 13 recommendations of general nature) which could have an impact on quality of implementation. |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | **P** – Monitoring indicators are provided (pp. 47-50) but some precisions regarding how to implement those are missing (eg institutions responsible for implementation). However, necessity to follow up on the effectiveness of the SEA process is outlined, as well as recommended timeline and 3 general questions that could frame this follow up (i.e. did the recommendations made in the SEA get implemented? Why or why not? Did the SEA lead to better decisions from an environmental and socio-economic point of view?) |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | **P –** SEA was carried out at the implementation stage of the ZNSS but helped enhance future version of the strategy and feed the MIP 2011-2013. (I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR). Reasons why the SEA has not been undertaken during the development phase of the ZNSS are not clear but could be related to the limited resources (ie funding, time) allocated for the development of the ZNSS. (I-EU-SR). |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | **P –** A few institutional constraints are outlined (e.g. limitations in the current institutional and regulatory arrangements to adequately deal with forests), as well as general recommendations on development and implementation of institutional and capacity buildingprogrammes. However, attention to institutional issues is mainly descriptive. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | **Y** – Synergies between the ZNSS and other policies, plans, programmes or projects are identified a few times in the SEA report. Conflicts are also highlighted (eg between the ZNSS which promotes expansion of sugar cane cultivation – which will increase the emission of dioxins and furans proportionate to the extent of sugar cane burned – and the Zambia’s National Implementation Plan (NIP) for the Stockholm Convention which does not recognize sugar cane burning as an important source of unintended generation of POPs). Relevant recommendations are generally made to address conflicts identified (necessity to acknowledge unintended production of POPs from the burning of sugar cane in the NIP). |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | **P** – The SEA report makes some reference to climate change with regard to the ZNSS eg impact of reduced water availability and increased temperatures upon sugar productivity. However, it does not propose measures for adaptation. Mitigation and low carbon development measures which address mitigation (e.g. gel fuel which qualifies for climate change funding; co-generation) are briefly outlined. Opportunities for access to carbon financing which could increase profitability in the ZNSS are mentioned (eg train and reinforce capacities of the Environmental Council of Zambia on options for generating carbon credits – for example through biodigestion of vinasse - in order to be able to promote such projects). |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | **Y** – Stakeholders were engaged at a very early stage of the SEA process (when preparing the ToRs) and different consultation approaches were held throughout the process to reach a wide range of stakeholders (ie bilateral interviews; stakeholders’ workshop (World Café format); presentations to governmental and EU Delegation representatives). Bilateral interviews and workshop involved stakeholders from various types of organizations (e.g. Government, civil society, NGOs, private sector). Less powerful stakeholders were involved in the process (eg the workshop organized during the SEA was dominated by a majority of men but women were represented and had the opportunity to say something) (I-EU-MB). Moreover, a joint press release from the EU Delegation and the Zambian Government was made in the three main newspapers of the country to advertise the SEA findings (email-EU-SR). |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | **P** – Outcomes of the consultations have been integrated into the SEA report as best as possible (some comments were provided after the deadlines for comments, ie after the deadline for the submission of the SEA report) (I-EU-SR). |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | **P**– A brief section (half a page) on the “use of SEA findings and SEA follow-up” is included in the SEA report. This includes information about where the SEA report should be distributed/published, when the SEA follow up should be organized and which questions/documents should be use to frame evaluation of SEA effectiveness. This is useful but would deserve to be more detailed to ensure implementation. |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | **P** – Institutions/organizations in charge of implementing recommendations are sometimes identified at Ministry level in the SEA report but this is probably too general to ensure responsibility for specific recommendations. Findings of the SEA are discussed and followed up by the Sugar Steering Committee chaired by Ministry of Commerce and Trade. |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | **P** – There are very little financial resources, time and capacity to implement the SEA recommendations (I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR, I-LC-HK). Moreover, theMinistry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, responsible for managing and coordinating the SEA process has no enforcement capacity and therefore cannot force the institutions in charge of implementing the recommendations to move forward (I-EU-SR). The EU Delegation is willing to support implementation of SEA recommendations by allocating some funding (see question 3.4 below). (I-EU-SR). |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | **P** – SEA recommendations have been included in the revised ZNSS (2010-2015) as the fourth strategic result: “Socio-economic and environmental factors in sugar producing areas are improved from a 2010 baseline”. (I-LC-HK, I-EU-SR). This strategic result has been reflected in the MIP which will include funding of activities recommended by the SEA (eg support to the Environmental Council of Zambia, vinasse handling, EIA adaptation to ethanol production, etc.). (I-EU-SR). |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | **Y** – The SEA raised environmental awareness and understanding within the Government and stakeholders that were consulted during the SEA. The joint press release on SEA findings and other forms of consultation (see answer to question 2.3.1 above) helped increase awareness. For example, there is now the appreciation that a by-product of sugar (vinasse) requires management considerations (I-EU-MB). The SEA also guided the Government on which measures of the ZNSS to focus on and on how to implement those. (I-LC-HK). |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | **P** – It was not always easy for the SEA team to get the necessary cooperation from some of the institutions of the Government and from the private sector regarding notably access to certain information which would have been of help for the analysis (*although some information did not exist, some information was confidential or could not be secured*). (I-EU-SR). |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | **N** – *A priori*, the Zambian Government had a big interest in the SEA as this was the first SEA to be carried out in the country and the Government wanted to use it as an exemplary case of good practice. (I-EU-SR). However, for different reasons (outlined in the box below) Government ownership was low: participation to the meeting where the findings of the scoping phase were presented, and to which all ZNSS Steering Committee members were invited, was very poor; none of the ZNSS Steering Committee members, or any representative of the Government institutions, provided feedback to the Scoping Report; some key actors did not send any representatives to the stakeholders workshop, which was a key opportunity to contribute to the process. (SEA report, p. 9). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * The sugar accompanying measures are considered as sectoral/thematic within the EU Delegation whereas sugar is considered by the Zambian Government as a component of the agricultural sector and not as a sector per se. Therefore, some stakeholders from the Government and from the EU Delegation question the relevance of doing an SEA for the sugar strategy considering that at the EU level, SEA is also required for agricultural strategies. (Q-EU-MB, I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR). * Involvement of stakeholders (including the Government) at a very early stage of the SEA process (ie preparation of SEA ToRs) increased their understanding of the process. (email-EU-SR). * Various reasons can explain the lack of Government ownership, including: 1) perception that SEA is a donor requirement rather than a process that helps to strengthen the programme’s overall design including the integration of environmental considerations; 2) limited and stretched capacity which means it is hard to add extra requirements to programmes beyond the minimum; 3) stakeholders fatigue (related to the necessity to undertake more and more tasks/approaches to meet requirements of the Government, donors, etc); 4) fear to see the negative impacts of the sugar sector acknowledged (Q-EU-MB, I-EU-MB, I-EU-SR). |

# Annex 6: *Ghana – SEA of the Transport Integration Plan*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire;

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation;

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interviews held with : Cedric Merel (EU Delegation, Accra), Jonathan Allotey (EPA), Christine Asare (EPA), Aru Inamdar Willets (SEA consultant), Sean Doolan (Royal Dutch Embassy, Accra)

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  SEA contract awarded to Mott Mc Donald and Municipal Development Collaborative Dec 2008 and SEA completed June 2010. Scoping Phase May-July 2009, Analysis Phase Sept 2009 –April 2010, Environmental Strategy Phase April-June 2010 leading to final report reviewed here. A team of 8 experts conducted the SEA with a total of 38.5 “months” inputs. Lead Government institution : Ministry of Transport.  Ghana is developing considerable experience in SEA with completed SEAs including the Ghana PRSP (2005), Water Sector (2007), National Transport Policy (2008), Minerals Sector (2009). The Transport Integration Plan for Ghana (TIPG) is intended to be the vehicle to operationalise the National Transport Plan which was finalized in 2008. The NTP requires that all transport policies, plans and programmes are subject to an SEA. The SEA commenced over one year after the TIPG design team had begun work.  Whilst preparation for development of the TIPG was underway a major re-organisation of Government Ministries in Jan 2009 occurred with separation of transport functions into the Ministry of Transport (responsible for Railways, Air, Maritime and Inland Waterways) and Ministry of Roads & Highways (MRH). This had profound impacts upon the emerging TIPG which was focused primarily on highways and urban roads.  **Overall** – It was considered that the consultants did a good job in challenging circumstances but that the late start for the SEA & weak government ownership conspired to limit the potential impact of this SEA. More prioritization and specificity in recommendations was also considered to be an area which would strengthen its impact and influence. The SEA was unusual in its (welcome) attention to issues of poverty & livelihoods. |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | YES – TIPG is a major transport and infrastructure plan with potentially significant environmental impacts |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs? | a) YES  b) PARTIALLY – Does not provide sufficient information on institutional capacities which has implications for implementation of the recommendations. |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | PARTIALLY – Report is lengthy and in parts very descriptive rather than analytical. Recommendations are generally sound but somewhat “lost” and could be presented more clearly and strongly. |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | PARTIALLY – Logical sequence of problem identification, analysis and proposed mitigations for many although some recommendations appear without significant justification eg use of police to enforce environmental regulations when earlier analysis suggests this is an EPA responsibility. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | YES – The challenges in methodologically linking into to an existing process in which key decisions had been already taken was explained and appropriate methodology adopted. |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | NO. |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | a) PARTIALLY – Recommends appropriate mitigation to address environmental concerns whilst maintaining socio-economic benefits.  b) YES – Considerable attention to social issues and recommends greater focus on poverty reduction and livelihoods through increased focus on rural access issues and TIPG linkages to key regional and rural development plans. |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | YES – Adequately covered in introduction. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | YES – Scoping report produced July 2009. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | YES – Considerable data collected. However not always clear how some data sets eg number and status of plant and animal species can or will be used in the SEA or in implementation. |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | PARTIALLY – Authors do reflect on lack of real alternatives in the TIPG which is really a programme of prioritized projects rather than higher level strategy. SEA report makes a case for focus on railways and inland waterways but do not formally propose an alternative scenario. A “with and without policy” approach is adopted.  This does reflect the challenge of conducting the SEA after key decisions have been made (I-EU-CM). |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | PARTIALLY – Stronger on direct impacts but at SEA level would expect more analysis of cumulative and indirect impacts – particularly of a suite of roads projects. SEA identifies land degradation and biodiversity loss of road construction but does not consider indirect impacts e.g. forest loss caused by illegal logging stimulated by new/improved roads in forest areas. The SEA at times takes a more EIA rather than strategic level approach. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | PARTIALLY – Strong focus on mitigation with sensible recommendations eg on air quality etc but limited attention to enhancement and alternatives. Over 50 recommendations made in section 10.2 but they are not prioritized which would assist in their implementation. Authors do recognize the challenges in enforcing existing existing standards and regulations but then propose some additional regulatory controls. |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | YES – An M&E framework is provided drawing out key recommendations and identifying institutions responsible although generality of some of the recommendations makes implementation unlikely. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | NO – The SEA began over a year after the TIPG design process had commenced meaning many key decisions had been taken. In this context the SEA consultancy team is considered to have done a good job in difficult circumstances and was still able to get some new issues onto the table such as greater attention to railways and inland waterways as transport priorities, the lack of attention to poverty in the TIPG and inclusion of stronger environmental criteria in the TIPG multi-criteria analysis.  A joint policy design and SEA team sourced under one tender might have helped to prevent this. (I-EU-CM) |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | NO – Attention to institutional issues is predominantly descriptive with no analysis on challenges including barriers and opportunities, incentives and disincentives for different stakeholders to promote integration of environment – as set out in the recommendations - in transport policy and plans. Appendix A.1.2 on capacity of key institutions for environment describes their roles but not their capacity or effectiveness. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | YES – It refers to other key national plans for regional development and the PRSP in attempts to bring more focus on poverty in the TIPG. |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | YES – The SEA usefully identifies some key issues eg implications for road quality and maintenance implications of temperature and rainfall changes, implications of CC on inland waterways. Useful recommendations made include the need for CC analysis for transport sector to complement those of other sectors. Given the high profile of CC at present it is felt that the SEA should have capitalized upon this and argued the case more strongly. |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | YES – Detailed stakeholder analysis was undertaken at an early stage. 3 scoping workshops were held involving 90 people and these appear to have influenced the sustainability criteria adopted. |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | YES – The outputs of the scoping workshops helped to frame the SEA methodological approach based on 4 key sustainability criteria. |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | PARTIALLY – A monitoring table is set out in Chapter 11. This is helpful but some of the recommendations are not sufficiently specific (identifying what should be done, when, how etc) to ensure that they will be implemented. |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | PARTIALLY – Institutions are identified at Ministry level but this may be too general to ensure responsibility for specific recommendations is noted and acted upon. |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | PARTIALLY – A few recommendations have indicative budgets which is very helpful. For many recommendations e.g. for monitoring land degradation, tackling pollution impacts, conducting environmental audits the budget is staged as “no additional cost” or “included within regular operational budgets” but in reality these recommendations are certainly going to represent additional costs to the agencies involved. |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | PARTIALLY - The SEA did have some influence in the design phase in terms of opening up debate on a wider range of issues including transport modes other than highways, issues of poverty and climate change. The TIPG is being finalized and it is to be seen if this has impacted upon the final policy.  The SEA process also assisted in modifying the weighting system for the prioritization of projects within the TIPG to strengthen consideration of environment. |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | YES – Some greater awareness of environment issues in the transport sector and greater debate about climate change in the Ministries of Transport and Roads & Highways. (I-EU-CM). |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | NO – The timing of the proposal design and SEA did not promote easy working with the SEA team starting one year after the design team. Neither teams’ ToRs adequately reflected the need to work in an integrated manner and the design team (it is sensed) felt that the SEA was an inconvenience. An integrated team under one tender might have helped. (I-EU-CM). |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | UNCLEAR – Government ownership is weak. EPA indicated that it felt the SEA process was flawed (especially with regard to timing) and that this made the end result of less value than it could have been.(I-LC-JA). Shorter more accessible outputs could have encouraged Government interest – Government did not comment on draft SEA report . EU Delegation has indicated that it will try to use the SEA to influence transport sector work but would have found it easier with some prioritized and very specific actions/recommendations. (I-EU-CM).  The split roles of the MRH and MoT mean that the SEA was always going to be hard pushed to bridge two institutions with potentially conflicting interests. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * **Consultancy teams** may benefit from a broader skills set than EC ToRs set out including economists and institutional experts. An economist could help to undertake valuations which present key environmental information in language understandable to decision-makers. (I-LC-consultant). * Methodologically it would be helpful for all recommendations to be “tested” for their acceptability and ownership by the institution responsible for their implementation. * Report is 96 pages, 183 including annexes which makes it a big and perhaps inaccessible report. It was queried whether this is the best way to present SEA findings.. is something easier to read and more accessible possible? (I-EU-CM). |

# Annex 7: *Mali – SEA of the Support Project for the Transport Sector Programme*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation

LC = Local Contact eg government official

HD= EC Help Desk to Environment Integration Advisory Services  
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interviews held with : Alain Houyoux (EU Delegation, Bamako), Catherine Paul (adviser to the former EC Environmental Integration Advisory Services), Famoussa Bagayako (Ministry of Environment and Sanitation).

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  The Malian Transport sector programme 2008-2013 (Transport Sector Programme II) is supported by the EC in collaboration with other donors (eg The World Bank, the Millenium Challenge Account, the African Development Bank, etc.). All of these donors support specific strategic priorities or measures.  The SEA was commissioned by the EU Delegation in Mali to identify the major environmental and social impacts of the transport programme and to recommend measures for enhancing it as well as the SPSP. SEA results were shared with the other donors of the programme (I-HD-CP).  The SEA contract was awarded to NIRAS. SEA was carried out by three consultants (one environmental expert, one transport economist and one socio-economist) within a period of approximately 5 months (191 man-days) with a limited budget (I-HD-CP).  Since 2008,SEA is part of the Malian legislation on environmental and social impact assessment (article 32 of the Decree no 08-346/P-RM of June 26th 2008 on environmental and social impact assessment - that modifies the Decree of December 2003). However SEA is not well institutionalized, partly because of limited available capacities (I-LC-FB). The SEA of the Support Programme for the Transport Sector Programme was the second SEA to be done in Mali[[3]](#footnote-3) but the first one to be undertaken in the context of large programmes involving multiple donors and covering the whole country (I-EU-AH). This posed challenges notably in terms of adequate methodological and technical preparation of stakeholders involved in the SEA to address national issues rather than local or regional issues. Currently, two other SEAs are being undertaken in Mali (ie SEA of the National Irrigation Programme and SEA of the decentralized forest management programme). Those are commissioned by GTZ and SIDA. (I-LC-FB). Further works are being planned to improve the legal and institutional SEA framework in the country. (I-EU-AH).  The SEA Final Report (September 2008) was preceded by the preparation of an engagement and consultation plan (submitted early after the beginning of the assignment) and of a scoping study (submitted in April 2008).  **Overall** – It is considered by the interviewees that the SEA was of good quality considering the time and resources allocated. However, late start for the SEA, lack of ownership (I-EU-AH) and lack of financial and logistical capacity of the government to implement and follow up on SEA recommendations (I-LC-FB) were identified as factors which limit potential impact of the SEA. |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | **Y** – This SEA is justified. It corresponds to an “environmentally sensitive area” for which an SEA is required according to the screening list (Annex 3) of the Environmental Integration Handbook for EC Development Co-operation (2007). |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs?  *For questions a) and b) specify which ToRs’ requirements (if any) are not met.* | **a)** **P** – The SEA broadly complies with its ToRs but does not clearly address some aspects eg determination of the significance of the impacts (in terms of duration, probability, magnitude, mitigability and reversibility); indication of possible costs of the proposed performance indicators, format of the SEA report (*all the components that should appear in the SEA report are in the report but they do not follow exactly the order of presentation requested in the ToRs*).  **b) P** – Same as above. |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | **Y –** The SEA report (including the Executive Summary) is very clearly written, well structured and easy to understand. It is very detailed and comprehensive, and information and analysis seem to be sufficient to support informed decision-making. |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | **Y –** Reasons that justify the recommendations are generally provided (both for the general recommendations which are applicable to the whole transport programme, and for the mitigation/enhancement measures and alternatives outlined for each project/measure of the programme). |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | **P –** The methodological approach is clearly described and the steps of the approach are justified. However, the framework, material and tools used to carry out the approach could be more detailed in the main text of the report (eg while one of the annexes of the report (pp. 190-194) mentions that the SEA will be carried out in accordance with the EC SEA Directive 2001/42/EC, use of this Directive as a framework for the approach is not mentioned anywhere in the Executive Summary or in the main text of the SEA report. The same applies to the material and tools used to assess the impacts of the transport programme). |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | **Y –** Uncertainties and assumptions, as well as constraints are clearly outlined (SEA report, pp. 36-38). |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | **a) Y –** Environmental, social and economic impacts are assessed for each project/measure of the programme. Linkages between these impacts are generally addressed (eg renovation of roads could increase agriculture and related water pollution but could also improve food security and reduce poverty).  **b) N –** Recommendations are mainly “environmentally” oriented without clearly balancing against the human development gains (eg protect wildlife, monitor air pollutions, etc.) |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | **P –** Purpose of SEA is clearly mentioned (p. 20) but not clearly linked to regulations, policies, directives or guidelines. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | **Y –** Scoping report submitted in April 2008. Good overview of scoping outcomes is given in the SEA report, including key issues and impacts to be further assessed in the SEA. |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | **Y –** Good overview of key environmental considerations relevant to the transport programme (climate, energy consumption, air, water, soil, vegetation and wildlife, socio-economic aspects) is provided. The report also gives an overview of the socio-economic and environmental context for the various regions of the country concerned by the programme (eg Bamako, Kayes, Koulikoro, Sikasso Ségou, etc.). |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | **P –** Alternatives are clearly identified and described for the specific projects/measures of the programme (eg asphalting of the Niono-Tombouctou road; renovation of the road Kita-Bafoulabé, etc.). Alternatives are also addressed at the strategic level (eg need to give more importance to water and rail transportation compared to road transportation in the programme) but those are not clearly assessed. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | **P –** Environmental impacts of the programme are assessed only for the projects/measures of the programme, not for the alternatives proposed for each of these projects/measures.  In addition to the negative and direct impacts, indirect impacts (eg opening up the northern part of Niger could facilitate access to a region rich in water, but could cause problems of irrigation to neighboring countries that use the same water source), as well as positive impacts and opportunities (eg food security improvement due to roads and transport infrastructures renovations) are very well outlined. However, cumulative impacts do not appear clearly in the report. |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | **P –** Recommendations (eg mitigation/enhancement measures, alternatives for each project/measure of the programme, as well as general recommendations applicable to the whole transport programme and to the SPSP) seem to be implementable. However, the list is quite long and recommendations are not prioritized which could limit their implementation. |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | **P –** Monitoring indicators are defined in the SEA report for each project/measure of the programme but are not integrated within a more complete monitoring and evaluation plan. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | **N –** This SEA was carried out once decisions on the measures to support and implement it had already been taken by most of the stakeholders and donors (Q-EU-AH, I-EU-AH, I-HD-CP). Indeed, carrying out the SEA was dependent of the agreement of donors to synchronize their support to the programme which happened at a late stage of the programme’s preparation process (I-EU-AH). |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | **P –** The analysis could be more detailed but the report at least proposes general capacity building measures for each measure/project of the programme considered within the SEA (eg reinforce capacity of the organisation in charge of managing the national airport to take into account social and environmental impacts related to its transport activities) and for the whole programme. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | **Y –**Synergies between the transport programme and other projects or programmes implemented in the country are identified (eg complementarities between projects/measures of the transport programme that aim to open up isolated areas and other projects undertaken by the EC in Mali such as the project against sand encroachment, the ADERE project, etc.). |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | **Y –**Impacts on climate change are assessed for each project/measure of the transport programme (contribution of the projects/measures to greenhouse gas emissions). Mitigation as well as low carbon development measures are outlined (eg use of quality fuels, regulations regarding the age of the vehicles, use of water and rail transportation as alternatives to the car). |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | **P –**Stakeholders were engaged at various stages of the SEA process: during the scoping stage and during the preparation of the SEA. Decision-makers (eg Malian Government including its Ministries, technical and financial partners) and the programme’s beneficiaries (eg private sector, civil society, transport users, etc.) were involved. Consultations were based on various approached which helped involve a large number of stakeholders (eg regional meetings in the main regions covered by the transport programme, interactive radio broadcasts - including one called: “Voice of Women” - to reach rural populations and villages; internet consultation targeting urban populations that have access to the Web). However, it was felt that more effort could have been done to engage stakeholders in charge of managing local roads at the communal level during the regional meetings, as those were underrepresented in certain regions. (I-LC-FB) |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | **Y –**Inputs from stakeholders/public involved have been incorporated in the final report (I-EU-AH). |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | **Y –**A strategic environmental plan for the implementation of the transport programme was developed and included in the SEA report. This plan outlines types of actions needed to implement the recommendations (eg studies, legislation, funding), specific measures that should be implemented as part of the SEA recommendations (eg good road maintenance) and organizations that should be in charge of implementing the recommendations (eg Malian Ministry of Equipment and Transportation). This is good practice but more specific details about who should be in charge of the recommendations would be useful to ensure responsibility for their implementation. |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | **Y –** See answer to question 3.1 |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | **N –** SEA implementation seems to be challenged by the limited financial and logistical capacity of the Malian National Office for Sanitation and Control of Pollution and Environmental Damage (DNACPN) to follow up on SEA recommendations and on the transport programme’s implementation. (I-LC-FB)  *The DNACPN takes care, amongst other things, of environmental and social impact assessments for roads, and monitors environmental procedures*. |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | **N –** Influence of the SEA on the EC support programme and on the transport programme has been minimal as the transport programme was already developed/finalised and support from donors was allocated to specific projects or interventions when the SEA was carried out (Q-EU-AH, I-EU-AH). |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | **P –**The SEA helped raise environmentalawareness of stakeholders who participated to meetings and consultations (eg civil servants, NGOs) on key issues that characterize transportation in Mali (I-EU-AH, I-LC-FB). It also helped government officials understand that SEA is not only a tool to assess the environmental impacts of a policy, plan or programme but also a planning approach (I-LC-FB). However, impact of SEA on high-level authorities (political decision-makers) has been relatively low. (I-EU-AH) |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | **Y –** Cooperation focused mainly on improving scoping and SEA reports contents (eg in the Malian Government the DNACPN (see answer to question 3.3) – together with other departments (eg transport, finance) - provided inputs and comments on the scoping and on the SEA reports and participated to key SEA preparatory and validation meetings with the consultants) (I-EU-AH, I-LC-FB). |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc? e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | **N –** The SEA was more seen as an approach initiated and supported by donors than an approach owned by the Government to help strengthen the programme’s design and contents. (I-EU-AH). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other key messages not captured in the evaluation grid:**   * The EC Environmental Integration Advisory Services has been requested by the EU Delegation to support the SEA in order to ensure quality of the process. (I-EU-AH). Role of the helpdesk was to give comments on the ToRs, the preliminary version of the scoping report and the preliminary version of the SEA report. (I-HD-CP). * One of the reasons that could explain the lack of Government ownership is the fear to question or revise political choices (eg priority given to the road sector – which is an oligopole in Mali and has important socio-economic implications – compared to rail or water transportation)  (I-EU-AH). Another reason is the lack of financial and logistical capacities regarding SEA implementation (see answer to question 3.3 above). * The Country Environment Profile (CEP) in Mali was already existent when the SEA was carried out. Information from the CEP was used as an input for the SEA. (I-EU-AH). |

# Annex 8: *Guyana – SEA of the Sea Defences Sector Policy*

**Sources of information :**

Information in the evaluation grid is sourced from the SEA report reviewed. Other sources of information are identified using the following key :

Q = Questionnaire;

I = Interview

EU = European Union Delegation;

LC = Local Contact eg government official   
For sources from Questionnaires or Interviews the initials of the contact are provided e.g. JS = John Smith

**Rating scheme:** Response to each evaluation question is provided using the following ratings and justified in the commentary box.

Y = Yes

P = Partially

N = No

U = Unclear

N/A = Not Applicable

Interview held with : Christopher Ingelbrecht (EU Delegation, Georgetown)

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and Context:**  Development of the Guyana Sea Defence Sector Policy in 2008 was funded under EDF8 (contingency funds) to provide a strategic framework for critical works to tackle chronic under-investment in the country’s sea defences. Funding of approximately €14.8 million (provided under EDF10) for implementation of the Policy is anticipated.  The SEA commenced April 2008 (consecutively with design of the Policy) and the final report was submitted January 2009. A Scoping Report was submitted July 2008. Team of 4 (200 person days) carried out the SEA at a total cost of €190,000. The nominated institutional home for the SEA was the Ministry of Public Works and Communications.  **Overall** – The SEA helped to promote debate about environment in the context of sea defences. Whilst it did not raise any new issues it did help to legitimize and formalize debate about alternative options such as the use of mangroves as a defence strategy. The EC has since agreed to fund a €4 million mangrove restoration project. Limited Government ownership and concerns about the generic nature of recommendations have made implementation of key SEA conclusions difficult. |

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Rating & Commentary** |
| --- | --- |
| **1. SEA COMPLIANCE, RELEVANCE & CONSISTENCY** | |
| 1.1 Was the SEA justified (relevant) given the nature of the policy or programme supported by EuropeAid? | YES – This strategy is focused upon major infrastructure investments in sea defences, some set in sensitive coastal environments. |
| 1.2 Does the SEA (process/report) comply with  a) the requirements set out in its ToRs &  b) EuropeAid’s Guidance on SEAs? | a) PARTIALLY – The SEA complies with the requirements of the ToR in terms of inclusion of all key components, however some aspects are not followed through to support decision-making eg alternatives, institutional issues.  b) PARTIALLY – The ToR for this assignment follow the EC Guidelines on SEA ToRs. |
| **2. QUALITY OF THE SEA** | |
| **2.1 The SEA report** | |
| 2.1.1 Is the information & analysis provided in the SEA report clearly set out & sufficient to support informed decision-making | PARTIALLY – Report is set out clearly and contains much information. Interviewees indicated that conclusions and recommendations were too generic to actively influence decision-making processes. (I-EU-CI). |
| 2.1.2 Is there justification for the recommendations made in the SEA report? e.g. for the selection of a preferred alternative or the acceptance of any significant trade-offs? | YES – Most of the recommendations appear after considerable discussion during the report in which issues are investigated. |
| 2.1.3 Is the methodological approach used to carry out the SEA properly described & justified? | YES – Approach (based on a pressure-state –response model) is set out and key issues emerged following stakeholder inputs. |
| 2.1.4  Are uncertainties, assumptions or value judgements relating to the assessment identified &/or justified? | NO – Not clearly articulated through the report. Some discussion of uncertainties in Section 11 but this does not carry forward to influence how recommendations are framed and mainly focuses on the further analytical work required. Some value judgements could be explained eg criticism of recommendations in the draft sea defence strategy to undertake economic valuation of mangroves as flood defences is, in part, an assumption that ignores political realities - political buy-in to such “soft defences” approaches is more likely if a locally applicable and convincing monetary valuation is available. |
| 2.1.5  Does the SEA effectively:  a) assess & balance the linkages &/or trade-offs between environmental, social & economic considerations relating to the proposal?; &  b) make recommendations which enhance the socio-economic dimensions of the proposal? | a) PARTIALLY –Flood defences straddle a suite of environmental, social and economic concerns and the SEA does recognize this although application to recommendations does not occur.  b) NO. |
| **2.2 The  SEA Process** | |
| 2.2.1 Are the following core SEA components addressed? |  |
| a) Description of the purpose of the SEA including relevant regulations, policies, directives & guidelines | YES – This is fully covered. |
| b) Scoping to identify key issues & impacts to be analysed | YES – Scoping Report produced July 2008 (not provided for review). |
| c) Establishment of environmental baseline | PARTIALLY . Baseline information provided in Section 4. Often very descriptive rather than analytical. |
| d) Identification & description of potential alternatives to the proposal | PARTIALLY – Some interesting consideration in Section 9 of possible alternatives in strategy approach eg in setting back sea walls and managed retreat but these are not followed through analytically and either proposed or rejected as recommendations. |
| e) Description & assessment of significant environmental impacts (including positive & negative, direct & indirect, cumulative) & potential opportunities presented by the proposal & its alternatives | YES – Overall key adverse impacts of the sea defence strategy are identified and assessed using the P-S-R approach. Recognition of the adverse impact upon sea defences of coastal degradation is stressed. Focus is primarily on key negative and direct impacts. Used risk management approaches to assist with managing uncertainty for environmental risks |
| f) Provision of decision-makers with practical & implementable recommendations regarding alternatives, mitigation & enhancement opportunities as appropriate. | PARTIALLY – Some sensible recommendations to improve the sustainability of approach are put forward but overall are lost in the report with no clear summary table or action plan. Concern that many recommendations were generically accurate but insufficiently specific to facilitate implementation eg “a programme can be started to raise awareness on the dangers of inappropriate land use” raising questions such as what sort of programme, run by whom, at what cost? etc. |
| g) Presentation of a Monitoring & Evaluation framework including appropriate indicators | PARTIALLY – Some 200 indicators reviewed in appendix 5 but unclear finally which indicators are proposed, nor which are prioritized. Key concern is that whilst some good analysis of indicators takes place it would be difficult for decision-makers to readily extract the key information. |
| 2.2.2 Was the SEA conducted in a timely manner which supported decision-making processes? | YES – The SEA reported back to key stakeholders late 2008 and the final report concluded in early 2009 ensuring that the SEA ran in parallel with the sea defence sector policy design. |
| 2.2.3 Is sufficient attention given to institutional analysis & assessment in order for the SEA to effectively address institutional constraints & opportunities? | PARTIALLY - There is more discussion of institutional capacities in this SEA than some however most of the content under the legal and institutional framework in Section 8 is descriptive. Capacity of Ministry of Public Works and Communications to manage the environment dimensions of major infrastructure works is not discussed. It is positive that the consultants recognize eg p14 that there is sufficient regulation but a lack of implementation and this SEA is refreshingly devoid of recommendations to introduce new environmental legislation. |
| 2.2.4 Does the SEA address potential synergies or conflicts between the proposal & other relevant policies, plans, programmes or projects & make appropriate recommendations? | YES. The SEA does recognize the key interface between certain sections of the sea defences policy and other policy areas eg the National Mangrove Management Plan under the aegis of the Forestry Commission and identifies the need for institutional coordination and clarification of responsibilities over policy leadership. |
| 2.2.5 Are issues of Climate Change addressed in the assessment & are recommendations regarding mitigation, adaptation & low carbon development included as appropriate? | PARTIALLY- Climate Change is clearly a critical issue for a low lying coastal zone and the SEA discusses this. However given the high profile of climate change in Guyana (international attention on Guyanese political leaders promotion of forests as a global resource) more could have been made in the SEA of climate change to leverage more focus on sustainable sea defence solutions. (I-EU-CI). |
| **2.3 Consultation & Participation** | |
| 2.3.1 Is there evidence of meaningful opportunities for stakeholder engagement in the SEA process (including for less powerful stakeholders)? | PARTIALLY – There was extensive consultation and some workshops. The final workshop did not attract wide interest (some 20 participants) . |
| 2.3.2 Are the inputs of stakeholders/public involved or consulted in the SEA incorporated in the final report? | UNCLEAR. |
| **3. INFLUENCE & OUTCOME** | |
| 3.1 Are there mechanisms in place to ensure SEA recommendations are implemented? e.g. management plans | NO. The recommendations are not presented in a manner which facilitates their usage in terms of presentation and next steps. There is no action plan, management plan etc. There is some prioritization eg short, medium and long term but no clarification of timescales |
| 3.2 Is responsibility for implementing recommendations attributed to specific institutions or individuals? | PARTIALLY – The wording of the recommendations in some cases indicates responsibility. |
| 3.3 Is consideration given to resources (eg human, financial resources) needed to implement SEA recommendations? | NO. The recommendations are not presented in a framework which recognizes resource constraints/opportunities which may influence their likelihood of implementation. . |
| 3.4 Is there evidence that the SEA influenced the design, decision-making or implementation processes? e.g. did the SEA lead to any changes to the EC support programme’s formulation and to the development process of the country’s policy or programme?; Did it make them more sustainable? | PARTIALLY. The final Sea Defence Policy was edited considerably and little from the SEA was included although components referring to alternative approaches such as natural defences remain and this might be, in part, due to the SEA(I-EU-CI). The SEA did however help to promote debate about the role of environment in the policy and helped to formalize some of the discussion about mangroves as a sensible defence option. This does not readily come through in the SEA but it did encourage EC support for a €4 million mangrove restoration programme. |
| 3.5 Are other (indirect) benefits from the SEA discernable? e.g. increased capacity or environmental awareness, institutional reform. | PARTIALLY – The SEA did not introduce new ideas to debate about sea defences but it did formalize and legitimise their inclusion in the policy debate (I-EU-CI). |
| 3.6 Is there evidence of working co-operation between the SEA team & those responsible for developing &/or implementing the proposal? | NO –The SEA team operated independently of the policy design team and there was limited inter-action. (I-EU-CI) |
| 3.7 Is there evidence of ownership of the SEA by stakeholders including Government Ministries, EU Delegations etc?  e.g. implementation of recommendations, allocation of resources? | PARTIALLY – The EC has attempted to draw upon the SEA eg in terms of its mangrove restoration programme but indicates that if the SEA were more specific in its recommendations then it would be easier to use. (I-EU-CI)  There is no evidence of any Government ownership of the SEA with limited Ministry of Public Works and Communications involvement during the SEA and some concerns from Government officials that they expected more practical recommendations to aid implementation of the policy (I-EU-CI) |

1. Environmental Management Authority (2007). *Strategic Environmental Assessment Unit website:* <http://www.ema.co.tt/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=111&Itemid=111> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This certification is required for agricultural activities on areas above 2 hectares, housing, building, infrastructure, industry and development efforts in the country and for decommissioning of sites. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The first SEA had been done on a mining programme (I-LC-FB). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)