



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
(UNEP)

Environment and Economics Unit  
(EEU)

---

**WORKSHOP ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT WITH  
PARTICULAR FOCUS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION**

*Report of the Workshop*

September 1994

---

**Environmental Economics Series  
Paper No. 13**

The views and interpretation reflected in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect an expression of opinion on the part of the United Nations Environment Programme

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
(UNEP)

Environment and Economics Unit  
(EEU)

**WORKSHOP ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT WITH PARTICULAR  
FOCUS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION**

UNEP Headquarters  
Nairobi, 5-7 September 1994

Report of the Workshop  
Hussein Abaza  
Workshop Organizer and Rapporteur



## **Acknowledgement**

Acknowledgement is made to the Staff of the Environment and Economics Unit (EEU), UNEP for their contribution in organizing this workshop and their input towards the preparation and finalization of the report. Particular mention is made to Ms. Shahida Ali Butt, Programme Officer, EEU in this respect.

Acknowledgement is also made to Ms. Marcela Bonilla (Colombia), Mr. S. Bhowmik (India), Mr. Dominic Mathu (Kenya) and Mr. R. Perelet (Russia), who chaired the various sessions of the workshop.

## CONTENTS

---

	<i>Page</i>
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1. Session I: UNEP's EIA Programme</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2. Session II: Country Presentations</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>3. Session III: EIA and Sustainable Development</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>4. Session IV: Coherence of EIA Procedures</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>5. Session V: International and Regional Cooperation</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>6. Session VI: Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	<i>17</i>

---

## ANNEXES

<i>Annex I</i>	<i>List of Participants</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Annex II</i>	<i>Annotated Agenda of the Workshop</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Annex III</i>	<i>Summaries of Country Case Studies</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Annex IV</i>	<i>Conclusions and Recommendations of the Workshop</i>	<i>49</i>

## ***Introduction***

1. The Workshop on Environmental Impact Assessment with particular focus on International Cooperation was sponsored by UNEP Environment and Economics Unit (EEU). It was held at UNEP Headquarters in Nairobi, from 5-7 September 1994, and was attended by 35 participants representing developing countries, countries in transition to market economies (CITS), international development assistance organizations (IDAOs) including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), bilateral aid agencies and multilateral development banks. The first two days of the workshop were devoted exclusively to recipient country participants, with representatives of IDAO attending as observers. The activities of the third day were extended to include representatives of IDAOs. Conclusions and recommendation emanating from the first two days of discussions were presented the third day of the workshop for reactions by representatives of IDAOs. The workshop was intended to provide an opportunity for representatives of recipient countries and IDAOs to exchange views on the subject and both receive first hand information and knowledge on major problems and issues involved in recipient country - IDAO collaboration in environmental impact assessment (EIA). See Annexes I and II for the list of participants and the annotated agenda of the Workshop, respectively.
2. The workshop was opened by Mr. Hussein Abaza, Chief, EEU, who welcomed the participants to the workshop. He outlined the main objectives of the workshop as providing a forum for EIA practitioners in developing countries and CITS to exchange experience in the application of EIA, problems encountered in their application, action required to address gaps in their effective use as a development and planning tool, and its integration in the development planning and decision-making process. He stated that this workshop provided an excellent opportunity to promote South-South as well as North-South cooperation. What the workshop hoped to achieve was the identification of gaps in North-South and North-North cooperation, the maintenance of a certain degree of coherence between developing countries and CITS in EIA practices, particularly with regard to their reactions to EIA requirements for projects supported by IDAO, and the development of modalities for cooperation.
3. He stated that UNEP had been working in the field of EIA since the early 1970's, when the emphasis was basically directed to the production of sectoral and general guidelines. However, since the early eighties there was a shift in emphasis within UNEP, prompted in part by the Brundtland Commission report which called for improved EIA procedures at all levels of government. Furthermore, Agenda 21 of UNCED emphasized the need for an effective EIA process and for integrating environment and development. Moreover, it outlined the key role of UNEP in the further development and promotion of the widest possible use of EIA, including activities carried out under the auspices of the United Nations specialized agencies. He pointed out that as a follow-up to UNCED, it was important for EIA to focus on helping to set the groundwork for sustainable development, as well as pollution prevention and environmental degradation minimization.
4. Mr. Abaza stated that the UNEP Consultative Expert Group Meeting on EIA, which was convened in Paris from 27-28 October 1993, resulted in the formulation of UNEP's

programme on EIA. The focus of the UNEP EIA programme was to provide assistance to developing countries and CITs in building and strengthening EIA capacity, including the identification of EIA needs and procedures, institutional and human resource requirements, and elaboration of their national EIA legislation. The EIA programme included the convening of a series of regional and sub-regional workshops for EIA practitioners in developing countries and CITs. The first in the series of those workshops, which was organized in collaboration with the Commonwealth Secretariat and EarthCare Africa, for Central and Eastern African countries, was held in Zambia from 7-11 March 1994. Besides providing an excellent opportunity for the exchange of experience and knowledge between EIA practitioners in Central and Eastern Africa, the workshop also helped to identify requirements for EIA guidelines, training needs and curricula, and institutional, legal and human resources requirements in the sub-region. The workshop provided the basis for the preparation of an EIA framework for the sub-region.

5. He stated that as a follow up to the workshop, the EEU jointly with Earthcare Africa organized an expert group meeting in Nairobi to draft an EIA Framework for Africa. The Framework was based on issues and concerns that emerged during the six week EIA workshop in Zambia. It attempted to provide broad guidelines to help African countries integrate environmental concerns in their National Development Strategies through appropriate political, social, and economic structures.
6. Mr. Abaza hoped that this workshop, which was in implementation of one of the recommendations of the Paris Consultative Expert Group meeting on EIA, would link up and provide useful input into the programme of work of the OECD/DAC project on coherence which was supported by the Canadian International Development Assistance (CIDA). He also indicated that this workshop would feed into the International Study on the Effectiveness of EIA, which was currently being undertaken by the Federal Environment Assessment Review Office (FEARO) of Canada, in collaboration with the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA), with input from other international organizations including UNEP.
7. Mr. Sun Lin, Director, Environmental Law and Institutions Programme Activity Center (ELI/PAC), then welcomed the participants to the workshop. He referred to the UNEP Governing Council Decision at its 17 Session which decided that special emphasis should be given to the development, promotion, and application of EIAs (including assistance to developing countries and CITs) as a tool for development planning and promotion of the concept of sustainable development. He noted that within ELI/PAC there was a strong focus on the legal aspect of EIA.
8. In 1981, an ad-hoc meeting of senior government officials and experts in environmental law included EIA as a subject area in the Montevideo Programme with objectives and strategies agreed upon. In pursuance of this programme UNEP had promoted the development of guidelines for EIA. The Governing Council of UNEP, in 1987, adopted a document called "Goals and Principles of EIA" which put forward recommendations which could be considered in preparing national EIA measures. He stated that there had

been a reorientation of focus on EIA within UNEP after UNCED and that the initiatives taken by EEU in this field were a major step forward in achieving the goals set by UNCED and the Governing Council of UNEP. He urged the workshop to address the challenges facing the practical use of EIA in developing countries and CITs.

***Session 1: UNEP's EIA Programme***

9. Mr. Abaza informed the workshop of UNEP's programme on Environment and Economics, which had evolved and was formulated through a series of consultative expert group meetings, and was subsequently endorsed by the 17 Session of UNEP's Governing Council. The main five components of the programme were (a) Valuation of Environmental Goods and Services, (b) Environment and Natural Resource Accounting, (c) Economic Instruments, (d) Environmental Impact Assessment, and (e) International Economic and Environmental Cooperation, concentrating on Environment and Trade related issues.
10. Mr. Abaza proceeded to outline the main objectives of UNEP's EIA programme. He stated that UNEP was committed to the implementation of the UNCED recommendations with respect to the promotion and the widest possible use of EIA procedures by governments and, where appropriate, international organizations and IDAOs as a development planning tool for achieving sound environmental management and sustainable development. EIA needed to be further developed as a practical and cost-effective tool for integrating environment and development in decision-making at the policy, programme, and project level; in addition, the capacities of developing countries and CITs to integrate EIA in the development planning process at the three levels should be enhanced.
11. In order to enhance the effectiveness of EIA, the programme was directed to the promotion and further development of techniques for the integration of physical, social, economic and environmental analysis and assessment of projects and programmes. Decision-making for environmentally sound and sustainable development required enhancing the understanding of how EIA of development projects, programmes and policies including risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis might be integrated into methods and procedures to strengthen decision-making. It followed, therefore, that the use of EIA as a continuous planning tool with the inclusion of monitoring and assessment and follow-up required further promotion. He further stated that UNEP's EIA programme recognized the need to promote the role of EIA as a tool for regional and international cooperation, particularly in cases of activities and programmes likely to have transboundary effects. The programme was committed to the promotion and contribution of efforts leading to the coherence of EIA procedures adopted by UN organizations and IDAOs, as well as developing countries and CITs. Developing countries and CITs had specific needs, and therefore it was important that EIA procedures developed and adopted by them took due cognizance of their capabilities and socioeconomic conditions.

12. The EEU was engaged in a wide range of activities to fulfil the objectives of the programme. Those activities included **Training and capacity building**. At the Environmental Assessment (EA) Summit held in Quebec in June 1993, training and capacity-building emerged as one of the main areas requiring attention by the international community. Based on recommendations of the Summit, UNEP offered to organize and convene a working group on EIA training to decide on future work in this area. The working group convened by UNEP in Quebec recommended that an EIA resource training manual on how EIA training modules should be developed. It was pointed out that this document was not intended to be an EIA training module, but rather a reference resource kit for trainers to develop training modules for EIA trainers, practitioners, administrators and policy makers. The Environment Protection Agency of Australia offered to provide assistance in the preparation of an initial draft of the resource kit, which would be reviewed by the working group in January 1995 and henceforth at the IAIA Summit in Durban in June 1995.
13. The convening of regional **workshops on EIA** was emphasized as a major activity in this programme. The sub-regional workshop for EIA practitioners of Central and Eastern African countries was a first exercise in this area. The main outcome of the workshop, as earlier indicated was that it provided the basis for the preparation of EIA framework and subsequently an EIA best practices for the sub-region, based on local conditions. EEU plans to convene a series of similar workshops for other regions in the near future.
14. Special focus was directed to **undertaking Case-study analysis** on the use of EIA for development activities with major environmental impacts, both at national and regional levels. An area of special importance was the environmental impacts of structural adjustment programmes. Included in the UNEP work programme was also looking into the EIA of trade policies and international trade agreements. The study would cover the assessment of the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the Uruguay Round on developing countries.
15. The Paris consultative expert group meeting, which resulted in the formulation and development of a comprehensive UNEP EIA programme, emphasized the importance of creating a network of EIA practitioners in developing countries and CITS, which would enhance the knowledge and understanding of the use of EIA for environmental management and sustainable development. The importance of networking was also highlighted at the EA Summit in Quebec, where FEARO on the recommendations of the Summit agreed, to coordinate activities and network information on EIA using existing structures and focal points in developed and developing countries.
16. The EEU was working on establishing a database not only on EIA, cost benefit analysis (CBA) methodologies and applications and "EIA best practices" for developing countries, CITS, and international and national institutions, but also for the other four areas of the EEU work programme. These include natural resource accounting, valuation of environmental goods and services, economic instruments, and trade.



***Session II: Country Case Studies***

17. Representatives of developing countries and CITs in submitting papers at the workshop provided a brief account of the experience of their respective countries in EIA. See Annex III for a brief abstract of the presentations made.

***Session III: EIA and Sustainable Development***

18. Although EIA was a necessary tool for sustainable development, it should not be regarded as the only one, and had to be supplemented by other tools. An important issue was the need to develop and promote EIA models and other planning instruments based on the expertise and development goals of developing countries and CITs. It was pointed out that EIA was able to contribute to sustainable development in a number of areas including sectoral integration. In order to achieve sustainability, environmental and socioeconomic integration had to be achieved. Since EIA was one of the few policy tools capable of integrating socioeconomic and biophysical considerations, it had made a major contribution to the quest for sustainable development, although much progress was still required.
19. It was pointed out that the achievement of sustainability required indices and indicators which could be measured. Given the processes involved in EIA which sought to measure environmental impacts, EIA should in time be able to identify appropriate sustainability indicators such as maximum sustainable yields, local assimilative capacities, etc. Combined with natural resource valuation and cost-benefit analysis, EIA provided a method of evaluating the net future benefit of a project, which was an important step towards sustainable development. Although traditionally thought to be applicable only at the project level, EIAs should also be applied to programmes and policies. Those developments were relatively new, but held great hope for sustainable development, as environmentally sound policies at the macro level should be in place even before programmes and projects were proposed or designed. It was considered important to use EIA as a tool to try to mitigate the negative social and environmental impacts and to enhance the quantification of the positive impacts of policies, programmes, and projects.
20. In the ensuing discussion, the definition of the concept of sustainable development was questioned. If the definition of the concept of sustainable development was accepted to be the preservation of natural resource capital for future generations, then identifying and estimating all the environmental and social costs in the EIA of a project could have important advantages for promoting sustainable development. By including those analyses, projects that were less sustainable would tend to have a lower priority and hence make the whole process of decision-making much easier. It was pointed out that it was essential to know from which perspective sustainable development was being defined.

21. It was considered useful to define a range of environmental indicators for various ecosystems which could be utilized to evaluate and monitor whether development was sustainable in those areas. Hence there was a need to assist in identifying and establishing carrying capacities of ecosystems. Guidelines to define sustainable development for a wide range of development "types" were required to be prepared.
22. It was noted that EIA could be viewed broadly as a tool for facilitating effective public involvement in project planning and development processes. During the discussions which followed, the need to enhance public participation was emphasized. In addition to including NGOs and community representatives as participating members during EIA preparation in the pre-feasibility stage and as part of the review teams, the possibility of providing an appeals mechanism, whether administrative or judicial, for reviewing all final decisions was suggested.
23. Part of the public participation process was the promotion of transparency in the EIA process through the provision of reasonable and timely access to EIA reports and other documents, and making available published EIAs in libraries and other fora for media dissemination. Another consideration was the possibility of funding NGOs or community residents to conduct critical reviews and technical studies of EIAs. Another and more substantive approach to increasing public involvement noted during the workshop, was the use of community monitoring committees to review compliance with EIAs. In addition, it was considered important that those involved in conducting EIAs consulted with NGOs and other community representatives to identify further ways to obtain public input.
24. Incomplete and inaccurate environmental baseline data were considered to be a major impediment to effective EIAs and to sustainable development planning generally. Although it was usually considered necessary to collect some project specific data, it was neither cost-effective nor practical to collect all EIA data on a case-by-case basis or for a single use. It was recognized that with access to comprehensive and validated environmental databases, project proponents could prepare EIA reports relatively fast and also be able to draw the right conclusions from such data. UNEP was urged to establish with other potential users an environmental baseline data system. A consideration here was compatibility with Geographic Information System (GIS) technology.
25. It was recognized that the creation of a database for countries within the same region could lead to a considerable reduction in the cost of conducting EIA. A database for project types (i.e. pulp and paper) was also required. Significant impacts and facts could be included in the database which could be adjusted and adapted to local conditions.
26. It was recognized that EIA studies were usually not linked to national and sectoral development programming and policy-making. Although most EIA legislation addressed the need to integrate environmental considerations and values into early project planning and programming, in fact most EIA studies were conducted well after key project decisions had been made. Besides, in cases where EIAs were conducted at the project

initiation, that did not cover the entire project lifecycle. Since in most CITs and many developing countries there was a tradition of centralized, long-range, or areawide economic and development planning, it was recommended that an environmental impact review screen be integrated in the existing institutional framework. Such early consideration of environmental concerns was consistent with sustainable development and with the directives of IDAOS.

27. It was considered important to create awareness and a commitment to perform EIAs not only for the public but also for decision-makers. It was felt that EIA should not be viewed as merely being a requirement to approve a project, but be viewed from a positive perspective, with the aim of using it as a tool to achieve sustainability objectives.
28. It was evident from the discussions that environmental policy and in particular EIA procedures required technical and administrative capacities and resources. Often those were in short supply in developing countries or were poorly coordinated. Instead of relying exclusively on development assistance agencies, international organizations or consultants to formulate and administer policies, developing countries needed to expand their indigenous capacities for environmental planning and assessment. Efforts should be designed to stimulate public education about environment and development, to build up a network of research institutions at existing universities, to train academics, administrators, public and private sector managers, and consultants in conducting as well as managing EIAs and environmental planning generally. It was considered important that training efforts included case studies, demonstration projects and practical exercises.
29. UNEP and other international organizations were requested to provide institutional and training support in EIA through sponsoring and convening of national and regional workshops, and the provision of resource persons or experts in EIA. A number of participants highlighted the need to provide training to address the specific needs of developing countries and urged the sponsorship of courses on EIA. Study tours for EIA teams in countries with different levels of EIA competence was also encouraged. Special emphasis was directed to training of trainers in the management and administration of EIAs, focusing on training in baseline data compilation, assessment and evaluation. The development of monitoring programmes to ascertain the effectiveness of EIAs and to make project proponents and developers accountable was stressed.
30. It was noted that the introduction of EIA in most developing countries and CITs had resulted in the need for the creation of new institutions and/or the strengthening of existing ones. This had created the need to provide the necessary expertise and trained human manpower to run those institutions, with the linkages between them and other government departments clearly defined.
31. There was a general agreement at the workshop that there was a need to promote cooperation between developing countries, through the creation of a network of practitioners which could enhance the knowledge and understanding of EIA for environmental management and sustainable development.

32. It was noted that the legal and institutional framework for implementing EIA should provide the basis and establish the authority and responsibility for decisions related to EIA and for compliance procedures. Many developing countries and CIT participants pointed out that EIA provisions in a national constitution or environmental protection act were inadequate for ensuring the implementation of an effective and coherent EIA process. Accordingly, the need for more detailed laws or regulations on EIA was required. It was suggested that UNEP could assist in this process by developing legal framework documents and working with individual countries to develop suitable national systems. UNEP was also requested to facilitate South-South and North-South networking for exchanging experience and knowledge in national EIA procedures, and between those responsible for implementing them. This could be a useful step towards facilitating the access to EIA laws and regulations of countries more advanced in their procedures.

#### ***Session IV: Coherence of EIA Procedures***

##### **Effectiveness of International Assistance in EIA**

33. It was noted that EIA systems both in developing countries and CITs varied widely. Some countries such as Indonesia had undertaken EIA studies for nearly two decades. They had developed EIA laws and regulations, acquired considerable practical experience, and had developed their own guidelines. Other countries had just begun to carry out EIAs, with recently enacted legislation, sets of regulations, and EIA procedures and institutional frameworks. It was recognized that differences also existed in EIA procedures between CITs and developing countries. The EIA frameworks for CITs were more related to those adopted by developed countries.
34. It was recognized that with the development of national procedures and guidelines, two sets of guidelines were now available, those prepared by developing countries and CITs, and those by developed countries and other international organizations. It was therefore emphasized that consistency and coherence needed to be introduced in those guidelines, and that they be tailored to a task and user. It was recommended that UNEP, in collaboration with the OECD and the Regional Commissions, should expand the OECD EIA coherence project to include developing countries and CITs, and in particular, to develop EIA country specific reports for developing countries and CITs.
35. It was considered important to develop EIA guidelines for and by developing countries, using local expertise and based on local experience, including case studies relevant to the region/ecosystem in question.
36. The development of methods to improve donor-IDA/O interaction was emphasized. In most of the cases expatriate teams were brought in to perform EIAs in a short period of time, with no training provided for dealing with the specific local socioeconomic conditions

prevailing in the recipient country. It was emphasized that recipient country participation and capacity could be enhanced if expatriate consultants were assisted by local counterpart personnel as part of the EIA team. UNEP and other IDAO were requested to facilitate this process.

37. It was noted that most of the EIAs in developing countries did not result from government requirements, but were conducted at the request of an IDAO either in fulfillment of a procedural requirement or on an ad-hoc basis, to demonstrate that environmental problems had been considered during the project planning and feasibility assessment stages. There was therefore always a risk that EIA would only be conducted in compliance with a procedural requirement and thus have no value as a planning tool. It was recommended that development agencies attach certain conditions to loans for projects that required environmental measures in order to obtain compliance with EIA procedures.
38. The issue of environmental standards in developing countries was considered to be very complex. It was noted that particular site characteristics and project features made uniform standards inappropriate, and that other factors needed to be taken into account. Often recipient countries tried to upgrade their EIAs to satisfy the requirements of IDAOS. UNEP and other IDAO were requested to develop minimum acceptable guidelines for both IDAO and recipients. Those could be elaborated, modified and supplemented, based on each country's specific characteristics and conditions.
39. It was noted that the value of EIA was limited unless it resulted in improved project design and the incorporation of measures for monitoring and managing environmental problems as they were likely to occur. In most developing countries follow-up and monitoring as well as compliance was, in many cases not included as part of the EIA process. Enforcement of EIAs and environmental compliance was an area which required special attention. Methodologies for designing an appropriate monitoring and follow-up programme in the EIA process were needed.
40. It was recognized that there were gaps in EIA procedures for conducting certain types of projects with regional and transboundary impacts. Those gaps could be filled through international assistance and UNEP was tasked to come up with initiatives similar to the "Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal." It was agreed that environmental impacts of transboundary activities were required to be assessed, with linkages between transboundary and regional impacts established.

#### ***Session V: International and Regional Cooperation***

41. The representative of the **Canadian International Development Assistance (CIDA)** expressed his appreciation to being invited to the workshop and stated that it had been a learning experience for him to participate in the workshop. He indicated that some of the recommendations of the workshop would be carried out within the "Effectiveness

Study". He also stated that recommendation of the workshop regarding to the need to transfer clean technologies to developing countries meriting special attention.

42. The representative of Gordon E. Beanlands Environmental Consulting Inc. (GEBEC) and (CIDA) consultant made a presentation on the project on Coherence of Environmental Assessment for International Bilateral Aid. He stated that one of the outcomes of the recent economic changes in the world had been the reduced budgets and manpower resources of aid agencies. This development highlighted the need for greater cooperation between IDAOs in order to maximize efficiency in fund usage. The issue arising from such cooperative activities was, whose EIA procedures should be followed? To answer this question, CIDA had attempted to produce some documents on coherence to facilitate cooperation between bilateral donor agencies in carrying out EIAs.
43. He pointed out that coherence did not mean standardization of procedures, instead it focused on "internal consistency" of procedures, or common features in a common framework. He further stated that the key operational requirement for achieving coherence was getting the right information to the right people at the right time. The information required should be brief and relevant for the purpose. It was stressed that no one policy or generic solution was possible under those procedures. What was required therefore was a flexible procedure which could be adapted to a variety of situations.
44. The representative of GEBEC/CIDA consultant proceeded to present a brief summary of the project on Coherence of Environmental Assessment for International Bilateral Aid supported by CIDA. The project was approved in October 1992 by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of OECD through its Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment. The aim of this project was to seek ways to improve coherence in environmental assessment procedures of Official Development Assistance (ODA) programmes of DAC Member countries. The results were expected to lead to increased efficiency and effectiveness in the planning and implementation of aid projects as jointly undertaken by recipient and OECD countries.
45. Advantages of increased coherence included reduced redundancy and overlap in data collection, and mutual learning among OECD countries on what works and what does not. The clarity of information on each bilateral aid agency reduced the confusion for recipient countries over the variety of EIA procedures available and the tendency to shop around for bilateral aid agencies with less complicated procedures.
46. Representatives of 18 participating countries and organizations including UNEP constituted the Task Force which assisted in gaining access to information, provided technical advice and guidance, and reviewed all draft documents resulting from the project. The project was conducted in two phases over a period of 16 months. Phase I focused on defining the nature and extent of the problems arising from a lack of coherence in environmental assessment among bilaterals. Phase II concentrated on developing working papers and procedural outlines for the priority areas mentioned below.

47. The results of Phase I established the priorities for improving coherence. Those included the development of a common terms of reference; greater coherence in managing the assessment process; more collaboration through the use of strategic assessment as opposed to the project level assessment; greater sharing of experience among OECD countries; the development of a common training module; increased coherence in commercial aid; improved coherence through evaluation and assessments; the role of NGO's in improving coherence; and, a summary of donors' legal and procedural EIA requirements.
48. After subsequent discussions, the areas in which coherence could be improved were reduced to six priority areas which were the focus of work in Phase II of the project. Those included the framework terms of reference, management guidelines, strategic assessment, EA training module, evaluation for improving coherence and the role of NGO's and of commercial banks.
49. From those priority areas, two areas which were considered to be sufficiently well understood were selected for the development of procedural guidelines. It was felt that coherence in EIA could be improved through the use of common reference documents. Those included ***The Framework Terms of Reference***, which incorporated the main procedural and technical aspects that were commonly required to ensure a comprehensive and high-quality environmental assessment and ***The Checklist for Managing Environmental Assessment***. This basically ensured that key requirements or options were not overlooked, and that a focus was maintained on the overall objectives, responsibilities and outputs relative to the assessment under consideration. This checklist complemented the terms of reference document.
50. It was stated that ***strategic assessment*** had received increased interest in recent years due to the inadequacies of the project based EIAs and due to the increased priority being placed on sustainable development, which required the integration of economic and social planning at the highest levels of decision-making, *i.e.*, at the policy and programme levels of planning. However within the context of the OECD project, it was concluded by the task force that strategic assessment was not yet sufficiently defined in an operational sense to warrant the development of practical guidelines at present. Besides, although strategic assessment might offer significant advantages over project level EIAs, it was not immediately clear how it would lead to increased coherence.
51. There was consensus that a common approach to ***EIA training*** would lead to increased coherence in assessment practices, and the intention here was to develop a common training module for use by all OECD countries. The training module was focused on providing participants with the understanding of how similarities and differences could affect their management responsibilities. The module, designed for desk officers, would take only one hour to present and would be only one unit in a broader management training programme given by IDAO's on a regular basis. However, it was apparent that this module would not be ready within the timeframe of the project.

52. He further stated that members of the Task Force did not feel that there was sufficient agreement among donors to develop **EIA evaluation** criteria or quality assurance indicators for EIA. They, however, recognized the importance of evaluation which could lead to greater coherence and supported further work in this field.
53. It was noted that although NGOs played a vital role in development assistance programmes, it was not clear how they could lead to improving coherence among donors in EIA practices. It was recognized that NGOs were more incoherent in their approach to development assistance. Furthermore, the strength of the NGO community lied in its variability. Trying to achieve greater coherence would undermine this fundamental strength.
54. The third part of the project dealt with the preparation of summaries of the legal, policy and procedural basis for environmental assessment of the bilateral donor countries. The **country summary sheets** were concise and brief and followed the format of the "OECD Good Practices" document. Designed as a working reference manual for desk officers and environmental specialists, they covered a wide range of interests and were easily adaptable to computer retrieval programmes. However, information in country summary reports needed to be updated regularly and field tested and adjusted accordingly.
55. The project recommended that the Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment proposed to the DAC the formal adoption of (i) the framework terms of reference for EIA of development assistance projects; (ii) the checklist for managing EIA; (iii) the summary of country policies and procedures;
56. It was also recommended that the Working Party on Development Assistance Environment incorporate in its workplan the further development of coherence in environmental assessment through the establishment of task forces on (i) *environmental assessment training*, which would coordinate linkages with the task forces work on capacity-building and develop a common core training module for use by all donor agencies; (ii) *strategic environmental assessment*, which would report on linkages with project, programme and policy assessment and national environmental planning, and document past experiences and accomplishments; and, (iii) *evaluation of environmental assessments*, which would attempt to develop common quality assurance indicators, and evaluation criteria and on the distribution of evaluation results.
57. The representative of GEBEC/CIDA consultant further stated that, it was recommended that the Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment initiate discussions with multilateral financial institutions with a view to improving coherence in EIA procedures, and coordinate the holding of regular technical workshops for environmental assessment specialists of donor agencies as a venue to share information and experience. It was also recommended that the DAC Working Party consider the most appropriate means to encourage greater coherence in EIA between bilateral donors and recipient countries, and that the DAC explore means to encourage the bilateral commercial lending and credit agencies to incorporate environmental assessment requirements into their financial



negotiations with developing countries.

58. It was recognized that one of the most difficult problems for coherence was the case where an IDAO rejected a project on environmental grounds, and that project was subsequently supported by another. There was a need for cooperation between IDAOs so that the practice of "shopping around" could be discouraged. It was recognized that cooperation in EIA procedures could be promoted not only between countries but also between development assistance agencies.
59. During the discussions which followed, it was emphasized that the OECD project was not based on harmonization but was based on coherence. From the recipient country point of view, if those country sheets were made available for developing countries, the value would be to highlight similarities and differences in EIA procedures adopted by OECD countries. Hence in cases of similarities between countries, duplication could be avoided and where there were differences, adjustments could be made.
60. The question was raised that when the recipient country was in a position to conduct EIA, how did the DAC member countries cope with this situation. The workshop was informed that generally when the recipients had a capacity to conduct EIA, DAC member countries would play a supportive role. However when DAC member countries had some legal and policy obligations to fulfil, they would need to ensure that their requirements were met. It was emphasized that all DAC member countries had agreed that EIA was the responsibility of the recipient country.
61. Participants noted that international aid agencies had provided helpful guidance to recipient countries and suggested that UNEP could be assigned the role of coordinating a coherent strategy on EIA procedures related to the requirements of the recipient countries. Furthermore, UNEP and/or development assistance organizations were requested to prepare a series of case studies and reports, for a variety of ecosystems and a variety of sectors selected for the positive and negative lessons that they offer for future EIAs.
62. The need for transparency in EIA procedures was highlighted. Often IDAOs provided assistance in performing EIA's but related documents were kept by those organizations. Assistance should take the shape of developing local expertise and broad guidelines in pilot projects and in the field of environmental economics. Attention was drawn to the practice of dumping inappropriate or environmentally unsound technology on recipients. IDAOs were urged to insist on the use of clean technologies in all development projects. Cost of such technology could be borne by projects funded by IDAOs.
63. It was noted during the ensuing discussions that North-South cooperation in EIA implementation could be improved through feedback between recipients and IDAOs in a given process. It was considered important to develop exchange programmes of EIA project teams among developed countries, developing countries and countries in transition to market economies and vice-versa. One of the participants drew attention to the fact that capacity-building was not only training but also institution-building and the

provision of equipment specific to requirements in the practice of EIA. The international community was urged to provide both hardware and software for EIA assessment and monitoring.

64. Both the representative of CIDA and the European Investment Bank (EIB) confirmed the right of IDAOs to refuse or veto a project. It was pointed out that many projects were rejected in the interests of sustainability, even when they satisfied current environmental criteria. It was accepted that each Bank had its own mandate, policy and lending regulations. What was acceptable to one Bank may not be acceptable to another. Coherence was therefore not considered feasible in the commercial banking sector.
65. The representative of **FEARO** stated that his Office devoted substantial efforts to the development of regulations for aid projects outside Canada. Within the context of the debate on adoption of recipient or IDAO procedures, **FEARO** was more inclined to substitute IDAO procedures with recipient ones after this workshop. However, it was emphasized that recipient procedures can only be adopted with substantial capacity-building programmes. He stated that without political commitment to perform EIAs, implementation and compliance became difficult and it took longer to get through bureaucratic procedures. **FEARO**, with the assistance of UNEP, and other international organizations was undertaking an "Effectiveness Study on EIA. Regional seminars, case studies and survey provided primary input in this study. The results of this study will be reported to the IAIA Conference to be held in Durban in June 1995.
66. The representative of **the United Kingdom** stated that the Overseas Development Agency (ODA) revised its EIA procedures for developing countries two years ago. He pointed out that under this new policy, ODA would support the development of local capacities in developing countries. Inherent in this new policy was the assumption that EIA was the responsibility of the recipient countries, and that ODA would respond by way of capacity-building and training measures. He fully supported the recommendation posed by the workshop, that developing countries needed to take the initiative and be committed in the adoption of EIAs as a planning and decision-making tool.
67. The representative of **OECD** stated that DAC was a specialized committee of the OECD, whose members had agreed to secure the expansion of the total volume of resources made available to developing countries and to improve aid effectiveness. Created in 1960, the Committee undertook periodic peer reviews that critically analyzed aid programmes. Members also consulted on broader aspects of development policy, encompassing a range of financial, trade, environmental and structural issues.
68. It was recognized that DAC was the principal international forum where bilateral donors adjusted the pattern of their aid in light of changing priorities and new perspectives on the development process. In 1989 the DAC created a Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment to strengthen the contribution of aid policies and programmes to sustainable development. The work programme of the Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment concentrated on developing coherent policies in development

assistance and the environment. Emphasis was directed to the production of a series of guidelines aimed at policy makers and practitioners. Seven of those guidelines had already been published whilst another two were being developed. Another area of importance was to monitor green policies and report to members as well as the Committee on Sustainable Development (CSD). The coherence project, which was the subject of discussion in this workshop, was funded by OECD/DAC in 1992. OECD planned to distribute the recommendations of this project widely. The OECD representative in concluding, commended UNEP in its initiative to convene this workshop and stated that she would carry the message from this workshop to OECD for consideration in its future work.

69. The **Australian** representative commended EEU on convening the workshop, which he indicated had been an enlightening experience for all the participants. He stated that although Australia was considered to be a developed country and had sophisticated EIA procedures, the discussions had revealed that the differences between developed and developing country problems were not that wide. Australia too experienced many of the problems identified in the workshop. He pointed out that although EIA was considered to be one of the essential tools for providing sustainable development, there were other tools as well, for example, sectoral policies, setting of environmental standards and policies, regional land-use allocation studies, and systems of land-use planning permits. Those had traditionally, been used apart from EIAs in Australia. Clearly, achieving sustainable development would require the application of a wide range of those tools. Hence what was required was a flexible definition of EIA.
70. The representative of the **EIB** stated, that as far as environment was concerned, EIB functioned on the basis of the framework of a specific European Community directive. Outside the community, EIB tried to verify the validity of the EIA procedures based on the same directive. The EIA directive divided the project into either EIA as a mandatory requirement or EIA conducted as requirement of the country's own legislation. The EIB engineer decided whether a full-fledged EIA was necessary after discussing the project with the proponent and conducting a scoping study of the project. This study was conducted on the basis of the project type, location, size and the technology used. He further stated that the clients' appreciation of the need to conduct an EIA was an important consideration for EIB. EIA was considered useful only if the client agreed that EIA would improve the project. If the client had reservations or disagreed, EIB often attempted to convince the proponent of the importance of conducting EIA rather than imposing it on him. Those procedures were adopted because it was felt that EIA both in industrial and developing countries was conducted purely for bureaucratic purposes and this had to be avoided at all costs.
71. The representative of the **European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)**, stated that the loan procedures of EBRD were very similar to those of the World Bank and were categorized according to level A, B and C projects. Level A projects required full EIA, B required a partial EIA and level C did not require any EIA. EBRD normally screened all the projects requiring EIAs, but the actual implementation was the responsibility of the

recipient country. The recipient could be a government, a municipality or an individual borrower. The Bank's procedures required environmental audits in addition to EIAs, which were carried out on existing industrial facilities to determine environmental liability issues. Normally an EIA was carried out by consultants appointed by the recipient. However, if the recipient was a government or a municipality then EBRD had access to technical co-operation assistance in carrying out the EIA. Once an EIA was completed, the results were assessed and if proved viable, the project was forwarded to the operations committee and to the Board for the final recommendation. In order to ensure compliance of the EIA, EBRD incorporated mitigation measures into the loan agreement and also prepared environmental covenants to be carried out.

72. The representative of the **African Development Bank (ADB)** outlined the goals of the environmental policy of the bank. He stated that ADB adopted its environmental policy in June 1990 and by December 1991, ADB had prepared and adopted guidelines to implement its environmental policy. It was considered mandatory to screen all ADB lending projects whether those were social, economic or environmental. He pointed out that efforts of ADB in carrying out their policies were often hampered by inadequacies of legislation and shortcomings of environmental institutions. EIAs were usually conducted by foreign consultants, usually assigned by the IDAO, as the recipients often neither had the expertise to undertake EIAs nor the resources to appoint expatriate consultants to do the job. However, the ADB usually supported the participation of a local counterpart consultant as part of the EIA team. He recognized that the EIA study should identify both the positive and the negative impact of the projects and provide alternatives that would assist in making the right decisions. Also and more importantly, the EIA study had to define quantified and costed mitigative measures and those had to be integrated into the cost of the project. This meant that environmental cost had to be internalized and reflected in the economic evaluation of the project.
73. Regarding public participation, ADB published a quarterly newsletter where in all projects where all projects were listed and summarized. As a requirement, ADB would wait for up to four months to receive reactions to the project from the public before projects were submitted to the Board for clearance. The ADB representative noted that an EIA made very little sense if the main recommendations were not integrated into the project design, and with instructions on how those were to be implemented. Within the ADB administration, EIAs were often seen as a constraint and a process which delayed project implementation. Increased training was now being offered to staff members to promote EIA awareness. It was considered important that EIA was not seen as a constraint but as a standard procedure. When project recommendations were not complied with by the recipients, then compliance procedures were there to withhold funds until those recommendations were carried out.
74. The representative of the **Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)** stated that FAO had developed EIA guidelines and tested them in about 70 projects. FAO had also developed an interesting software package for assisting the implementation and analysis of EIA. This package was user friendly, free, available on request, and came with a training manual.

The package required details on location of project, anticipated activities and for each sub-activity it was possible to identify up to five levels of primary as well as successive impacts.

75. The representative of FAO pointed out that the organization was concentrating less on EIA since it had embarked into sustainability analysis and sustainable assessment which seemed to be giving better results. It was recognized within FAO that if projects were to be sustainable then they should be so from all aspects i.e., social, cultural, economic, environmental, etc.,. Working jointly with WRI, FAO had developed 200 indicators, now reduced to 90, based on economic, social and environmental criteria. The selected indicators had been linked to the sustainability analysis module which was a package for agricultural planners and was called, "K2 package." This package had 12 modules, i.e., commodity module, energy module etc., which were in turn linked to a sustainability module for sustainable assessment. This training module would be available for use next year. The second part of FAO's programme was focused on developing tools for assessing sustainability at the country level. This activity was being conducted jointly with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), using 30 methods and tools to test sustainability. The outcomes of this project pointed out that no single tool was sufficient to test sustainability and that a variety of other tools needed to be used.
76. The representative of the **Netherlands** supported the initiatives of the multilateral and bilateral funding agencies on capacity-building and legislative strengthening for the successful implementation of EIA. He stated that though EIA could be an effective tool to achieve sustainable development objectives, it should be seen as one of the tools in a tool box of instruments. Incorporating cost-benefit analysis and valuation techniques into the EIA could be a very effective tool as had been revealed by a study conducted by Dutch consultants in Egypt.

### ***Session VI Conclusions and Recommendations***

77. Participants of the workshop selected a drafting committee of five members to draft the main conclusions and recommendations of the workshop for consideration by the rest of the participants. After subsequent discussions and alterations and reactions by observers representing IDAOs, NGOs, bilateral aid agencies and multilateral development banks, to the document prepared by the drafting committee, the workshop agreed on a set of conclusions and recommendations. See Annex IV for conclusions and recommendations of the workshop.
78. Mr. H. Abaza closed the workshop by thanking the participants for their contributions and active participation in the workshop. He also thanked the drafting committee and participants, who chaired the various sessions of the workshop.

**Annex I**  
**List of participants**

***List of Participants***

**BAHRAIN**

Mr. Ali Jassim Al Hesabi  
Economist  
Environmental Protection Committee  
P.O. Box 26909  
Bahrain  
Tel: (0973) 293693  
Fax: (0973) 293694

**BRAZIL**

Ms. Hidely Grassi Rizzo  
General Coordinator  
Ministry of Environment  
Esplanada Dos Ministerios  
Bloco "B" - 8º andar  
Tel: (55-61) 322-5635 ext 215  
Fax: (55-61) 226-8050

**CHINA**

Mr. Li Xinmin  
Department of Environmental Monitoring  
and Supervision  
National Environmental Protection Agency  
No. 115 Xizhimennei Nanxiaojie  
Beijing  
P.R. China  
Tel: 86 1 832991  
Fax: 86 1 8328013

**COLOMBIA**

Ms. Marcela Bonilla  
Sectoral Environmental Direction  
Colombian Ministry of the Environment  
Edificio Avianca  
Piso 30, Santafe de Bogota, Colombia  
Tel: (57 1)3-36-11-68  
Fax: (51 1)3-36-39-84

Mr. Alvaro E. Rodriguez  
First Secretary - Focal Point of Colombia  
Permanent Mission of Colombia to UNEP  
P.O. Box 30661  
Nairobi  
Tel: 711811  
Fax: 765911

**COSTA RICA**

Mr. Jorge A. Gutierrez  
Vice President for Research  
University of Costa Rica  
Apdo. 2060 - San Jose  
Costa Rica  
Tel: (506) 224-70-51  
Fax: (506) 224-93-67

**EGYPT**

Mr. Mohamed Mokhtar El-Halwagi  
First Under-Secretary of State  
and Managing Director of the  
Technical and Technological Consulting,  
Studies and Research Fund  
Ministry of Scientific Research  
101 Kasr El-Aini St.  
Cairo, Egypt  
Tel: - (202) 3558939/3540804  
Fax: (202) 3558609

**HUNGARY**

Ms. Anna Radnai  
Head of EIA Section  
Department for Environmental Policy  
Ministry for Environment and Regional Policy  
Budapest, 1. Fou 44-50  
H-1394, Budapest  
P.O. Box 351  
Hungary  
Tel: (36-1) 201-3480  
Fax: (36-1) 201-2361

**INDIA**

Mr. S. Bhowmik  
Joint Director  
Ministry of Environment & Forests  
C.G.O. Complex  
Lodi Road  
New Delhi 110 003  
India  
Tel: 436 13 16  
Fax: 436 06 78



**INDONESIA**

Mr. Bambang Purwono  
Sub Director for Supervision and Evaluation  
of the Environment Impact Assessment  
Bapedal (EIMA)  
Arthaloka Building, 11th Floor  
Jalan Jenderal Sudirman No. 2  
Jakarta 10220  
Indonesia  
Tel: 62-21 251-1483  
Fax: 62-21 251-2459

**IRAN**

Mr. Mohammad Vahedi  
Director General of EIA's Bureau  
Department of the Environment  
P.O. Box 1581  
Tehran  
Iran  
Fax: 898246  
Telex: 215064 DOEC

Mr. Heshmat Attarzadeh  
Embassy of the Islamic Republic  
of Iran  
Nairobi  
Tel: 720343  
Fax: 728686

**KENYA**

Mr. Dominic N. Mathu  
National Environment Secretariat  
P.O. Box 67839  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 229261

Mr. John O. Odipo  
Executive Officer  
The Permanent Mission of the  
Republic of Kenya to UNEP  
Harambee Avenue  
P.O. Box 41395  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 337290  
Fax: 215105

**NIGERIA**

Mr. H.H. Bdliya  
Assistant Director  
Federal Environment Protection  
Agency  
Independence Way South  
P.M.B. 265  
Garki-Abuja  
Nigeria  
Tel: 09-5233375  
Fax: 09-5233376

**POLAND**

Ms. Jolanta Rawska - Olejniczak  
Ministry of Environmental Protection  
Natural Resources and Forestry  
Department of International Cooperation  
52/54 Wawelska Str.  
00-922 Warsaw  
Poland  
Tel: (48 22) 25 11 33/25 00 01 ext 256  
(48 22) 25 64 35  
Fax: (48 22) 25 39 72 or comertel 39120042

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Mr. Renat Perelet  
Research Leader  
Institute for Systems Analysis  
Professor-Consultant  
International Independent University of Ecology and  
Politology  
Prospect 60-Let Oktyabrya, 9  
Moscow 112 317  
Russia  
Tel: 7-095-135 43 22  
Fax: 7-095-938 22 09  
E-mail: semgin@isa.msk.su

**SINGAPORE**

Mr. Patrick Hesp  
National University of Singapore  
Department of Geography  
10, Kent Ridge Crescent  
Singapore 0511  
Fax: 65 7773091

**SLOVAK REPUBLIC**

Mr. Frantisek Kolocany  
Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic  
Hlboka 2  
812 35 Bratislava  
Slovak Republic  
Tel: (42 7) 491 843  
Fax: (42 7) 311 368

**ZIMBABWE**

Mr. Shem Chaibva  
Principal Ecologist  
Department of Natural Resources  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. Box CY 385  
Causeway Harare  
Zimbabwe  
Tel: 263 4 705671  
Fax: 263 4 793123

***INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND DONOR COUNTRIES' REPRESENTATIVES***

**AUSTRALIA**

Mr. Robin Saunders  
Chief Assessment Officer  
Department of Planning and Development  
477 Collins St.  
Melbourne  
Victoria 3101  
Australia  
Tel: (613) 628 5406  
Fax: (613) 628 5132

**CIDA**

Mr. Robert Weir  
Director  
Policy Branch/Environment  
Canadian International Development Agency  
200 Promenade du Portage  
Hull, Quebec  
Canada K1A 0G4  
Tel: (819) 997 6731  
Fax: (819) 953 3348

**GEBEC**

Mr. Gordon Beanlands  
President  
GEBEC  
Wedgewood AVEC.  
Halifax, N.S. B3M 2B5  
Tel: (902) 443-3284  
Fax: (902) 443-5204

**ENVIRONMENT CANADA**

Mr. Martin Green  
Director General  
Intergovernmental and  
Regulatory Affairs  
Environment Canada  
13th Floor, Fontaine Building  
Hull Quebec  
K1A QH3

**ITALY**

Mr. Ugo Astuto  
Second Secretary  
Embassy of Italy  
P.O. Box 30107  
Nairobi  
Kenya  
Fax: 337056

**NETHERLANDS**

Mr. Fred Smiet  
Environmental Adviser  
Netherlands Embassy  
Uchumi House  
Nairobi  
Fax: 339155  
Tel: 227111

**NORWAY**

Mr. Svein Mehli  
Deputy Permanent Representative  
Norwegian Embassy  
P.O. Box 46363  
Nairobi  
Kenya  
Tel: 337121  
Fax: 216009

**ORGANIZATION FOR  
ECONOMIC COOPERATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT**

Mrs. Bettina Soderbaum  
OECD  
2, rue Andre Pascal  
75775 Paris Cedex 16  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 24 90 26  
Fax: (33 1) 45 24 16 50

**SIDA**

Ms. Maria Berlekom  
Programme Officer  
Natural Resources Management  
Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)  
Development Cooperation Office  
P.O. Box 30600  
Nairobi  
Tel: 229042  
Fax: 218908

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Mr. Jim Harvey  
Senior Natural Resources Adviser  
Overseas Development Administration  
Regional Office  
Nairobi

**MULTILATERAL BANKS****AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT  
BANK**

Mr. Omar Aw  
African Development Bank  
Central Projects Department  
01 B.P. 1387  
Abidjan  
Cote d'Ivoire  
Tel: (22 5) 20 40 52  
Fax: (22 5) 20 49 07

**EUROPEAN INVESTMENT  
BANK**

Mr. Jean-Jacques Schul  
Head of Technical Advisory Service  
European Investment Bank  
100, Boulevard Konrad Adenaur  
Luxembourg-Kirchberg

L-2950 Luxembourg  
Tel: (352) 4379 6466  
Fax: (352) 4379 6476

**EUROPEAN BANK FOR  
RECONSTRUCTION AND  
DEVELOPMENT (EBRD)**

Mr. William V. Kennedy  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
European Bank for Reconstruction and  
Development (EBRD)  
One Exchange Square  
London EC2A 2EH, UK  
Tel: (44 71) 338 6567  
Fax: (44 71) 338 6848

***NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS***

**EARTHCARE AFRICA**

Mr. Edward Rugumayo  
Director-General  
EarthCare Africa  
P.O. Box 76358  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 564971

**AMKA CONSULT**

Mr. Wycliffe A. Mutsune  
Consultant  
Resource and Environment Economics  
AMKA CONSULT  
Tourism and Agribusiness Consultants  
P.O. Box 46420  
Nairobi  
Kenya  
Tel: 254-2-225192  
Fax: 254-2-211701

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
(UNEP)**

***ENVIRONMENT AND  
ECONOMICS UNIT***

Mr. Hussein Abaza  
Chief  
Environment & Economics Unit  
United Nations Environment Programme  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi  
Kenya  
Tel: 254-2 623371/623372/624051  
Fax: 254-2 226886/226890  
624268 (Direct)

Ms. Shahida Ali Butt  
Programme Officer  
Environment & Economics Unit  
UNEP

Mr. Bernd Schanzenbacher  
Junior Professional Officer  
Environment & Economics Unit  
UNEP

Ms. Alessandra Goria  
Junior Professional Officer  
Environment & Economics Unit  
UNEP

Ms. Ivonne Higuero  
Consultant  
Environment & Economics Unit  
UNEP

***ELI/PAC***

Mr. Sun Lin  
Director  
ELI/PAC

Mr. Mark Berman  
Programme Officer  
ELI/PAC  
UNEP

Ms. Marceil Yeater  
Programme Officer  
ELI/PAC  
UNEP  
Tel: 624251  
Fax: 230198

***ITEC***

Mr. Christian Holger Strohmann  
Programme Officer  
International Environmental Technology Centre  
2-110 Ryokuchi Koen  
Tsurumi-Ku  
Osaka 538  
Japan  
Tel: (81-6) 915-4585  
Fax: (81-6) 915-0304



**Annex II**  
**Annotated Agenda**

## Annotated Agenda

Monday, 5 September

- 09:00-09:30**                    **Registration of participants**
- 09:30-09:45**                    **Welcoming and Opening Remarks and adoption of Agenda**
- 09:45-10:30**                    **Session I: UNEP's EIA Programme**  
UNEP's Programme on Environment and Economics; UNEP's work on EIA; objectives of UNEP's EIA Programme; challenges facing EIA in order to make it an effective tool for sustainable development; latest initiatives in EIA; objectives of the Workshop.
- 10:30-11:00**                    **Break**
- 11:00-12:30**                    **Session II: Country Presentations**  
Presentations by recipient country participants, in the use and application of EIA, with particular reference to EIA applications for externally funded projects. The country presentations will cover EIA procedures adopted by recipient countries (nationally developed, provided by donors, or those recommended by UN organizations or multilateral banks); institutional and regulatory aspects, projects, programmes and policies subjected to EIA; donor requirements; level of involvement of local and expatriate professionals and institutions; role of NGOs, public participation; local capacities, commissioning of EIA, etc. Each presenter will be required to highlight main problems encountered in EIA applications and suggested action to promote the use of EIA as an effective tool for sustainable development.
- 12:30-14:00**                    **Lunch**
- 14:00-16:00**                    **Session III: EIA and Sustainable Development**  
The use of EIA as an effective planning tool and as a tool for integrating environment and development in decision-making for sustainable development as stipulated in Agenda 21 of the United Nations Conference on environment and development (UNCED); identification of sustainability criteria; approaches, definitions and parameters for EIAs; methodologies and approaches needed to integrate environment and development concerns to achieve sustainability at the project, programme and policy levels; integration of physical, socioeconomic and environmental assessment; etc.
- 16:00-16:30**                    **Break**
- 16:30-17:30**                    **Continuation**

**Tuesday, 6 September****09:00-10:30****Session IV: Coherence of EIA Procedures**

Consistency and coherence in different EIA procedures and applications among recipient countries, donor agencies, UN organizations and development assistance institutions; contradictions, or confusing signals, in differing EIA guidelines; role of UN in helping build coherence among donors and recipients and in coordinating development sustainability assessment approaches; links between UN organizations, development assistance institutions and bilateral agencies in building EIA coherence; role of NGOs; action to be taken to build coherence in developing countries; role of UN, international organizations, research institutions and NGOs in developing countries and CIT.

**10:30-11:00*****Break*****11:00-12:30****Session V: International and Regional Cooperation**

Promoting dialogue between developed and developing countries and CIT; cooperation and exchange of experience and knowledge between developing countries and between CIT; transfer of knowledge and experience from developed to developing countries and CIT; identification of the perceived needs and problems in developing countries and CIT for EIA, as opposed to donor-driven needs.

**12:30-14:00*****Lunch*****14:00-16:00****Session VI: Conclusions and Recommendations**

Main conclusions and recommendations for future work; assistance required from the international community, including UN organizations, international development institutions, multilateral development banks, bilaterals and NGOs; role of UNEP; etc.

**16:00-16:30*****Break*****16:30-17:30*****Continuation***

**Wednesday, 7 September****09:00-10:30****Session VII: Recipient Countries' Perspective**

Presentation of main conclusions and recommendations of first part of the Workshop; action required to promote dialogue and collaboration between recipient countries, the international community, including UN organizations, international development institutions, multilateral development banks, bilaterals and NGOs as far as EIA application is concerned; etc.

**10:30-11:00*****Break*****11:00-12:30****Session VIII: International Community Perspective**

Experience of donor countries, multilaterals and bilaterals in EIA coherence; application of EIA in recipient countries and problems encountered in their application; action required to address gaps in the use of EIA as a development and planning tool, and its integration in the development planning and decision-making process; public participation; commissioning of EIA and its independence; etc.

**12:30-14:00*****Lunch*****14:00-16:00****Session IX: Conclusions and Recommendations**

Conclusions and recommendations reviewed to reflect discussions of the Workshop.

**16:00-16:30*****Break*****16:30-17:30****Panel Session**

Briefing session with UNEP Permanent Representatives on the main outcome of the Workshop.

**17:30*****Reception***

## **Annex III**

### **Summaries of country case studies presented at the workshop**

## **Summaries of country case studies presented at the workshop<sup>1</sup>**

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Brazil***

EIA is one of the tools used in the implementation of the National Environmental Policy in Brazil. This assessment consists of a set of technical and administrative procedures for a systematic analysis of the environmental impacts arising from a given project and its various alternatives. Its purpose is to provide a basis for planning and to orient the decisions regarding the licensing of the activity or the project. Several institutions regulate the EIA process: the National System for the Environment (SISNAMA), the National Council for the Environment (CONAMA), and the Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA). It is the responsibility of the State Environment Agencies (OEMA) to license specific projects within their jurisdiction. The IBAMA licenses projects with significant environmental impacts at the national or regional level, as well as coordinates the licensing process when the project involves two or more states.

The EIA includes the following activities: a) an environmental diagnosis of the area, including physical aspects, biological aspects and natural ecosystems, and socioeconomic aspects; b) analysis of the environmental impacts of the project and its alternatives; c) definition of the steps to mitigate negative impacts, and; d) elaboration of follow-up and monitoring programmes. The EIA is executed by a skilled multidisciplinary team independent of the project proponent. Public participation in the EIA process is guaranteed by law, and applications for licenses are made public through newspapers. Civil entities, the Public Ministry or a group of fifty or more citizens may demand a public hearing. In addition, the Federal Constitution allows for civil suits to be brought against projects that are damaging to the environment, the consumer, or goods of artistic, aesthetic, historical, tourist and scenic value.

For donor funded projects, the resources required to elaborate the EIA are the national counterpart's responsibility. In the case of an Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) project, the key responsibility of supervising the preparation of the EIA will be given to the national project team, supported by the Environmental Protection Division (ENV) of the IDB. The ENV will also assist the project and the country teams in ensuring that the Bank's environmental requirements are met from the beginning until the completion of the project.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in China***

China's programme in the field of EIA has been evolving since the early 1970s. The first environmental protection activities were characterized by regional environmental quality appraisals, but in the last 15 years EIAs have been incorporated into China's national laws. EIAs

---

<sup>1</sup> Represents a brief account of presentations and papers submitted by participants. Full texts are available in the UNEP Environment and Economics Unit.

have been established as institutional requirements for all infrastructure, medium- and large-sized projects. The EIA framework has now been refined and standardized to meet international requirements. At present EIA can be enforced by law, as it is one of the provisions of the Chinese Environment Protection Law. The latter requires that project designs can only be approved by planning committees following approval of the EIA report; however, current EIA requirements are restricted to construction and regional developing projects. To insure that EIAs meet certain minimum standards in performance, only qualified institutions undertaking EIAs have been granted certificates to practice.

The World Bank (WB) and Asian Development Bank (ADB) have directed much attention to China's environmental protection in their loan programmes, and prescribed strict guidelines for evaluation of impacts including a 120 day review period for EIAs prior to approval by the Bank Board of Directors. On the basis of the WB and ADB requirements and in accordance with international standards for assessment, scope and methodology, a handbook for successful internationally funded project analysis, "EIA Management Stipulation for Loan Projects," has been prepared by the Government.

With regard to capacity-building, an EIA Training programme was completed by the National Environment Protection Agency (NEPA) and the ADB in 1991, including the technical training of experts, the development of training manuals, and the formulation of future training strategies.

With regard to more recent developments of the EIA programme, in 1992 the WB financed the Japan Grant Fund project, which assisted China in the formulation of EIA regulations, the standardization of EIA methodology, and its expansion of public participation policies.

The EIA efforts in China must be refined in the areas of: enforcement of the EIA priority, especially before construction work; investigation into advanced assessment procedures and EIA methodologies from abroad to facilitate incorporation and modification of the Chinese EIA work; strengthening of EIA legislation; EIA training and capacity-building; enactment of regulations that stress the economic and legal liability of the conclusions reached by the EIA practitioners so as to improve the quality of EIA reports; and improvement of the precision of EIA analysis and expansion of the scope of EIA work.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Colombia***

After natural resource legislation was passed in 1974 in Colombia, and prior to 1993, projects that had an impact on the environment were required to obtain an Environmental License (EL) from the Institute of Natural Resources (INDERENA) before implementation. However, due to lack of personnel, the need for clear and well-defined criteria for licensing, the diverse and excessive workload at INDERENA, and other constraints, it was difficult to apply a coherent environmental policy with preventative, mitigatory, and control measures to proposed projects. In December of 1993, the Colombian Congress passed a law creating the Ministry of the Environment and the National System of the Environment. This new law endorses EIAs as a basic, preventative tool

for decision-making in the construction of projects and activities that may significantly affect natural or human-made capital. Once an EIA is prepared, the project proponent proceeds to obtain an EL which, according to the new law, is an authorization given by the official environmental authority and is bound to be complied through a series of commitments established by the Government to prevent, mitigate, correct, compensate and manage the impacts of the activity. ELs can be approved by the Ministry of the Environment, the Regional Corporations and some municipalities and districts. Another type of planning tool is the Environmental Study of Alternatives (ESA) which presents the most appropriate alternatives for a project, from the technical, financial, and environmental point of view. The EIA must provide information on: the site of the project, the environmental, physical and socioeconomic aspects of the area that may be affected, the assessment of the impacts, concrete actions, allocation of funds, workplans and the design of environmental mitigation measures. The public participates in the approval process through the media, public hearings and the courts.

It is expected that officers working in the Ministry of the Environment and the Regional Corporations will form a more permanent core group of multi-disciplinary EIA practitioners. Salaries have improved and training in specific EIA topics is being provided. In the private sector, more and more professionals are being trained in the preparation of EIAs and it is expected that a higher standard of quality will be achieved in the near future. The government of Colombia is seeking to establish a strategy to ensure coherence with environmental procedures and regulations of donors. A mechanism should be designed in which the donors release project funds only with the approval of ELs and the compliance of the environmental measures established in the Management Plans of EIAs. In this manner, Colombia will be able to fully implement their environmental policy and develop an environmental preventative approach towards sectoral projects.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Egypt***

A new Environment Law decreed in 1994, mandates the use of the EIA process in the context of licensing new, expansion or rehabilitation projects as specified in the Law's Executive Regulations to be issued soon. The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) is drafting procedures and guidelines for EIA preparation through a Danish funded and jointly managed project. Once those are established, the EIA process will become effectively institutional. However, the EIA process in Egypt is not new. Full-fledged EIAs have been undertaken in Egypt for major donor funded development projects. EIA's have also been practiced by international petroleum companies. In each case, donor agency- or company- specific procedures and guidelines are followed. In addition, a simplified version of environmental evaluation is always embedded within the major Egyptian licensing systems. Normally, the costs are financed by the investor. In case of foreign assistance development projects, the costs are generally provided as grants. Still, national experience and expertise in conducting multi-disciplinary and comprehensive EIAs is limited. Few consulting firms have developed this capability to a certain extent through practical experience. Some local consultants have also been trained and involved partially in the conduct of EIAs through being personally contracted as members of the team, whether by foreign



consulting firms hired by donor agencies or the local consulting firms subcontracted by the foreign consulting firm. In general, however, the extent of involvement of Egyptian practitioners as well as formal public participation in donor-funded EIA studies has been limited and mostly absent in the latter case. On the other hand, there exists a very large pool of expertise in the environmental and related fields which can be readily called upon to form the multidisciplinary teams needed for a comprehensive EIA. What is required is proper intensive training, experience, and above all good team management.

The most pressing and challenging task is to devise an integrated viable EIA system that would appropriately fulfil the needs of and conditions in Egypt. On one hand, a practical approach should be adopted in order to cope with a number of constraints and shortcomings such as inadequacy of available data, the level of knowledge and experience of local institutions and personnel, the time and cost constraints, and the limited extent of public awareness. On the other hand, the outcome should reasonably, even after a limited transitional period of time, meet the minimum national, regional, and international requirements in order to ensure unified use of Egyptian EIA procedures in all situations including donor-funded projects.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Hungary***

The EIA process in Hungary started in 1983 with the resolution of the National Council on Environmental Protection, which was followed by the decree that made it obligatory to elaborate impact studies for major projects under governmental control. The most recent decree issued by the Government in 1993 for the Provisional Regulation of the Assessment of Environmental Impact of Certain Activities established systematic investigation of a broad range of activities, linking EIAs to the decision-making process.

The EIA process consists of a preparatory or preliminary environmental impact study phase and a detailed impact assessment phase. The proponent is required to submit the preliminary Environmental Impact Study to the competent regional environmental authority. The competent authority then conducts the full EIA scoping, considering the comments of other concerned relevant authorities, and on this basis is entitled to release or refuse the environmental permit.

International Funding Agencies, such as the World Bank (WB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and the European Union, participate in the EIA process for externally funded projects. There are some differences regarding EIA guidelines between the Government of Hungary and the development banks, especially in the areas of generation of alternatives and early public participation in the EIA process.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment: the Procedures in India***

New industrial development projects in India require clearance from the Ministry of Environment and Forests, as specified under the Environment Protection Act of 1986. The project proponents are required to submit to the Ministry a project report which should include an EIA, prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

At present, EIA is conceived merely as a project level tool to assess the environmental compatibility of the projects in terms of their location, suitability of technology, efficiency in resource utilization and waste recycling. EIAs are conducted under severe limitations of time, human and financial resources, and data, particularly due to lack of extensive data collection in a vast and extremely variable territory. The most important components of the EIA's analysis are meteorology and air quality, and hydrology and water quality.

The concept of public participation has recently been adopted on a case by case basis, mainly allowing for public information through the publication of the EIA reports in the national newspapers.

The financial costs of the projects are usually borne by the project's authorities; in some cases projects have been financed by the World Bank (WB) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB), and EIAs have been produced by consultants chosen by the international funding agencies jointly with the project proponents.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Indonesia***

The EIA process in Indonesia has been in development since the early 1970s, and it has gradually become more institutionalized within the government agencies. Following the establishment in 1990 of the Environmental Impact Management Agency, BAPEDAL, it was assigned full EIA implementation responsibility tasks in development, coordination, control and supervision of EIAs.

The legal basis for EIA, which dates back to 1982, has been recently revised and strengthened by the Government, through the establishment of general guidelines by BAPEDAL. Based on those general guidelines, sectoral departments and non-departmental government agencies prepare EIA guidelines, under the technical advice of Central and Provincial Commissions. BAPEDAL chairs an interagency technical team to discuss problems, constraints, progress of implementation and to formulate policy administration of the EIA. Licensed consultants are hired by project proponents to prepare the necessary EIA documents.

When the proposed projects are not subject to EIA by regulation, they still have to meet certain Standard Operating Procedures, either on an industry or activity specific basis, to minimize negative environmental impacts.

To enhance public participation, the Indonesian Environmental Forum was created in 1980, providing national level coordination to the NGO network. International agencies provide considerable EIA financial assistance for project funding and EIA implementation. The release of funds is usually conditional to the accomplishment of strict EIA requirements. International assistance is often provided to strengthen EIA institutions, development of EIA guidelines, and human resource development programmes.

Some of the challenges for the Government of India are: development of human resources at national and provincial levels; increase in the level of environmental awareness and knowledge among people involved in the EIA process; the need for EIA dedicated units for the members of technical teams and EIA commissions in each department at the national and regional level; reduction of conflicts of interest in the preparation of EIA reports; strengthening of the linkage between the EIA report and the permitting and licensing system of projects.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in the Islamic Republic of Iran***

The Department of the Environment, created in 1972 and directed by a Vice-President, is empowered by the Constitution to protect the environment from economic or other activities which cause environmental pollution or other irreversible damages. It is entrusted with the responsibility and to supervise the protection and conservation of the country's environment in general. A High Council, headed by the President, is attached to the Department and is in charge of determining the environmental policies and strategies of the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI).

In 1976, the implementation of the Bushehr I and II Nuclear Power Plants followed the guidelines of the International Atomic Energy Agency and certain development projects financed by the World Bank (WB) such as the Sistan Flood Control Project, the Teheran Drainage Project, the Irrigation Improvement Project, the Gas Flaring Reduction Project and other energy and transportation projects, followed the World Bank EIA guidelines and requirements. Many of the environmental laws and regulations that were established in the IRI since 1971 include some aspects of the preparation of an EIA for industrial, agricultural and commercial activities. However, well-defined legislation that clearly mandated the formulation of EIAs for major development projects did not come into effect until March of 1994. Projects such as petrochemical plants, oil refineries, power plants, steel mill plants, dams and other water structures, industrial estates, and airports require the preparation of an EIA simultaneously with the planning and preparation of feasibility studies. The Department of the Environment makes accessible the material about EIA methodology to applicants and has the power to approve or disapprove projects based on the information provided in the EIA. Currently, the IRI is interested in obtaining a comprehensive and appropriate framework and methodology for implementation of EIAs through the sharing of international and regional experiences.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Nigeria***

The Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA) was created in 1992 and is the main organ responsible for the implementation and regulation of the EIA process in Nigeria. A technical committee (EIA secretariat), constituted with a UNEP consultant, three local consultants, and FEPA staff has been working on the methodology for implementation of EIA in Nigeria and an EIA procedure for Nigeria has been elaborated. FEPA has also developed draft sectoral guidelines and a format for the writing of the EIA report to aid EIA preparers. The EIA secretariat will monitor the implementation of the project once approved, in order to verify compliance with the EIA recommendations. There is an awareness of the need to cooperate with other institutions and agencies in order to manage the EIA process. For example, FEPA works with the National Planning Commission in order to ensure that permits are not released until FEPA issues a clearance certificate for the project. Also this cooperation will ensure that in the planning stages, a percentage of the project cost will finance the EIA study. Most donor agencies require an EIA as a condition for project financing and approval. Project proponents are not preparing EIAs in accordance with FEPA regulations and are not reviewed by FEPA before submission to donors. It is recommended that donor agencies insist on proponents submitting their EIA study along with a FEPA clearance certificate.

FEPA intends to involve NGOs in the EIA process. A consultative meeting on the implementation of EIA in Nigeria will be scheduled and various NGO representatives will be asked to participate. FEPA plans to involve NGOs in the national seminar on EIA implementation in Nigeria as well as in the EIA publicity campaigns. Those campaigns will be used to sensitize the general public as to their rights and responsibilities in the entire EIA process as well as their duties to take interest in development activities in their communities. The draft sectoral and procedural guidelines will be placed in strategic places for easy access to the public for review and comments. During the EIA process, the public will be able to participate in public fora and hearings and FEPA will address public concerns about a project during the scoping stage. During the EIA review process for a project, EIA documents will be placed in easily accessible locations within and outside the proposed project environment for public comments.

The secretariat is in need of immediate capacity-building, including recruitment and redeployment of additional personnel to the secretariat. It requires equipment for the secretariat and the EIA registry. Immediate and long-term training programmes have been recommended for the EIA secretariat, including formal lectures, workshops, training, fellowships, working visits, study tours, etc.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment in Poland***

The law that governs the EIA process in Poland took effect in July of 1984. It was included in the country's ecological laws in 1987. The project proponent is charged with the task of obtaining an environmental impact statement (EIS) in order to receive a permit for the initiation of a project.

An environmental commission consisting of 75 specialists was created in 1987. This commission is responsible for all environmental protection aspects: preparing studies in order to make key decisions regarding size and location of state and regional investments particularly harmful to the environment and human health; publication of information and documents relating to EIA methodology; and providing training courses on EIA for environmental specialists. At the moment, Poland is trying to harmonize its EIA standards with the European Union directives, particularly in the areas of public participation and transboundary issues.

Many EIA seminars and courses sponsored jointly by the Polish Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry and organizations such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), Milan Technical University, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and the Japanese International Cooperation Agency have been offered to EIA specialists in Poland. These courses focused on EIAs for transportation and highway systems, EIAs for development projects, Polish and foreign EIA procedures and regulations, preparation of the EIA report, regional EIAs for trade policies, EIAs for industrial projects, farming and food industry projects, and EIAs for coastal and urban development projects.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment in the Slovak Republic**

Legislation regulating the use of EIAs in the Slovak Republic was passed in April 1994 and has been in effect since September 1994. The Slovak EA mandate is based on the European Union directive and experiences in the Netherlands, Norway, the United States of America, and Austria. In addition, the legislation introduces provisions for the preparation of EIAs in the context of transboundary issues.

Both state and private sector projects that affect the environment require EIAs and costs for the EIA and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are borne by the project proponent. The EIS is prepared by a team of specialists selected by the proponent. The EIA must contain an explanation of advantages and disadvantages of the proposed activity and its alternatives. Once completed, the EIS is submitted to the Ministry of Environment for revision, but the final decision for the project is made by local environmental authorities. The general public is given the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process by making written comments and taking part in public hearings before a final determination is made.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment in Zimbabwe**

For the past twelve years the EIA process has been carried out on an ad-hoc basis in Zimbabwe, mainly at the insistence of the international funding agencies and donor countries as a precondition for project funding. For a trial period of 5 to 10 years, to be applied on a goodwill basis, the Government has formulated an Interim EIA Policy which seeks to formalize and institutionalize EIA.

At present, the administration of EIA is centralized in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Permitting authorities are required to refer applications for projects which may adversely affect the environment to the Ministry of Environment for EIA screening. The Ministry leaves the hiring of the EIA consultants up to the proponent. In the past experience they have been mainly external consultants, even if there was evidence of local talent and experts in the field. The Environmental Forum of Zimbabwe, an NGO, is currently compiling a register for EIA practitioners in Zimbabwe.

The main obstacles to EIA implementation in Zimbabwe can be identified as the lack of human and financial resources, the problem of retaining qualified and trained personnel in the Government, the need for economic investment and economic growth which might be inconsistent with EIA requirements, and the view that EIA is another bureaucratic hurdle inconsistent with the economic structural adjustment programme being carried out.

With regard to the legal framework, the existing fragmented environmental legislation will need to be harmonized to be compatible with EIA. The institutional setting should allow for decentralization of the EIA administration and decision-making, particularly for small projects. In Zimbabwe, there is a need to move from an EIA policy that is project-specific to a Strategic Environmental Assessment macro-level of analysis.

## **Annex IV**

### **Conclusions and recommendations of the workshop**

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

After extensive discussions among participants from developing countries and countries in transition to market economies (CIT) covering a representative sample of the four continents, Africa, Asia, Eastern and Central Europe, and Latin America, the following were the main conclusions and recommendations of the workshop:

1. Since the introduction, use, and application of EIA, as a mandatory requirement, in most developing countries and CITs was relatively new, with recently enacted legislation, sets of regulations, and EIA procedures, compliance to EIA procedures was generally difficult.
2. Compliance during project implementation and in the post implementation phase was lacking. It was noted that follow-up and monitoring as well as compliance was in most of the cases not included as part of the EIA process. ***Enforcement of EIAs and environmental compliance was recognized as an area which required special attention as it was lacking in most countries. Methodologies for including follow-up and monitoring in the EIA process were required.***
3. It was noted that EIAs funded by development assistance organizations were conducted according to the directives provided by such organizations. ***There was a need to strengthen national EIA procedures and directives and promote their application.***
4. It was recognized that though EIA could be an effective tool to achieve sustainable development objectives, it should be considered as one tool in a tool box of instruments which need to be used to achieve sustainability objectives.
5. EIA should be part of the socioeconomic analysis. Moreover, it should be integrated with other tools such as valuation of environmental and natural resources, cost-benefit analysis, and resource accounting.
6. Integration of EIAs into socioeconomic decisions and development plans and activities with major environmental impacts and budgets, was recognized as one of the priority areas which needed to be addressed. ***Methodologies for the integration of EIA in socioeconomic decisions and development plans and activities with major environmental impacts were required.***
7. ***There was a need to create awareness in EIAs, not only for the public, but also for decision makers. International assistance was required to assist in this process.***
8. There was a need to involve the public in the EIA process from inception. NGOs should play an active role in this process. ***Methodologies to manage public participation, including the role of NGOs were needed to be developed.***
9. It was recognized that there were differences in capacities, experience and state of development between CITs and developing countries. The EIA framework for CITs are more related to those adopted in the developed world. Differences also existed among developing countries in their capacities to conduct EIAs, as well as in their legal frameworks, and institutional setups.
10. With the development of national procedures and guidelines, two sets of guidelines were



now available. Those prepared by developing countries and CITs and those by developed countries and other international organizations. ***Coherence was therefore required between those two sets of guidelines. It was recommended that UNEP, in collaboration with the OECD and the UN Regional Commissions should expand the OECD EIA coherence study to include developing countries and CITs, and in particular, to develop country reports for developing countries and CITs.***

11. The introduction of EIAs in most developing countries and CITs has resulted in the creation of new institutions and/or the strengthening of existing ones. ***This has created the need to make available the necessary expertise and trained human manpower to run those institutions, with the linkages between those institutions and other government departments clearly defined.***

12. Moreover, the management of the EIA process and the EIA team, as well as baseline data compilation, assessment, and evaluation, were identified as areas in which experience was lacking. Training was therefore required to enhance the capacity of countries in those areas. ***Emphasis was made on the need to build local capacities, particularly, through the training of trainers in the management and administration of EIAs. Training and capacity-building was therefore required for the development of monitoring programmes to ascertain the effectiveness of EIAs, and in order to make project proponents and developers accountable.***

13. ***There was generally a need to strengthen training/capacity in pilot projects and in the field of environmental economics. Internationally assisted training programmes must be self-perpetuating and must benefit local communities in a sustainable manner.***

14. ***Though in most cases eia was only conducted at the project level, it did not cover the entire project life cycle. Moreover, there was a need to extend the use of eias for programmes and policies, and as a planning tool to develop and formulate sustainable development programmes at the regional and sectoral levels.***

15. Developing countries need to take the initiative in the adoption of EIAs as a planning and decision-making tool, and commit themselves in using eia as a legally binding planning and decision-making tool.

16. There was lack of equipment, both hardware and software for EIA assessments and monitoring. ***Development assistance organizations were requested to consider providing assistance to developing countries and cits in this area.***

17. ***Development assistance organizations should insist on the introduction and use of clean technologies in any development project. Cost of technologies to be borne by projects funded by bilateral donor agency.***

18. ***There was a need to develop simple indicators and techniques for determining sustainable development paths and models. Additionally, it was useful to define a range of environmental "indicators" in various ecosystems which could be utilized to evaluate and monitor whether the development was "sustainable". Hence there was a need to assist in identifying and***

***establishing carrying capacities of the ecosystem. Guidelines to define sustainable development for a wide range of development "types" were required to be developed.***

19. While there was abundant literature on EIA, ***there was a need for texts/reports detailing successes and failures of eias, including an assessment of eias which failed, and the objective evaluations of these EIAs. UNEP and/or development assistance organizations could fund and support the preparation of such reports (for a variety of ecosystems and a variety of sectors).***

20. ***There was a need to develop EIA guidelines for and by developing countries, using local expertise and based on local experience and socioeconomic conditions, including case studies relevant to the region /ecosystem/sector in question.***

21. ***There was a need to develop methods to improve interactions between recipient countries and development assistance organizations in the field of EIA. In most of the cases expatriate teams were brought in to conduct eias in a short period of time, with no training provided. There was therefore a need for recipient countries and cits to actively participate in eias. In order to enhance recipient country participation and capacity, if expatriate consultants were insisted upon by development assistance organizations, local counterpart personnel should be included as part of the EIA team. UNEP, in cooperation with the international donor community should assist in facilitating this process. However, more and more eias should be carried out by recipient country experts.***

22. ***Environmental impacts of transboundary activities were required to be made, with linkages between transboundary and regional impacts to be established. UNEP's assistance was required in this respect.***

23. ***There was a need to develop eia information and data systems, with the assistance of UNEP.***

24. ***Emphasis was laid on south-south and north-south cooperation in EIA. One way of doing that was through the convening of regional workshops and seminars. UNEP should assist in this process.***

25. ***Professionals from developing countries and CITS with experience in EIAs should be drawn on to assist in the development and implementation of the recommendations of the workshop.*** Participants expressed willingness to assist in the implementation of various recommendations of the workshop.

26. In commending the Environment and Economics Unit of UNEP for its Environmental Economic Series, and its publications on EIA, ***the Unit was encouraged to continue to prepare and publish such publications for wide distribution.***