



**WWF PROJECT ON
SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT
OF TRADE**

MID-TERM EVALUATION

REPORT

Meg Gawler
Richard McNally

November 2002



ARTEMIS Services

For Nature Conservation and Human Development

Tel: +33 4 5040 7870 Fax: +33 4 5040 7379

E-mail: meg@artemis-services.com

Web site: <http://www.artemis-services.com>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This mid-term evaluation was aimed primarily at enhancing the performance of WWF's project on Sustainability Assessment of trade agreements (SA). The objectives of the evaluation were to:

- A. provide an assessment of progress made towards realising the project's objectives
- B. assess the realism of these objectives and the extent to which they lend themselves to ongoing evaluation
- C. assess the effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems
- D. review internal and external communication activities
- E. identify any major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered during the first 18 months of this project in pursuit of the project objectives
- F. propose recommendations for resolving the above mentioned difficulties so that they do not negatively impact upon the project's implementation, and to enhance positive impacts/results.

A first step in the evaluation process was the development and refinement of targets and indicators for each of the project's objectives. Then a project monitoring matrix was developed based on these targets and indicators in order to advance the project's monitoring and evaluation systems, and to put in place a system of adaptive management – the process that integrates project design, monitoring and management to provide a framework for learning and timely information for management decisions. The project team contributed a self-evaluation using the monitoring matrix to assess progress towards the project goals.

The evaluation team carried out over forty semi-structured interviews with the project team, key staff within the WWF Network, national project partners, and international policy and advocacy partners.

In addition to examining progress to date, problems encountered, the realism of the project objectives, and communications activities, the evaluation also looked at trade assessments in general, including: the different approaches to trade assessment of which SA is one, the status of trade assessments as an emerging tool, assessment methodologies, and monitoring the effectiveness of SAs. The evaluation identified major problems and constraints with trade assessments, and made additional proposals for ingredients of a good trade assessment.

The litmus test of the value of SAs will be reflected in whether they actually make a positive influence on trade negotiating agendas and on trade policies and decisions. Many NGOs point to the grave danger that the SA process could easily be subverted to "greenwashing" – by going through the motions of assessing sustainability, while allowing economic and political forces alone to drive trade agendas. WWF and other NGOs have a critical role to play in ensuring that SAs are designed and carried out with integrity, and in making sure that their findings actually do influence trade policies and promote sustainable development.

External perceptions of the project were positive, even enthusiastic. The project is perceived as having had an impact on putting sustainability assessments on agendas, and WWF is well respected in the policy arena.

A. Progress towards Objectives

The SA project is working on a wide range of fronts. We found that, in general, the project is making progress towards each of its objectives. The project is on the right course in its advocacy work, lobbying for transparency, rigour, and stakeholder representation in the SA process. The two new position papers on critical elements of SA and on stakeholder involvement bring important and constructive contributions to the debate.

Progress has definitely been made on institutionalization of SA in the EU, the US, and the Philippines. However, there is still a high level of mistrust of SA in many developing countries, who fear it will be used to prevent them from gaining market access.

Questions arose, however, on the goal of institutionalizing SA. If it is not done properly, there is a risk that institutionalization of SAs may not actually contribute to sustainable development. WWF and other NGOs need to ensure the quality of this tool as it is institutionalized.

It would be worthwhile in the second half of the project to focus the advocacy on the actual quality of institutionalization, and to give higher priority to the objectives of capacity building, case studies, and internal communications within WWF.

Work on capacity building is considered a priority, but in many cases, has progressed more slowly than expected. It is critical when SAs are put out for comment, that WWF, other NGOs, and civil society have the capacity to respond technically to assessments before they are finalized.

The case studies presently underway in Brazil and the Philippines have not yet been completed, and were not ready for evaluation. Case studies are the best hope of demonstrating the relevance and usefulness of SA, and for learning lessons that will improve methodologies.

Trade policy is one of the major issues that cut across virtually all of WWF's work. However, little progress seems to have been made in mainstreaming SA within WWF or in incorporating SA into WWF's ecoregional work. WWF runs a very real risk that trade will continue to undermine conservation goals unless sustainable development becomes the foundation of trade policies.

B. Realism of Project Objectives

The project was set up with the intention of operating for a limited, three-year timeframe, and within that short time, to generate momentum to keep the interest in SA alive in governments, in other NGOs, and within WWF itself. The project's objectives, targets, and indicators are, in general, reasonable, as demonstrated by the considerable achievements detailed in the project monitoring matrix. Nevertheless, the short timeframe of the project poses problems for some objectives. It now looks as though it may be difficult to achieve the targets for capacity building within the three-year project period. Likewise institutionalization – and especially ensuring the quality of institutionalization – takes time. Given the likelihood that the project will be at its most effective in year three, and the lack of a clear exit strategy, we question the wisdom of shutting it down after that time.

We thoroughly endorse the intent of the project to set up a process so that it does not have to remain as an active funder in the different countries where it is working. However, a three-year timeframe seems very short for:

- launching the project
- developing a robust, adequate, and stakeholder-friendly methodology
- launching and completing the case studies
- building capacity to levels where others can continue the work in a sustainable way, and
- developing and carrying out an exit strategy.

C. Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Early project reports produced were largely descriptive, and did not provide a strategic or systematic basis for monitoring progress. However, great progress was made with the development of targets and indicators, the monitoring matrix developed for this evaluation, and the project's commitment to carrying out mid-term and final evaluations. These tools will provide a good basis for effective monitoring and evaluation.

D. Internal and External Communications

The project has produced an excellent website (www.balancedtrade.panda.org), to which a number of improvements could be made. The publications produced by the project – glossy documents, policy papers, technical papers, etc. – have been widely requested and, in general, well received. Communications within the WWF Network have remained a challenge, and will require more effort during the second half of the project.

E. and F. Problems / Constraints, and Recommendations

Trade-related assessments have their own set of problems and constraints, including: lack of political support; a methodology in its infancy; lack of empirical data in many places; inadequate capacity and resources to invest in SA; the highly politicized nature and confidentiality of trade negotiations; the fact that the integration of the results of trade assessments into trade policy has not yet really begun; the large margins of error and loss of critical information when results are aggregated in macro-economic modelling; the difficulty of making robust links between trade policy and field impacts; and the lack of awareness of what SA can do, and the benefits that parties can derive from it.

Given this long list of difficulties, it is clear that the WWF SA project has a truly daunting task. The following table summarizes a more detailed one in the report presenting the major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered by the project, and recommendations for resolving them and for enhancing the positive impact of the project.

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
1. Sustainable development as an over-riding goal.	1. What is needed is a paradigm shift of trade actually pursuing the goals of sustainable development, and WWF should reinforce its advocacy work in this sense.
2. Risk of greenwashing.	2. WWF and other NGOs have a critical role to play in ensuring that SAs are designed and carried out with integrity, and in making sure that their findings actually do promote sustainable development.
3. There is a risk that institutionalization of SAs – unless their application is rigorous and principled – may not actually contribute to sustainable development.	3. WWF and other NGOs need to ensure the quality of the institutionalization of this tool.
4. Scepticism of developing countries.	4. The project is addressing this, but countering this scepticism is a major challenge that will likely require substantially more resources than the project currently has available.
5. Assistance to developing countries.	5. Encouraging governments or trading blocs to provide financial and technical assistance to developing countries should be given a higher priority.
6. Capacity to engage.	6. It is very important to build this capacity so that the WWF Network and other NGOs can fulfil their watchdog role.
7. Language.	7. It would be helpful to translate as many more publications as possible into Spanish and Portuguese, and raise funds for a Spanish version of the website.

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
8. Capacity building strategy.	8. We recommend that the project take a more strategic approach to capacity building, identifying: critical areas where trade has the biggest impact, key targets for building capacity, and the needs of these target populations.
9. Need for long-term capacity building.	9. Before closing the SA project, WWF needs a realistic exit strategy for how SA work will continue.
10. Action learning for advocacy.	10. The project team should commit itself to drawing lessons as they carry out their advocacy work.
11. SA methodology is complex, and is often top-down in its design and execution.	11. WWF should aim to make the SA methodology more participatory and easier for stakeholders to use. The Project should advocate for greater use of participatory research methods in SA.
12. Case studies.	12. Case studies are the best hope of demonstrating the relevance and usefulness of SA, and for learning lessons that will improve methodologies.
13. Collaboration with UNEP.	13. We recommend that the project explore further collaboration with UNEP, to repackage and market UNEP's case studies.
14. National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plans.	14. By 2005 all parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity are required to have NBSAPs, providing an excellent hook for promoting SA in almost every country.
15. Technical papers.	15. Several respondents expressed the desire for more in-depth, specialist technical papers, and more detail on the methodology of carrying out SAs in different sectors.
16. Communications.	16. The project should try to make technical papers more relevant, understandable and accessible.
17. Visibility and awareness of SA.	17. It would be good to build relationships with economists at key newspapers, and link environmental concerns to social conditions, especially in developing countries.
18. Influencing the debate.	18. Following each case study, effort should be made to publish a serious article in a peer-reviewed journal.
19. Website.	19. A number of suggestions for improvement are detailed in the report on page 26. In addition, the project should make more effort to market the website.
20. SA needs to be more mainstreamed in WWF.	20. The project should make a concerted effort to get the ecoregions, the regional programmes, and the Target Driven Programmes engaged in SA, through face-to-face meetings.
21. WWF should experiment with SA as a tool for ecoregion conservation.	21. The project needs to reach out to the regional and ecoregional programmes, and clarify the added value of SA with respect to root causes analysis.
22. WWF's trade and investment strategy.	22. This strategy should position SA within WWF's overall work on trade throughout the Network.
23. WWF devotes few resources to its trade and investment work, yet WWF's target-driven programmes are unlikely to be successful in the long term if economic forces do not move in the direction of sustainable development.	23. A well-resourced trade and investment programme with a sharply focused strategic plan and strong core support will be critical to WWF's long-term success. Given the initial successes of the SA project, and the potential importance of the tool, work on SA should be a key element of a WWF strategy on trade and investment.
24. Communication challenges inherent in decentralized, geographically dispersed teams.	24. Face-to-face meetings at least once a year are important for the efficient functioning of a decentralized project team. Monthly updates with news from each member of the team would be helpful.

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
25. Project monitoring.	25. It is recommended that the monitoring matrix, as developed for this evaluation, be used by the project team on a six-monthly basis.
26. Adaptive management.	26. The project monitoring matrix should serve as a tool for ongoing, adaptive management.
27. The SA project was conceived as a time-bound project, to finish after three years. Mid-way through the project, however, it looks as though this may have been a design flaw.	27. We recommend a longer time horizon in order to enhance the sustainability of the project's results. A process should be put underway now to consider how this expertise and capacity can be best built upon, and how the project should phase itself out, so that the work can be carried on by others.
28. We predict that if the project could be funded at the same level for another three years, its impact will be greatly enhanced, and the cost-effectiveness of the funding invested will be substantially improved.	28. We recommend that WWF and the project donors consider a second three-year phase for the project at similar or increased funding levels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We especially would like to thank all of the respondents, who generously gave their precious time and contributed their fruitful ideas to this evaluation: Maria Amparo Alban, Sandra Arcamo, Hernan Blanco, Nilo Brucal, Adriano Campolina, Jason Clay, Simon Cripps, Chris Elliott, Audo Faleiro, Penny Fowler, Mauricio Galinkin, Kevin Gallagher, Aimee Gonzales, Svein Erik Haarklau, Jenifer Havercamp, Mikel Insausti, Carlos Klink, Sue Lieberman, Paolo Lombardi, Alvaro Luchiezi, Tom McShane, Denise Meredith, Luiz Miranda, Sophia Murphy, Jose Padilla, Mireille Perrin, Eric Peters, Jamie Pittock, Ketut Sardjana Putra, Sarah Richardson, Claudia Saladin, Gordon Shepherd, Jenny Springer, Priscilla Stephan, Amelia Supetran, Lory Tan, Romy Trono, Elizabeth Tuerk, Jerry Tupacz, Keith Tyrell, Alexandra Wandel, and Imogen Zethoven.

We are particularly grateful to Priscilla Stephan, who translated the questionnaire into Portuguese, and carried out the interviews with the respondents in Brazil.

Tom Crompton, the third member of our evaluation team, was a great help in the evaluation design and the interview process, and he provided critical comments on this report. His laser-like insights have been invaluable throughout our work together.

Finally, we would like to thank Mireille Perrin for her unflagging support throughout the evaluation process. Her expert guidance, clear thinking, and remarkable efficiency were a tremendous help.

Meg Gawler
Richard McNally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	vi
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	viii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Overview of the Project and Context of the Evaluation.....	1
1.2. Purpose of the Evaluation	2
1.3. Objectives of the Evaluation	2
1.4. Composition of the Evaluation Team	2
2. Approaches to Assessment of Trade Agreements.....	2
3. Project Goals.....	4
3.1. Project Vision	4
3.2. Project Objectives.....	4
3.3. Project Targets And Indicators.....	5
4. Evaluation Methodology	9
5. Evaluation Findings.....	10
5.1. Institutionalization	20
5.2. Capacity Building.....	21
5.3. Case Studies	22
5.3.1. Brazil.....	22
5.3.2. Philippines	22
5.4. Internal WWF Goal	23
5.5. Project Monitoring and Evaluation Systems.....	24
5.5.1. Realism and Pertinence of the Project Objectives, Targets and Indicators.....	24
5.5.2. Effectiveness of Project Monitoring and Evaluation	25
5.6. Project Communications Activities	25
5.6.1. BalancedTrade Web Site	25
5.6.2. Project Publications and Resource Papers	26
5.6.3. Communications Messages for External Audiences	27
5.6.4. Internal Communications	28
5.7. Trade-Related Assessments in General.....	29
5.7.1. Emerging Concept or Mainstream Tool?.....	29
5.7.2. Lessons in Assessment Methodologies.....	30
5.7.3. Monitoring the Effectiveness of SAs.....	31
5.7.4. Major Problems and Constraints of Trade-related Assessments.....	32
5.7.5. Ingredients of a Good Trade-Related Assessment.....	34
6. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	35
Annexes	
A. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	44
B. List of Individuals Interviewed	49
C. List of Documentation Reviewed	51
D. Interview Protocol.....	53
E. Questionnaires Used	56
F. Short Biographies of the Evaluators.....	61

--- o0o ---

Box 1. Project Targets and Indicators.....	5
Table 1. Sustainability Assessment Project Monitoring Matrix.....	10
Table 2. Problems / Constraints, and Recommendations for Enhancing Project Impact.....	39

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACP	Africa, Caribbean, Pacific
ALCA	Area de Libre Comercio de las Americas
CEC	Commission on Environmental Cooperation (NAFTA)
CEDA	<i>Centro Ecuatoriano de Derecho Ambiental</i> (Centre for Environmental Law, Ecuador)
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality (US)
CHF	Swiss franc
CIEL	Centre for International Environmental Law
CIPMA	<i>Centro de Investigacion y Planificacion del Medio Ambiente</i> (Environmental Research and Planning Centre, Chile)
CSD	Commission for Sustainable Development
CTE	Committee on Trade and Environment
DG	Directorate General (EC)
EC	European Commission
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ER	Environmental Review
EU	European Union
FFLA	Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano
FTA	Free Trade Area
FTAA	Free Trade Agreement of the Americas
GBR	Great Barrier Reef (Australia)
GZ	Grupo Zapallar
IA	Integrated Assessment
IGO	Intergovernmental Organization
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean region
LRFI	Live reef fish industry (Philippines)
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
MFTZ	Mediterranean Free Trade Zone
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAFTA	North America Free Trade Agreement
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plans
NEDA	National Economic Development Authority (Philippines)
NO	WWF National Organization
NPF	Northern Prawn Fishery (Australia)
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
RCA	Root Causes Analysis (WWF)
SA	Sustainability Assessment
SEA	South East Asia
SIA	Sustainability Impact Assessment
TDP	Target Driven Programme (WWF)
TED	Turtle Excluder Devices
TEPAC	Trade and Environmental Policy Committee (US)
ToR	Terms of Reference
TWG	Technical Working Group (Philippines)
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USTR	United States Trade Representative
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organization
ZG	Zapallar Group (Forum for Discussion of Trade & Environment, LAC)

WWF PROJECT ON SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT OF TRADE

MID-TERM EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

The sustainability assessment (SA) project is a joint effort undertaken by WWF International and WWF US, which started in January 2001 and will end in December 2003. It is being implemented in partnership with a range of organizations worldwide, and has activities in Brazil, Norway, the Philippines, the USA, the EU, and Latin America. The project is funded by seven European governments, the government of Canada, and one US foundation.

1.1. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

How we trade and invest across borders has profound implications for human development and the health of our planet. WWF is advocating for the use of sustainability assessment to identify and address the economic, environmental and social impacts of trade and investment policies. By involving a broad range of government and non-government stakeholders involved in, and affected by trade, sustainability assessments help determine how to maximize the positive effects and mitigate/avoid the adverse impacts of trade and investment policies.

In March 2000 in Quito, WWF and Fundacion Futuro Latino Americano organized an International Experts Meeting on Sustainability Assessment, which provided a unique and timely opportunity for more than 100 representatives of governments, intergovernmental bodies and NGOs to discuss the purpose, utility and policy relevance of sustainability assessments. The Quito meeting made clear that there is interest in sustainability assessments as tools to facilitate the consideration of social and environmental as well as economic variables in trade-policy making. However, it also revealed concerns about the potential use of SAs as instruments of "green conditionality" in international economic relations. Many participants emphasised that the building of trust is essential for the further development of sustainability assessments. Building trust depends upon: a) the participation and involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the dialogue, and b) experience and capacity building at the national and sectoral levels.

While the meeting constituted a first step towards laying the foundations of trust between developed and developing countries, the process of establishing a workable relationship and constructive dialogue is ongoing. In this context, WWF launched a three-year project aimed at fostering the dialogue on sustainability assessment and building confidence and capacity to undertake these assessments.

The purpose of sustainability assessments is to identify the costs and benefits of trade liberalization policies so as to better inform national and international policy making and negotiating processes. SA has the potential to be a tool for empowerment, but this will depend on how the process is actually designed and applied. SA is a young process. IGOs such as UNEP, and regional bodies such as the EC, are still experimenting with various methodologies and adapting the current approaches to develop a comprehensive tool. There is also a danger that SAs could be misused – as green protectionism, for example. NGOs such as WWF have an important role to play in influencing this process in a positive direction during its formative years.

1.2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The current evaluation is a mid-term evaluation, aimed primarily at enhancing the performance of the SA project, to help ensure that the project will effectively meet its objectives by the end of its three-year lifetime in December 2003. As such, the focus of this evaluation is on the **use** of the evaluation results by the primary intended users, namely the project team. The evaluation was designed to promote learning, and support team-building among the members of the SA team. This mid-term evaluation should also provide a foundation for the final evaluation of the project, planned for the end of 2003.

The purpose of the evaluation is thus to assess the progress of the SA project after 18 months of implementation, and provide concrete recommendations for enhancing its impact on the ground and on its key target audiences.

1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation seeks to:

- A. Provide an assessment of progress made towards realising the project's objectives.
- B. Assess the realism of these objectives and the extent to which they lend themselves to ongoing evaluation.
- C. Assess the effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems.
- D. Review internal and external communication activities.
- E. Identify any major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered during the first 18 months of this project in pursuit of the project objectives.
- F. Propose recommendations for resolving the above mentioned difficulties so that they do not negatively impact upon the project's implementation, and to enhance positive impacts/results.

1.4. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team was composed of Meg Gawler, Founding Director of ARTEMIS Services (team leader), Richard McNally, WWF-UK Economics and Global Policy Officer, and Tom Crompton, Coordinator and Advisor on Trade Policy for the WWF Network. The first two members of the team were tasked with writing this report. Brief biographies of the evaluators are attached in Annex F.

2. APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

A number of national governments and international organizations have recognised the need for the assessment of trade agreements. At the national level, the US, Canada, the EU and Norway have either carried out assessments/reviews, or have made commitments to do so. The EU is involved in an ongoing effort of assessment at the regional level. At the international level, institutions such as the OECD and UNEP are also working on issues related to trade assessment. In some cases assessments or reviews focus exclusively on environmental impacts of trade agreements. In other cases an effort has been made to include a broader range of issues related to sustainable development in the methodologies and analysis. Approaches may also differ in scope, some focusing entirely on impacts at the national level, while others may include transboundary and/or international impacts. The different proponents of assessment have adopted their own terminology, which can lead to confusion. Countries that are comfortable with environmental assessment or reviews (US, Canada, Norway) are not necessarily ready to conduct full sustainability assessments that include development, for fear that they are too broad and methodologies for incorporating social indicators into the analysis are unreliable.

The major approaches are described below.

Integrated Assessment (UNEP):

Integrated Assessment (IA) evaluates the positive and negative economic, social and environmental effects of trade and trade policy across individuals, households, regions, ecosystems, companies and industries at a national scale. IA can provide the basis for the design and application of packages of policies that together are supportive of sustainable development, and can serve as the basis for a coherent and integrated position in trade-related negotiations. In 2001 UNEP released its *Reference Manual for the Integrated Assessment of Trade-Related Policies*, which is part of the organization's ongoing work to improve countries' understanding of the linkages between trade, the environment and development, and to enhance their capacities to develop mutually supportive policies that promote sustainable development.

Environmental Review (US):

Environmental Reviews (ERs) are a recognized policy tool for involving the public in the development of trade agreements, and for informing negotiators of the possible environmental implications of trade agreements, both positive and negative, as they are being negotiated. The focus is on impacts at the national level. In 1992 the United States prepared the first written environmental review of a major trade agreement, the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). It also prepared a follow-up report on NAFTA-related environmental issues in 1993, and conducted reviews of the Uruguay Round Agreements (1994), the Accelerated Tariff Liberalization initiative in forest products (1999), and the US-Jordan Free Trade Agreement (2000). ERs were institutionalized in the United States in 1999 by Executive Order 13141; guidelines to implement the executive order were completed in 2000, and ERs were incorporated into the US Trade Act of 2002. Under the guidelines, reviews should begin early enough to be a productive part of the negotiations. In 2000 USTR began an inter-agency process to analyse the environmental effects of the FTAA. USTR also announced that it would proceed with an environmental review of the negotiations on agriculture and services currently underway in the WTO. Environmental reviews of US free trade agreements with Singapore and Chile are also underway.

Framework for Conducting Environmental Assessments of Trade Negotiations (Canada):

As a first step in developing the framework, Canada published a *Retrospective Analysis of the 1994 Canadian Environmental Review of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations* in 1999. The *Framework for Conducting Environmental Assessments of Trade Negotiations* was finalised in 2001. The approach is also known as a Strategic Environmental Assessment, which has as its stated goal to integrate environmental considerations into decision-making from the earliest stages. The primary focus of such assessments, at this time, will be on assessing the most likely and significant environmental impacts of trade negotiations in relation to the Canadian environment. Transboundary, regional, and global environmental impacts will be considered if they have a direct impact on the Canadian environment.

Sustainability Impact Assessment (EC):

The aim of the European Commission Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) is to assess the impact of future WTO negotiations on sustainability. The SIA initiative is being undertaken by contractors on behalf of the Commission. During the first phase of the initiative (June-Sept 1999), contractors carried out a literature review of impact assessment methodologies, examined cases where these techniques have been used, and developed a methodology for SIA, which is broad and qualitative. It uses a core group of sustainability indicators to measure the impact that further liberalization and changes in rule-making might have on sustainability. The indicators are balanced between economic, environmental and social measures. In Phase Two of the SIA initiative, the methodology was used to conduct a preliminary assessment of the impact on sustainability of the proposed new round of multilateral trade negotiations. Phase Three of the EC's SIA initiative, expected to be completed over four years, is now under way, and will result in a fuller methodology and at least six sectoral studies. Other initiatives currently underway or near completion include an SIA of the EU/Chile-Mercosur negotiations.

Analytic Framework for Assessing the Environmental Effects of NAFTA (CEC):

The North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) is the only environmental organization created by an international trade agreement specifically to examine the relationship

between trade liberalization and the environment. In 1999, the CEC released the *Final Analytic Framework for Assessing the Environmental Effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement*. To encourage the use of the Framework, the CEC sponsored a symposium in 2000 on understanding the linkages between trade and the environment. Research papers and case studies were presented, examining issues such as the impacts of NAFTA on freshwater, fisheries, forests, hazardous wastes, and domestic environmental laws. Using the framework as a methodological reference point, and guided by the results of the symposium, work at the CEC will continue to examine environmental issues and policies in pursuit of mutually supportive trade-environment goals. A second symposium is scheduled for March 2003.

Sustainability Assessments (WWF):

In 1999 WWF released a framework to assess the economic, social, and environmental impacts of the Uruguay Round and other relevant agreements. A sectoral analysis, using various quantitative and qualitative methodologies, provides the substantive basis of the assessment. In order to build on existing momentum in this field, WWF organized an experts meeting in collaboration with the Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano (FFLA) in Quito in March 2000, to determine how sustainability assessments can be developed and used by governments and relevant stakeholders in order to promote effective integrated policy making. The meeting made clear the need to build trust and capacity in developing countries to ensure further development of SAs, and in response, WWF launched a three-year project aimed at fostering dialogue on SA, and building confidence and capacity to undertake these assessments.

3. PROJECT GOALS

3.1. PROJECT VISION

To reform trade policy decision-making processes and their outcomes in favour of sustainable and equitable development, by creating the context for, and catalysing effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessments in key countries/regions, in conjunction with targeted advocacy for meaningful implementation of these assessments.

3.2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The ultimate goal of the project is to catalyse and establish a process owned and trusted by local stakeholders, so that discussion and action on sustainability assessment of trade are pursued and strengthened beyond this project's duration. The project's four main objectives are to:

1. Get national governments to adopt and implement politically effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment processes ("institutionalization of SA" objective).
2. Build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate in and advocate for the use and promotion of sustainability assessments ("capacity-building and advocacy" objective).
3. Strengthen trade reform, or trade policy decision-making processes, by developing strong fact-based arguments built on sustainability assessments ("analytical/case-study" objective)
4. Demonstrate how trade policy may either pose a threat to, or be an opportunity for the achievement of WWF's targets in its Target-Driven Programmes (TDPs), priority biomes and ecoregions ("internal WWF conservation" objective).

The aim of the project is to move from WWF-driven activities to partner-driven activities, and to this end, priority is given to working with local partners in terms of leadership and implementation.

3.3. PROJECT TARGETS AND INDICATORS

The project plan includes a three-year work plan that fleshes out the above objectives. In an effort to strengthen the project's monitoring and evaluation system, and in preparation for this evaluation, the Project Coordinator sent out draft targets and indicators for comment to the project team, with a request for feedback. Refinements of the targets and indicators were also proposed by the evaluation team, and further improved through discussions with the Project Coordinator. The updated targets and indicators were then returned to the project team in June 2002 (see Box 1 below).

These targets and indicators are the first step in putting in place a robust monitoring and evaluation system to help strengthen the SA project with respect to:

- a) meeting its goals by December 2003
- b) accountability to donors
- c) creating a framework for learning and sharing lessons, and
- d) providing a basis for substantive communications, both internal and external.

To provide a tool for integrated reporting, learning, and decision-making, these targets and indicators were put into a matrix whereby project partners could report – for those targets and indicators that are relevant to their work – on progress to date, any difficulties encountered, corrective actions, and comments on the targets and indicators themselves – including an assessment of their realism, and suggestions for improvements from the particular work context of the project reporting. These targets and indicators were used by the project team for their six-monthly progress reports ending 30 June 2002.

The evaluation interviews provided an additional opportunity to assess the pertinence and realism of the targets and indicators, and to suggest further refinements.

Box 1.

Project Targets and Indicators

Objective 1 *Institutionalisation of Sustainability Assessment: Encourage national governments to systematically undertake and implement stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment processes as part of their trade policy making process.*

Targets:

1.1.1. Commitment from at least one developing country government to implement a stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment at the national level (e.g., Philippines).

Indicators of success:

- 1.1.1.1. A Presidential Executive Order or a legislative/executive directive on sustainability assessment published (e.g., Philippines).
- 1.1.1.2. An announcement by at least one government at the WSSD in September 2002 to institutionalize SA.
- 1.1.1.3. Elements of a process for official government decision to institutionalize SA visible, such as high level meetings to develop and institutionalize government-initiated SAs, or government funding for SA processes (e.g. Brazil).

1.2. Commitment by countries where government-led processes already exist to allocate adequate financial, technical and human resources to undertake environmental reviews and/or sustainability assessments of trade policy (e.g., US, Canada, EC).

Indicators of success:

- 1.2.1. Process includes full participation of government departments with mandates related to environment, development, trade, and economy, as well as any specific sector or region under investigation such as agriculture, fisheries, ACP countries (e.g., US and EC).
- 1.2.2. Capacity developed in all relevant government departments to ensure meaningful participation in SA processes.
- 1.2.3. Government financial and budgetary documents published, with information about expenditures, budgets and forecasts for SAs

1.3. At least two governments or trading blocs that are undertaking assessments of trade policy: a) provide financial and technical assistance, either bilaterally or through intergovernmental agencies, to developing countries to encourage capacity building in SAs, and b) enhance the likelihood that additional governments will make commitments to institutionalize assessment processes at the national level.

Indicators of success:

- 1.3.1. Assistance provided to developing countries or trade blocs to undertake their own environmental review or SA in the context of important trade talks, (e.g. US and Chile; EU and Mercosur).
- 1.3.2. The WTO earmarks financial resources and develops a capacity building programme for environmental and/or SAs.
- 1.3.3. UNEP work on capacity building and integrated assessment pursued, and increased funds allocated to UNEP-UNCTAD CBTF on specific technical assistance for assessment.

1.4. In countries undertaking assessments, the assessment process has been informed by stakeholders' input, and has influenced relevant trade negotiating agenda(s).

Indicators of success:

- 1.4.1. Civil society is included in the process at the earliest stages: proposing issues that should be considered in the assessment, contributing to the scope of the assessment, and being able to propose specific policy recommendations (e.g., US, EC and Canada).
- 1.4.2. Government processes instituted to obtain meaningful input from stakeholders on sectoral case studies, and to establish a review mechanism by Parliament (e.g., Norway, EC).

1.5. Reference to sustainability assessment of trade is clearly reflected in political statements of important trade-related fora and processes.

Indicators of success:

- 1.5.1. The 5th Ministerial Meeting of the WTO (in Mexico 2003) includes references to assessment that meet or exceed the numbers and strength of the references in the Doha Declaration (paragraphs 6 and 33).
- 1.5.2. Assessment as a standing item on the work programme of Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) regular and special sessions, and government commitments to share results prior to, and during the 5th Ministerial meeting of the WTO.
- 1.5.3. A strong, action-oriented reference to SA included in other important international negotiations (e.g., WSSD, FTAA)

Objective 2: Capacity building: Build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate in and advocate for the use and promotion of sustainability assessments.

Targets:

2.1. Sustainability assessment is recognised among stakeholders in at least two developing countries as an important item in the trade, environment and development dialogue.

Indicators of success:

- 2.1.1. National NGO networks or working groups on trade and sustainability related issues address SA (e.g., Brazil, Philippines).
- 2.1.2. Linkages between trade, environment and development appear as a regular agenda item for discussion among the above mentioned stakeholder groups, and lead to the development of collective position statements, including open letters to national governments in the context of important trade negotiations.

2.2. Key civil society groups undertake their own sustainability assessments of trade, whether general or sector-specific, and conduct related advocacy activities.

Indicators of success:

- 2.2.1. National organizations and civil society groups undertake their own sustainability assessments and case studies, and stakeholders are informed of their work through additional sectoral and location-specific studies posted on www.panda.org/balancedtrade; (e.g., Philippines, Brazil, EU, Chile, US)
- 2.2.2. Joint statements by civil society groups are issued in important international fora such as the WSSD in September 2002, the Ministerial Conference of the FTAA in October 2002, the WTO 5th Ministerial Meeting, and others, to put pressure on their governments to conduct SAs, including in bilateral trade negotiations (e.g., US / Chile).

2.3. Civil society groups from a broad range of countries actively participate in regional and international debates/networks on sustainability assessment.

Indicators of success:

- 2.3.1. NGOs advocate for environmental reviews or SAs in the context of ongoing or future trade negotiations, and work closely with developing country governments to explore opportunities for assessments (e.g. WTO and FTAA negotiations).
- 2.3.2. A coalition of developmental and environmental organizations push for assessment of major trade agreements and policies in the context of preparations for the WSSD, issuing joint statements and organizing joint meetings at the preparatory sessions for, and during, the WSSD in September 2002.

2.4. At least two active regional networking and advocacy processes on sustainability assessment are engaged in activities such as dialogue, information sharing through workshops or other means, joint advocacy, partnerships.

Indicators of success:

- 2.4.1. Grupo Zapallar continues to exist and gains in strength and visibility, with a distinct part of its work focused on sustainability assessment.
- 2.4.2. Following the EU meeting in July 2002, a revitalized EU civil society network is established and closely monitors the EU official assessment processes, through joint submissions during consultations with the Commission, joint press releases at key EU meetings and joint critiques of the EU SIA studies.

Objective 3 Analytical/case study: Strengthen trade reform, or trade policy decision making processes, by developing strong fact-based arguments built on sustainability assessments.

Targets:

3.1. Three to four case studies on sustainability assessment conducted through the SA project, and their recommendations taken into account by relevant governments.

Indicators of success:

- 3.1.1. Case study on soy in Brazil completed, and its recommendations taken into account by the Brazilian government, the EU, and other stakeholders in the EU-Mercosur negotiations and in the WTO agricultural trade negotiations.
- 3.1.2. Case study on the live reef fish in the Philippines completed, and the relevance and utility of its recommendations demonstrated to the government in such a way that it makes a commitment to institutionalize SA at the national level.
- 3.1.3. A third case study consistent with this target initiated by March 2002 (potentially on tourism).

3.2. The main sustainability issues identified in these case studies are reflected in relevant trade negotiating agendas and national trade policy-making dialogues.

Indicators of success:

- 3.2.1. Issues, practical solutions and good practices emerging from the soy case study in Brazil are considered and better reflected at the national level and in the context of EU-Mercosur negotiations (e.g., problems linked to plantation agriculture and its expansion, habitat conversion (including savannah woodlands), and threats to freshwater ecosystems in the Pantanal).
- 3.2.2. Issues emerging from the case study on live reef fish in the Philippines are reflected in national policy dialogues in this sector, and taken into account in further discussion on liberalization at the national level (e.g., threats of massive expansion in trade, including damage to coral reefs through use of cyanide and impacts on a local artisanal fisher community).

3.3. The case study methodologies developed in the context of this project are used and adapted by other actors, both governmental and non-governmental, to undertake further sustainability assessments.

Indicators of success:

- 3.3.1. Similar work on SA is conducted by different groups in selected regions (e.g., SEA, LAC), and is posted on www.panda.org/balancedtrade
- 3.3.2. Other institutions undertaking assessments under the auspices of international organizations such as UNEP, UNCTAD, WTO and OECD, draw on the experience and methodologies developed in the SA Project case studies (ref. bibliographies of published documents, agendas of meetings, etc.).

Objective 4 Internal WWF Conservation: Demonstrate how trade policy may either pose a threat to, or be an opportunity for, the achievement of WWF's targets in the TDPs, priority biomes and ecoregions. (NB: this goal is closely related to Goal 3 but includes distinct targets)

Targets

4.1. Trade-related impact assessments are incorporated in the socio-economic assessment processes undertaken for key ecoregions.

Indicators of success:

- 4.1.1. SA results incorporated in relevant ecoregion socio-economic assessments (e.g., Cerrado and Sulu-Sulawesi seas).
- 4.1.2. Where there is an overlap between SA sectoral work and activities in a specific ecoregion, concrete linkages between global trade policies and decisions and specific impacts at the local level are demonstrated and distributed to the WWF network.
- 4.1.3. SA messages reflected in ecoregion communications pieces, where there are links between the SA geographical focus and a specific ecoregion.

4.2. The case-studies undertaken provide evidence of linkages between trade, environmental degradation, and threats to social well-being, and more specifically, on where trade poses a threat to the achievement of the marine, freshwater and forest TDP targets.

Indicators of success:

- 4.2.1. SA case studies demonstrate that trade is a driving force of environmental and social degradation (e.g., Brazil, Philippines).

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

To enhance the use of the evaluation results, the evaluation methodology was utilization-focused, and was developed in close collaboration with the SA project team.

The methodology began with a review of the project documentation by the evaluation team. The next step was – together with the Project Coordinator – to refine and further develop the targets and indicators for monitoring progress with respect to the project objectives, as detailed above.

Four different groups of project stakeholders were identified for interviews:

- the project team
- key staff within the WWF Network
- national project partners
- international policy and advocacy partners.

The evaluators, in consultation with the SA project team, then formulated and prioritized the key questions to be asked of each stakeholder group during the evaluation.

The first step in the data collection was a self-evaluation by the members of the project team, based on a monitoring matrix of the project's targets and indicators that was developed for this review (see targets and indicators in box above and results presented in Table 1 below).

Based on the information received in the project reports and matrices, the evaluation team refined and developed the interview protocols for each of the different respondent groups. Each question was related to one or more respondent group, to one or more of the six evaluation objectives, and to one or more of the four project objectives (see interview strategy in Annex D). We used three questionnaires: one for the project team, one for other WWF staff, and one for national and international partners. The text of the questionnaires is given in Annex E.

Our plan was to carry out at least 40 interviews (ten from each of the four respondent groups). To this end, we sent out questionnaires by email, with a request to participate in the evaluation, to 72 potential respondents worldwide, hoping for a 60% response rate. We managed to carry out 42 interviews as follows: 11 with the project team members, 16 with key staff from the WWF Network, 9 with national partners, and 7 with international policy partners. The number of interviews with partners outside WWF was slightly lower than we had hoped for, but we were quite satisfied with the responses we did get. Budget constraints for the evaluation meant that it was not possible to devote more time to recruiting additional potential respondents. The WWF staff included key programme leaders, and a random selection of ecoregion coordinators (chosen by random number generation among WWF's 74 priority ecoregions). The list of individuals interviewed is attached in Annex B.

We then analysed the data collected from the interviews, together with the project documentation and monitoring matrices, and synthesized our evaluation findings. The result was a draft evaluation report sent out for comment to the project team. Two weeks were allowed for comments, after which this final report was prepared.

5. EVALUATION FINDINGS

In general, as shown in the following monitoring matrix (Table 1 below), the project is working on a wide range of fronts, and is making progress towards each of its objectives. This table was produced by the project team members as part of their six-monthly reporting, and as an input to the evaluation. The table represents a self-assessment by the project team of progress through the end of June 2002.

In the text following this matrix, we synthesize the findings from our interviews with respondents from the different stakeholder groups.

Table 1. Sustainability Assessment Project Monitoring Matrix

Target / Indicator	Status as of <u>30 June 2002</u>	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
Objective 1: Institutionalization of SA				
1.1. Commitment from at least one developing country government to implement a stakeholder-oriented SA at the national level (e.g., Philippines).	- Philippines: A multi-stakeholder SA Technical Working Group (TWG) has been formed, chaired by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA), and including the Depts of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Industry, Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Philippine Council for Sustainable Development, a national fisherfolk organization, Intl Marine Life Alliance, and the Chamber of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. NEDA issued a memorandum to concerned government agencies to participate in the SA TWG		- Brazil: the advocacy phase will begin following the launch of the final case study report during a workshop in Brasilia (date to be determined)	
1.1.1. A Presidential Executive Order or other directive on sustainability assessment published (e.g., Philippines)	- Philippines: there is interest to integrate the SA process in the ongoing assessment systems of the government			
1.1.2. An announcement by at least one government at the WSSD in September 2002 to institutionalize SA.	- SA is in the WSSD Chairman's text			
1.1.3. Elements of a process for official government decision to institutionalize SA visible (e.g. Brazil, Ecuador).	- Brazil: minimal; government resistance - The Brazil case study contains the description and indications of policies to be altered in favour of more sustainable development of the sector	- Need for more govt capacity - Lengthy/time consuming process - WWF has little on-the-ground presence in LAC	- Help develop govt courses in partnership with Brazilian academic institutions - Workshop in Quito in 10/02 on the margins of the FTAA; promote	- A public announcement to institutionalize SA in LAC by 2003 is probably unlikely; in Ecuador the project is not so deeply involved; if this becomes something governments

Target / Indicator	Status as of <u>30 June 2002</u>	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
			South-South exchanges	are willing to discuss and consider, and it is something that LAC NGOs are discussing and pushing, that would be a measure of success, given current resistance
1.2. Commitment by countries where government-led processes already exist to allocate adequate financial, technical and human resources to undertake environmental reviews and/or SAs of trade policy (e.g., US, Canada, EC).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10% of DG trade budget allocated to SA project over next 3 years - USTR has hired a dedicated staff person to work on environmental reviews (David Brooks) - The Bush administration reaffirmed the policy of doing environmental reviews of trade agreements - ERs appeared in both the Republican and Democratic version of the "Fast Track Trade Promotion Authority" (the main congressional vehicle for establishing US Trade policy) - No commitments by Norwegian authorities so far, though the govt has carried out a few studies in some selected sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited technical expertise in DG trade, and over-reliance on consultants - The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) which technically co-chairs the ER process with USTR has remained relatively unengaged - US political will to implement ERs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engage the US administration in dialogue with US NGOs through a series of informal meetings to discuss implementation of the Executive order, including the relative roles of CEQ and USTR. - Engage more on the appropriations for ER in the next fiscal year - WWF Norway will soon comment on 4 govt financed studies now out for a hearing, and govt commitments and allocation of resources for SAs 	
1.2.1. Process includes full participation of government departments (environment, development, trade, economy), as well as any specific sector or region under investigation such as agriculture, fisheries, ACP countries (e.g., US and EC).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process is led by DG trade with limited input from other DGs - The US Trade Policy Steering Committee is an interagency process, including all relevant govt departments and is chaired by USTR; in the US, the main problem is the effectiveness of the ER as a policy tool, and less the issue of interagency engagement - Norway: the process of carrying out the 4 (voluntary) studies was not done with full participation, neither from government agencies nor from civil society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited capacity to involve other DGs, and even other directorates in DG trade - The ER process is perceived, even by many of the environmental agencies, as duplicating the interagency process and as added work without added value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drafted WWF discussion document on SA process in EU and joint NGO statement calling for increased technical capacity 	
1.2.2. Capacity developed in all relevant government departments to ensure meaningful participation in SA processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - USTR is so far the only agency with a staff person solely dedicated to ER, although virtually all agencies have at least one or more persons dedicated to trade issues - Philippines: participation in the TWG is actively building capacity in SA among members 			

Target / Indicator	Status as of <u>30 June 2002</u>	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
	- Norway: no commitments for a formalized and mandatory SA process means that capacity is very likely to be inadequate for meaningful participation			
1.2.3. Government financial and budgetary documents published, with information about expenditures, budgets and forecasts for SAs.	- EU documents published on DG trade website - US govt has no official documents with budgetary information on ER (foreseen or done in the past) - Philippines: an indication of this will come out once SA has been integrated in existing government processes	- USTR has no specific amount allocated for ERs in their budgets with the exception of staff salaries, Federal Register Notices.	- Talk to USTR about how they do ERs, and encourage more independent outsourcing	
1.3. At least two governments or trading blocs that are undertaking assessments of trade policy: a) provide financial and technical assistance to developing countries to encourage capacity building in SAs, and b) enhance the likelihood that additional governments will make commitments to institutionalize assessment processes at the national level.	- DG trade says it is willing to support UNEP and UNDP efforts in this area, and wants to forge partnerships with other organizations to achieve this - The US reportedly offered assistance to the Chilean govt to conduct an ER of the US-Chile FTA, but Chile turned it down; the US has not specifically earmarked funds for this, but may include it as part of their capacity building contribution to the WTO - Brazil: the EU intends to conduct an assessment of the agreement with the Mercosur - Philippines: the Dept of Agric is providing funding to WWF for the SA project; UNDP through the NEDA has approved in principle the funding proposal for undertaking the capacity building component of SA	- No commitment from EC to support third countries	- Raised issue during discussion with DG trade and DG Env; called on commission to support third countries in responses to their reports - WWF Brazil trying to persuade the negotiators that an environmental fund, negotiated with and provided by the EU, should facilitate cost internalization in Brazil and the Mercosur countries; SA could be a counterpart in the negotiation of such a fund	- Question about the degree to which the project should be encouraging US to contribute bilaterally (this is often not regarded as helpful), or to do so through multilateral mechanisms
1.3.1. Assistance provided to developing countries or trade blocs to undertake their own environmental review or SA in the context of important trade talks, (e.g. US and Chile; EU and Mercosur).				
1.3.2. As part of its Doha technical assistance and capacity building mandate, the WTO earmarks financial resources and develops a capacity building programme for environmental and/or SAs.				
1.3.3. UNEP work on capacity building and integrated assessment is pursued, and increased funds are allocated to UNEP-UNCTAD CBTF on				

Target / Indicator	Status as of 30 June 2002	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
specific technical assistance for assessment.				
1.4 In countries undertaking SAs, the assessment process is informed by stakeholders' input, and has influenced relevant trade negotiating agenda(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EC conducting formal stakeholder dialogue sessions., but have had minimal impact on outcomes re negotiating agenda - In the US, NGOs have engaged in the ER process through the official Federal Register process; in the case of the FTAA quantitative review, according to communications with USTR, they are considering changing their approach on the FTAA after criticism they received through the federal register comment process - Norway: no formalized process; very limited stakeholder input in the studies carried out so far 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure of EC SIA programme makes it difficult for stakeholders to influence scope and outcome of studies - With the Chile-US FTA, the draft ER came fairly far along into the process of negotiating the agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Called for reform of EC SIA programme and changes to method to allow stakeholders to have greater influence – both through formal submissions, NGO joint statement, and discussions with EC 	
1.4.1. Civil society is included in the process at the earliest stages (e.g., US, EC and Canada).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The official US process starts at the scoping stage with a request for public comment on the scope of the ER - EU also consults with NGOs regularly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SIAs begun too late; lack of interest on the part of civil society; ToR and scope already decided before stakeholders are consulted - The federal register process and the official Trade and Environmental Policy Advisory Committee (TEPAC) process are the only mechanisms for public input, and discussions are confidential; TEPAC is a limited tool for input into the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worked to raise awareness and capacity in NGO community; called on EC to begin SIAs earlier; encouraged broad participation, e.g., with ER handbook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The issues of confidentiality of negotiation processes are ones the SA project has not grappled with in general - Indicator difficult to measure; on one hand the US and EU processes looks reasonably good (public engaged from scoping stage), but it is difficult to gauge how effective that engagement is
1.4.2. Government processes instituted to obtain meaningful input from stakeholders on sectoral case studies, and to establish a review mechanism by Parliament (e.g., Norway, EC).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No review mechanism by Eur. Parliament yet - 2 Members of Parliament (MEPs) giving presentations on SIA at EU seminar will focus on role of Parliament - US ER process is on an agreement by agreement basis; there is no formal Congressional mechanism for reviewing ER, other than existing mechanisms for reviewing trade policy generally - Philippines: a case study employing this framework was conducted with the preliminary results presented to the members of the TWG during the Coron meeting with stakeholders; a mini SA on the tariff reform program will be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of awareness among MEPs - Congress has been distracted by the Fast Track; the US process of implementing the ER has been slow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lobbied MEPs on their role in EU SIA program; held seminar at European Parliament 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not clear what the distinction is between 1.4.1 and 1.4.2

Target / Indicator	Status as of <u>30 June 2002</u>	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
	undertaken to further test the usefulness of SA			
1.5. Reference to SA of trade is clearly reflected in political statements of important trade-related fora and processes.	- SA was not reflected in the Summit of the Americas text			
1.5.1. The 5 th Ministerial Meeting of the WTO (Mexico 2003) includes references to assessment that meet or exceed the numbers and strength of the references in the Doha Declaration (para.6 and 33).				
1.5.2 Assessment as a standing item on the work programme of CTE regular and special sessions, and government commitments to share results prior to, and during the 5 th Ministerial meeting of the WTO.				
1.5.3. A strong, action-oriented reference to SA is included in other important international negotiations (e.g., WSSD, FTAA).				
Objective 2: Capacity Building				
2.1. SA is recognised among stakeholders in at least two developing countries as an important item in the trade, environment and development dialogue.	- Philippines: government agencies that play important roles in trade-related discussions agree to the potential value of SA in terms of improving trade assessment and discussions			
2.1.1. National NGO networks or working groups on trade and sustainability related issues address SA (e.g., Brazil, Philippines).	- Philippines: an SA forum has been set up, primarily for NGOs, research institutions and academia			
2.1.2. Linkages between trade, environment and development appear as a regular agenda item for discussion among the above mentioned stakeholder groups, and lead to the development of collective position statements in the context of important trade negotiations.	- Philippines: these linkages are subjects of discussions of advocacy groups and are part of the basis for their positions such as anti-dumping, anti-subsidy, etc.			
2.2. Key civil society groups undertake their own SAs of trade, and conduct related advocacy activities.	- Aprodev conducting SIA style study in Zimbabwe; Eurostep working on study of Asia/Caribbean/Pacific (ACP); FoE study on Mediterranean Free Trade Zone (MFTZ) - Launched NGO joint statement on EC's SIA - WWF a founder member of European Trade Network - CEDA (Ecuador) is pursuing funding to do SA case studies on flowers - Philippines: the network "NGOs for Fishery Reform" articulated their interest in SA saying that the tool would	- Poor attendance by NGOs of EC dialogue exercise: studies independent of WWF program and FoE study are old; lack of awareness in civil society on SIA - Norway: limited	- Engaging with NGOs to co-operate on SIA advocacy and explore opportunities for joint work; working to raise profile of SIA among NGOs; trying to improve NGO engagement in EC stakeholder dialogue;	

Target / Indicator	Status as of 30 June 2002	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
	further enhance their advocacy; the same perception was echoed at the Inception Workshop in 06/02 - Norway: currently not	resources	hosted NGO strategy session on SIA	
2.2.1. National organizations and civil society groups undertake their own SAs and case studies, and stakeholders are informed of their work through additional postings on www.panda.org/balancedtrade (e.g., Philippines, Brazil, EU, Chile, US)	- WWF participated in Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC)'s first North American symposium on assessing the environmental effects of trade and is on the advisory committee for the second, which is taking an environment first approach. The CEC will sponsor a number of case studies - Philippines: establishment of SA Forum to ensure the constant exchange/sharing of information on SA related activities			
2.2.2. Joint statements by civil society groups are issued in important international fora to put pressure on their governments to conduct SAs, including in bilateral trade negotiations (e.g., US and Chile)	- Joint statement organized by WWF on SIA presented at seminar; Oxfam signed up to critique of Manchester SIA; Aprodev for joint studies on agriculture - Quebec City NGO statement calling on governments to do SA of the FTAA was distributed at the Summit of the Americas in 04/01 - US NGOs did joint comments on the draft US-Chile ER; several groups from Chile also submitted comments - Norway: partly through the Forum for Development and Environment, an umbrella group of 60 NGOs	- Lack of awareness of SIA in NGO community - Several LAC NGOs don't see joint statements as the most useful approach at this time; they believe govts need to be engaged more in dialogue on the substance - Norway: limited coordination, at least partly due to different approaches and positions in relation to globalization and free trade	- EU: Raise awareness, forge partnerships - LAC: see above - Norway: uncertain; dependent on internal NGO cooperation during hearing of four government studies	- Philippines: a clear indication on joint statements may come towards the end of the project period after most stakeholders fully appreciated the value of SA
2.3. Civil society groups from a broad range of countries actively participate in regional and international debates/networks on SA.	- High international registrations for WWF seminar in July - LAC: Grupo Zapallar has done several sessions on assessment - Quebec City Summit of the America's workshop on SA (sponsored by WWF) - CIPMA sponsored a workshop on the Chile-US FTA that covered assessment issues - Focus of WWF Brazil is on national level - Philippines: the SA Forum will hopefully jumpstart this	- International attendance at Commission meetings non-existent; expense of attending EU based events; poor publication of EU events; lack of awareness internationally - Brazil: human resources - Norway: limited interest in SAs so far	- Encourage EC to engage and support participation from third countries; hold events in developing countries; improve communication of SIA events - International action should focus on the EU-Mercosur, where there is not a great involvement of Latin American NGOs - WWF Brazil hopes to	

Target / Indicator	Status as of 30 June 2002	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
		and more NGO focus on protesting against globalization and free trade	attract the attention of some NGOs, creating synergies, and extending the scope of its action	
2.3.1. NGOs advocate for environmental reviews or SAs in the context of ongoing or future trade negotiations, and work closely with developing country governments to explore opportunities for assessments (e.g. WTO and FTAA negotiations).	- FTAA – see 2.2.2 above - In Brazil this will be carried out only for the case of the EU Mercosur negotiations - Philippines: Some NGO networks are engaged in discussions with government agencies, particularly the Dept of Agric, in preparation for the forthcoming WTO negotiation; hopefully they will incorporate SA in their negotiating points			
2.3.2. A coalition of developmental and environmental organizations push for assessment of major trade agreements and policies in the context of preparations for the WSSD, issuing joint statements and organizing joint meetings at the preparatory sessions for, and during, the WSSD (09/02).	- This has been achieved in the recently held WSSD prep-com in Bali, Indonesia - Norway: limited coalitions in terms of development and environmental NGOs, but more coordination in relation to WSSD where WWF is playing an active role		- Norway: involve and coordinate with other NGOs in hearing of 4 govt studies; work through Forum for Development and Environment in relation to WSSD	
2.4. At least two active regional networking and advocacy processes on SA are engaged in activities such as dialogue, information sharing, joint advocacy, partnerships.	- European Trade Network launched, SA on agenda - Grupo Zapallar – see 2.3 above		- WWF participates in Brazilian Network for the People's Integration, including a working group on Trade & Environment, and will start up a dialogue on the relevance and usefulness of SA in the soy and other agricultural sectors	- 2.3 and 2.4 seem to be somewhat redundant
2.4.1. Grupo Zapallar continues to exist and gains in strength and visibility, with a distinct part of its work focused on SA.	- GZ has held two workshops, which in 2001 included SA	- GZ is in the process of determining its future role/function in the trade and environment debate	- Quito workshop (10/02) may be a way for raising the profile of SA as an area for cooperation and dialogue within GZ	
2.4.2. Following the EU meeting in 07/02, a revitalized EU civil society network is established and closely monitors the EU official assessment processes, though joint submissions, press	- Not started		- Compile database of NGOs present and those requesting information, and use this as base to	

Target / Indicator	Status as of 30 June 2002	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
releases, and critiques.			achieve goal - Norwegian NGOs should use the development in the EU to push the Norwegian govt, where appropriate, and to a larger extent work with EU civil society	
Objective 3: Analytical / Case Studies				
3.1. 3-4 case studies on SA conducted , and their recommendations taken into account by relevant governments.	- The Brazil case study is nearly completed - Philippines: a case study on the live reef fish industry (LRFI) has been started - a study on shrimp aquaculture will hopefully take place in the Philippines by 11/02			
3.1.1. Case study on soy in Brazil completed, and recommendations taken into account by the Brazilian government, the EU, and other stakeholders in the EU-Mercosur negotiations and the WTO agricultural trade negotiations.	- Case study mostly completed; WWF has been working on EU-Mercosur advocacy	-The first draft of the Brazil case study was problematic for WWF	- Brazil case study currently being revised - Work plan of activities for advocacy and communications almost complete	
3.1.2. Case study on the live reef fish in the Philippines completed, and the relevance and utility of its recommendations demonstrated to the government in such a way that it makes a commitment to institutionalize SA at the national level.	- Philippines: the preliminary results of the study on LRFI have been presented to the TWG meeting in Coron and to the civil society group in the inception workshop; the final draft that will include recommendations from TWG should come out by 10/02			
3.1.3. A 3 rd case study initiated by March 2002 (potentially on tourism).	- Not yet initiated	- Funding not yet available		- Start date will change
3.2. The main sustainability issues identified in these case-studies are reflected in relevant trade negotiating agendas and national trade policy-making dialogues.	- EU: no direct influence discernable yet - None of the case studies are completed yet – too early to say whether they have had an impact on negotiating agendas - In the second phase WWF Brazil will start a dialogue process with a broader range of stakeholders, with one target being to influence negotiating agendas - Philippines: these issues are expected to be highlighted upon the conclusion of the study by 10/02	- SIAs started too late - Brazil: time constraints	- Monitor EC output and lobby for early starting of SIA - Brazil: good schedule of activities and focus on results	
3.2.1. Issues, practical solutions and good practices emerging from the soy case study in Brazil are considered and better reflected at the	- LAC: Too early - Brazil: issues and practices already identified; WWF Brazil made two public statements for the EU Mercosur negotiating	- Some resistance from the Brazilian govt, which sees SA as a "European	- Brazil: direct contact, showing the credibility and responsibility of	

Target / Indicator	Status as of 30 June 2002	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
national level and in the context of EU-Mercosur negotiations.	process	tool"	WWF's past action; part of these constraints could be reduced after the presidential election	
3.2.2. Issues emerging from the case study on live reef fish in the Philippines are reflected in national policy dialogues in this sector, and taken into account in further discussion on liberalization at the national level.	- LAC: Too early			
3.3. The case-study methodologies developed in the context of this project are used and adapted by other actors, both governmental and non-governmental, to undertake further SAs.	- Philippines: a mini SA on the Tariff Reform Programme and several workshops are going to be held upon completion of the case study on LRFI, intended to demonstrate the usefulness of SA			
3.3.1. Similar work on SA is conducted by different groups in selected regions (e.g., SEA, LAC), and is posted on www.panda.org/balancedtrade	- LAC: See 2.2 above - Brazil: many NGOs in Latin America are already conducting case studies and advocacy on SA	- One major difficulty is for groups to find funding for conducting their own SAs.		
3.3.2. Other institutions undertaking assessments under the auspices of international organizations such as UNEP, UNCTAD, WTO and OECD, draw on the experience and methodologies developed in the SA Project case studies (ref. bibliographies of published documents, agendas of meetings, etc.).	- The CEC has changed its assessment work to focus on the environment as an analytical starting point, rather than the marginal changes in trade induced by NAFTA			
Objective 4: Internal WWF Conservation				
4.1. Trade-related impact assessments are incorporated in the socio-economic assessment processes undertaken for key ecoregions.	- The Pantanal and Freshwater Programmes of WWF Brazil have foreseen an economic assessment of water uses		- Closer relationship with the Pantanal and Freshwater Programmes of WWF Brazil	
4.1.1. SA results are incorporated in the ecoregion socio-economic assessment (e.g., Cerrado and Sulu-Sulawesi seas).	- WWF Brazil does not have a programme for the Cerrado, but only isolated actions; the results of the case study will be disseminated in favour of the conservation in the Cerrado and in the Pantanal, a neighbouring ecoregion affected by the development of soy and agriculture in the Cerrado - Discussions with the Sulu-Sulawesi project staff have been undertaken to identify points for coordination with a view to incorporate SA in the Sulu-Sulawesi project			
4.1.2. Where there is an overlap between SA sectoral work and activities in a specific ecoregion, concrete linkages between global	- WWF-Brazil is working on the environmental impacts of agriculture in specific ecoregions, e.g., case studies on soy and on agriculture on the Pantanal		- Closer relationship with the Pantanal and Amazon Programmes	

Target / Indicator	Status as of <u>30 June 2002</u>	Difficulties Encountered	Corrective Measures	Comments on Targets / Indic.
trade policies and decisions and specific impacts at the local level are demonstrated and distributed to the WWF network.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These linkages are reflected in the Pantanal and Amazon Programmes - Philippines: this would be contingent upon results of exploratory talks between SA and Sulu-Sulawesi projects 			
4.1.3. SA messages are reflected in ecoregion communication pieces, where there are links between the SA geographical focus and a specific ecoregion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brazil: SA messages are already incorporated into the ecoregional messages 			
4.2. Case-studies provide evidence of linkages between trade, environmental degradation, and threats to social well-being, and more specifically, on where trade poses a threat to the achievement of the marine, freshwater and forest TDP targets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soy case study demonstrates these linkages - Philippines: as a result of SA work, even at this early stage, trade is already seen by stakeholders as driving marine ecological health to the edge 			
4.2.1. SA case studies demonstrate that trade is a driving force of environmental and social degradation (e.g., Brazil, Philippines).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soy case study attempts to demonstrate the environmental and social effects of trade 			

5.1. INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The first objective of the project – the institutionalization of sustainability assessments – is to encourage national governments to systematically undertake and implement stakeholder-oriented SA processes as part of their trade policy making. Progress has been made in this respect in the EU, the US, and the Philippines.

The EC launched Sustainability Impact Assessments (SIAs) in January 1999, and DG Trade has allocated 10% of its budget to SIAs over the next three years. In an effort to promote dialogue and fully engage civil society, the EC conducts one full week of consultation on trade every eight weeks. Unfortunately few NGOs have the resources to fully take advantage of this. There is a lot of scepticism in the NGO community about what is behind the EC's civil society dialogue.

"There is a risk of paralysis by analysis, where advocacy gets drowned in the detail."
(European respondent)

After several years of engagement, NGOs have not seen concrete results in terms of integrating SIAs into trade policy in general, nor into specific trade negotiations. According to DG Trade, it is early days yet – four major studies are being carried out, with the first results expected only next year. DG Trade emphasizes that a Sustainability Impact Analysis is not finished with the report, and that it is very important to the EC to show concrete actions taken as a result of the SIA, and to demonstrate coherence in its policy making.

Although the Norwegian government has not committed itself to doing SAs on a regular basis, it has carried out four environmental reviews, which have been strongly criticized by WWF Norway.

The US adopted its environmental review (ER) policy in 1999, produced guidelines in 2000, and incorporated ERs into the Trade Act of 2002. A presidential Executive Order mandates environmental reviews on impacts in the US (and possible transboundary impacts) for bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations. WWF has argued that impacts of ecosystem and global importance should be included.

Many developing countries are very sceptical of SAs, which they see as: a) a Northern tool being imposed from the outside, and b) a way to prevent them from gaining market access. Where there is a high level of mistrust, many developing countries do not see that SA could, in fact, be a powerful tool in their hands. Overcoming this mistrust will be one of the challenges at the SA workshop planned for the Ministerial meeting in Quito in November 2002.

"In some ways SA could be a Trojan horse for developing countries, giving them arguments that they could use as a big political issue with WTO, e.g., 'We need to see your subsidies dropped if we are to liberalize.'"
(Anonymous respondent)

The Philippines government, however, is now interested in how trade assessments can help formulate policies that will take into account environmental, social, and economic issues. The interest and support of the government has been concretely demonstrated by the provision of funding by the Department of Agriculture to WWF Philippines for its SA work. In addition, the project has provided input into updating the Philippine Agenda 21, in which SA is identified as one of the tools for achieving sustainable development.

In international processes, such as the Doha conference, there is a recognition of trade-related assessments as a voluntary tool on a national basis. The Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) was the first to highlight the need for sustainability assessments; OECD produced guidelines in 1994; UNEP has an entire programme of work on SA, and the idea of environmental reviews of trade

agreements survived bruising challenges in the recent World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

Under Objective 1, Target 1.4 – that the SA process is informed by stakeholder input and has indeed influenced trade negotiating agendas – has been the most challenging. One intrinsic obstacle to stakeholder participation is the confidentiality of the trade negotiation process. This is an issue that requires further attention from the project.

The litmus test of the value of SAs will be reflected in whether they actually make a positive influence on trade negotiating agendas and on trade policies and decisions. Many NGOs point to the grave danger that the SA process could easily be subverted to greenwashing, by going through the motions of assessing sustainability, while allowing economic and political forces alone to drive trade agendas. WWF and other NGOs have a critical role to play in ensuring that SAs are designed and carried out with integrity and that their findings actually do influence trade policies and promote sustainable development.

5.2. CAPACITY BUILDING

The project targets capacity building for a range of stakeholder groups: key stakeholders in the countries where the case studies are being carried out (government partners, NGOs, producers); civil society groups from a broad range of countries (both environment- and development-oriented organizations); regional networking processes, international organizations, etc.

The project's capacity building work in the Philippines has been through the creation of the Technical Working Group (TWG) and the SA Forum. Through their participation in the TWG, key stakeholders from government, civil society and the live reef fish industry itself are coming to understand SA by taking responsibility for managing the process of a real example. The SA Forum provides a much broader information-sharing mechanism for a wide range of stakeholders and people interested in SA. The members of the TWG whom we interviewed felt that this hands-on approach is an effective strategy for building capacity.

The project has translated some documents into Spanish. Nevertheless, in Latin America the project's capacity building work has been limited by the lack of documents and internet resources available in Spanish and Portuguese. In Brazil, one respondent said that workshops targeting capacity building for small scale farmers in the context of the soy study are needed so as to better involve these primary stakeholders.

In countries like the US and Canada, there has recently been a notable increase in transparency, with assessments posted for comment on the internet. There is a need in both North America and Europe to build the capacity of civil society to comment effectively when assessments are put out for comment, and the project is encouraging stakeholders in the US and Europe to become more involved in the public comment process. In the US, the project acts as a convenor, bringing together representatives of the USTR with key individuals from academia and NGOs to debate the analyses. In Europe the project has held seminars with NGOs, member states, trading partners, and different commissions and bodies, informing them of procedural and methodological issues, and building capacity for them to get more involved in the process. Similarly, the workshop in Brussels held last July was aimed at revitalizing the activities of European NGOs on SIAs, given official assessment studies undertaken by the Commission.

Various respondents from the international policy group reported that capacity building was a priority, but that it had not started yet, or was progressing more slowly than expected. There is an acute and widespread problem of insufficient human resources in NGOs to address the complex issues of SA, in both developed and developing countries.

5.3. CASE STUDIES

The third objective of the project is to strengthen trade policy decision making processes by developing strong fact-based arguments, and demonstrating the usefulness of SA through case studies, i.e., real life examples, with the target of completing three to four case studies within the lifetime of the project.

The case studies in Brazil and the Philippines are near completion, and a proposal has been submitted for funding for a third case study in Turkey. We were told that WWF Norway had hoped to get funding from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for a case study on export driven salmon farming, but this was strongly opposed by the Ministry of Fisheries.

We found the Terms of Reference for the case studies to be very well formulated, giving clear guidance on the rationale for the study and why the particular sector is a priority, and on developing an operational approach, including key questions for sustainability.

As the two case studies underway have not yet been completed, it would have been premature to try to evaluate them, especially since the budget for the evaluation did not allow for travel to Brazil or the Philippines. Nevertheless, we present some initial feedback gleaned from our interviews with stakeholders.

5.3.1. Brazil

The case study in Brazil focuses on the soy sector. There was wide agreement in WWF that the first draft of the case study requires more work. Many of our respondents criticized the Brazil case study as:

- weak on the environmental and social issues
- being out of touch with local reality, perhaps because it was done largely by academics
- “missing the forest for the trees” because it lacks integration of the various sections written by different specialists
- appearing flawed because it did not mention the EU decision to ban genetically modified soy, which has had a massive impact in Brazil
- lacking a critical examination of who the powerful actors are in the soy sector in Brazil
- failing to really ask hard questions, assuming only one outcome (trade liberalization)
- neglecting to start with sustainability as a baseline, and
- not assessing options other than increased soy cultivation in the Cerrado area.

5.3.2. Philippines

The strategy of WWF Philippines has been to show the results of the case study on live reef fish to various stakeholders, including those who can potentially replicate the work, and to demonstrate that SA will be useful in their respective advocacy activities (for NGOs), and useful in arriving at acceptable policies (for the government).

WWF Philippines did not encounter difficulties in introducing SAs, largely because of the country’s long familiarity with EIAs. SAs were seen as giving a name and a face to a familiar but more holistic process, and applying this to trade agreements.

The biggest accomplishment in the Philippines has been the creation, through a formal MoU, of a Technical Working Group. The TWG – composed of high-level representatives of key government departments, NGOs, people’s organizations, and the private sector – has genuine responsibility for overseeing the SA case study, including developing the ToRs, evaluating the results, and making policy recommendations. WWF Philippines is to be congratulated on giving ownership of the process to this multi-stakeholder group, and establishing a process that is accepted by both government and industry. The TWG is not only facilitating the institutionalization process in the Philippines, but also –

by including fishers in the discussions – ensuring that their concerns are heard right away and factored into the policy recommendations. The TWG also appears to be functioning effectively as a vehicle for capacity building.

To promote capacity building, the project has also set up the “SA Forum” for sharing information and experiences, which includes civil society, academic, and governmental agencies who are not on the TWG.

National partners have affirmed that the WWF case study has been helpful in crafting a specific methodology.

WWF Philippines, in addition to its work on the live reef fish case study, is doing a “mini SA” of the government’s tariff reform programme, and is planning to do another case study on shrimp aquaculture.

“SA showed how livelihoods affect social well being and biodiversity. SA drives the stakeholders to better understand what sustainable use is all about, because they can see how what they do will lead to disaster. With SA, they really saw how they were digging themselves into a grave.”

(Respondent from the Philippines)

Our sense is that the project has had a huge influence in the Philippines, and the project’s final evaluation should verify this.

5.4. INTERNAL WWF GOAL

The project has often found it more difficult to communicate internally within WWF than with external audiences. Nevertheless, there was strong agreement among the WWF respondents that trade policy is absolutely critical to the overall process of sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. Like poverty alleviation, trade policy is one of the major cross-cutting issues in all of WWF’s work.

Little progress seems to have been made on Target 4.1 (incorporating SA into ecoregional socio-economic assessments). Contacts with the ecoregions were not effectively made in the initial stages of the case studies. It would have been beneficial, for example, to invite staff from the Sulu-Sulawesi Seas ecoregion to the early planning meetings for the live reef fish industry study.

“Trade policy is extremely important, but is overlooked almost everywhere. For example, in Pakistan we are witnessing losses of biodiversity in mangrove ecosystems, and the cause is water withdrawal upstream for the irrigation of cotton for international trade. And yet we were planting mangroves with the communities – you could do that ‘til hell freezes over, and it won’t make a difference... Trade is such a driving force in how national governments define their own policies, and how flows of funds go. The longer we do not take these issues seriously, the greater the damage will be.”

(WWF respondent)

One respondent said that WWF is looking at trade too narrowly. For WWF, it is important to focus on real impacts on the ground or in the sea, and to determine what role trade may or may not play in that, and what other root causes may come into play. The project has carried out a case study on the likely effects of trade liberalization on the soy sector in Brazil, but if soy subsidies were eliminated in the US, this would be likely to expand soy production in Brazil to a greater extent than the liberalization of trade. Likewise, currency valuation and devaluation, more than trade policies, may be the major factor determining volumes of exports and imports.

Trade policy is perceived not only as a threat to biodiversity conservation in the WWF Network, but also as an opportunity. We heard a striking example of this from WWF Australia regarding the Northern Prawn Fishery (NPF), which exports a lot of prawns to the US. During the previous US administration, there was a decision not to import prawns from the NPF because of the lack of turtle excluder devices (TEDs) to prevent accidental capture of sea turtles. The net result of the US decision

was that the NPF quickly introduced TEDs, and the fishery then improved in a lot of other areas because they realized that their export trade was threatened. The Northern Prawn Fishery started doing bycatch studies, and looking at areas for closure of the fishery. Once the TEDs were introduced in the NPF, this put pressure on the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) – which is a World Heritage site, but does not export prawns to the US – to introduce TEDs in its prawn fisheries, and now turtle excluder devices are required in the GBR. This is an interesting example of how far-reaching a trade policy decision can be in promoting biodiversity conservation – in this case, in generating a trade-motivated conservation ethic within the fishery, and extending the use of TEDs to a neighbouring ecoregion of prime conservation importance.

There is a serious risk that ultimately, WWF will not achieve its major targets if trade does not change. Trade is a driving force that will undermine conservation goals, unless there is a paradigm shift in trade policies in favour of sustainable development.

"SA plays a key part of the overall strategy to attain sustainable development, particularly at this current time, when everyone identifies trade as the single most important source of financing for development."
(WWF respondent)

5.5. PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

5.5.1. Realism and Pertinence of the Project Objectives, Targets and Indicators

In project planning there is always a tension between ambition and realism. Projects need to be sufficiently ambitious to inspire change, yet grounded in the reality of what is feasible in a given context. In addition, it is important that policy projects set their sights high in order to rally support for change.

In general, the project team felt that the SA project's objectives, targets, and indicators are reasonable, and this is demonstrated by the considerable achievements detailed in the project monitoring matrix above.

As in any advocacy project, political events and processes are beyond the control of WWF. The project's initial assessment of the evolution of the political climate may have been a bit optimistic. WSSD, for example, was a disappointment, and some of the advocacy goals may not be achieved in the current political environment.

It now looks as though the targets for capacity building may not be achievable in the short timeframe of the project. Likewise, institutionalization takes time. In the Philippines, for example, it took a well-financed project four phases (ten years) to institutionalize environmental accounting. In developing countries where trade assessments are not yet in place, concrete instruments enshrining SA may not be possible within the project timeframe.

Fundraising has proven to be more difficult than anticipated, and the project is facing a budget shortfall in 2003. The original ideal budget for the SA project was CHF 2.47 million, and the project has raised CHF 1.63 million to date. To conduct three case studies and to continue to operate in the countries and regions where it is currently active, the project needs to raise an additional CHF 200,000.

In regard to Objective 1, in the EU, the objective of institutionalizing SA has essentially succeeded. A bigger question now arises as to the advantages and disadvantages of institutionalization. What is important is how SA is institutionalized. The alternative might be a lively, well-resourced civil society process, where society engages government, rather than government engaging society. There is a risk that institutionalization of SAs – unless their application is rigorous and principled – may not actually contribute to sustainable development. WWF and other NGOs need to ensure the quality of

the institutionalization of this tool. It would be worthwhile in the second half of the project to focus the advocacy on the actual quality of institutionalization – and not just the institutionalization process itself – and to give higher priority to the objectives of capacity building, case studies, and internal communications within WWF.

In terms of other indicators that could be used in the project monitoring matrix, the project team suggested developing indicators to measure the integration of sustainability into trade policies. However, it is not always the role of WWF to come up with the indicators. In the Philippines, WWF is playing the role of a facilitator, and it is the multidisciplinary Technical Working Group who is responsible for developing indicators to measure the effectiveness of the SA.

5.5.2. Effectiveness of Project Monitoring and Evaluation

In its first year of operation, the reports produced within the project were largely descriptive and activity-focused, and did not provide a very strategic basis upon which to monitor progress. However, great progress was made with the targets and indicators that were developed, and used in the monitoring matrix attached to the six-monthly reports for the period ending 30 June 2002, as shown by the consolidated matrix in Table 1 above.

"The monitoring matrix [developed for this evaluation] has been very helpful for us. It actually enhanced our own monitoring matrix, and our set of indicators."

(Project team member)

Furthermore, our interviews with the project team indicated that they were very much engaged in action learning, and were actively drawing lessons from their work in the formative stages of SA, though they were perhaps not always systematically recording and sharing these lessons.

The investment of the project in this mid-term evaluation demonstrates its commitment to developing a rigorous monitoring and evaluation system.

5.6. PROJECT COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES

5.6.1. BalancedTrade Web Site

The project website, <http://www.balancedtrade.panda.org/>, has been up for a little over a year, and receives about 450 visits per day on average. The site is updated regularly, with news and new reports.

In general, our respondents found the website to be useful and generally user-friendly. Many respondents felt that it is an invaluable resource.

The project is to be commended for creating a site that goes well beyond the scope of WWF's work on SAs, and includes information on all types of trade-related assessments, as well as documents from many partner organizations. Both the project team and external respondents reported that the site is a great resource for building capacity on SA with other NGOs and government agencies, and that their partners feel they get meaningful information from the site.

"The site is very good – it's better than ours. We are very pleased to be able to put our reports there."

(Respondent from the international policy group)

Shortcomings and recommendations include:

- The site and its pages are sometimes painfully slow to load, even in the North with a high-speed connection. When this occurs, it is a serious problem that undoubtedly inhibits all but the most dedicated users.
- The BalancedTrade site is not sufficiently visible from the WWF website, www.panda.org – the user needs the search engine to find it.
- Users do not easily find the link to the SA site from WWF's Trade & Investment page.
- The wildlife trade page of panda.org could also provide a link to the SA page.
- The reports available on the site could be presented in a more user-friendly way, with a picture of the cover, and information such as the size of the digital file, the number of pages in the report, the report's target audience, and a sentence saying what is in the report. As it is now, the user has to download a report to see what is in it, which takes time, and can end in frustration if it is not what the user had hoped for.
- Some of the pages, and even the site, did not load the first time we tried it.
- On several occasions the server was unable to present the website because of high traffic.
- A Spanish version of the site would be very welcome in Latin America. Though this would involve substantial resources, we suggest that this might be a cost-effective means of building capacity on SA in Latin America.
- Some respondents requested more detail on methodology for actually carrying out SAs in different sectors.
- The larger, more technical documents should also have short, non-technical summaries, putting the information in a friendly format for the non-specialist.

5.6.2. Project Publications and Resource Papers

As part of the project a number of publications have been produced, geared to different audiences. They include:

- glossy documents, such as *Balanced Process*, *Balanced Results*, which explain sustainability assessments and trade to a broad audience
- policy papers, such as *Critical Elements for Sustainability Assessment*
- technical papers, e.g., *Response to the final report by Manchester University on phase III SIA methodology*, and
- questions and answers to help people better understand the SA concept.

The case study reports from the soy study in Brazil and the live reef fish industry work in the Philippines are expected soon, and should make an important contribution to the literature on trade-related assessments.

Members of the project team have found the two new position papers on the elements of a good sustainable assessment and on effective stakeholder participation to be very useful. These papers give WWF clear criteria with which to evaluate what is being produced by governments.

"I think WWF should be commended for taking on the project itself. WWF is doing a great job trying to bring more fact-based arguments into the debate. The [Brazil] case study will be a great contribution when it is done."

(Respondent from the international policy group)

In general the project publications have been widely requested, and well received. According to our respondents, demand has outstripped supply in some countries. Some project documents have been translated in to Spanish, e.g., the Quito report, the "Balanced Process" brochure, the NGO sign-on statement from Quebec, and the two recent position statements on effective SAs and good stakeholder consultation. However, most of the publications are available only in English, which severely limits their utility in many parts of the world. Since the project is focusing on Brazil and Latin America, it would be helpful to translate as many publications as possible into Spanish and Portuguese. WWF Norway has translated some of the material into Norwegian.

Some respondents found the publications to be too general. There seems to be a need for more focused documents discussing specific areas or issues, e.g. methodologies, or specific contexts such as the US, the EU or Latin America. More than one external respondent would have liked more specialist, technical papers from WWF.

Others found the publications too technical, and suggested producing documents of more interest to the general public.

One respondent commented that *Balanced Process, Balanced Results* seemed to fall in between, lacking the detail to impact trade policy experts, and at the same time not being general enough for the masses – i.e., the target audience for this publication was not clear.

Some respondents expressed concern that the papers were too conceptual, and need to present more empirical evidence of the value of SA. This should be remedied with the publication of case studies in the next month or so. The full case studies are likely to be detailed and lengthy, and it will be crucial that they have excellent executive summaries, and are accompanied by one-to-two page briefs that identify the policy implications, as well as the results of the study.

In general, our respondents who had read the project papers were highly complimentary about their quality and usefulness.

5.6.3. Communications Messages for External Audiences

WWF often produces good technical reports that are valuable as reference documents, but that are not very effective at getting messages across. For documents directed at the general public, the project needs to make an effort to be shorter, clearer, and more popular in its writing.

It is a challenge to communicate effectively on such a complex subject as SA. The project is presently employing a very promising strategy, namely to show that SA matters at a human level, by sending a top-notch environmental journalist to the Philippines to do a story on the case study that has been carried out on the live reef fish industry. This is an effort to inject on-the-ground reality into what is often a very abstruse debate – to translate the theory of SA into something the informed public can understand. This will be the first time that a journalist has looked at SA in depth.

"Our messages are:

- For NGOs: "Wake up to SAs!"
- For the EC: "Do this properly; don't be cynical, and use it!"
- For the press, "We want SA to work, but it has to be done correctly – no greenwashing!"

(Project team member)

Another important strategy is to make sure that papers are written occasionally for the peer-reviewed literature, and published in periodicals such as *Foreign Affairs*, or other journals in the fields of trade policy, EIAs, agricultural economics, etc. This is critical if WWF is to get the debate on SAs out into the decision-making world.

The project could work with Claude Martin to do an opinion editorial on trade for major, influential broadsheets such as the *International Herald Tribune*, *Financial Times*, *Wall St Journal*, *Washington Post*, etc.

When communicating with NGOs, it is important to remember that SAs are quite peripheral to most NGOs. WWF should sell SAs not as a good thing *per se*, but should demonstrate how SA can produce concrete benefits to specific stakeholders: development NGOs, gender NGOs, environment NGOs, etc.

It may be worthwhile considering media other than publications – such as films, videos, or an international, moderated e-group – to get the message out about what SAs have to offer.

5.6.4. Internal Communications

Knowledge of the SA Project

We interviewed 15 senior WWF staff, the names of ten of whom were given to us by the project. The evaluation team chose an additional five ecoregion coordinators, selected at random from among WWF's priority ecoregions. As shown in the responses below, nine out of ten of the respondents suggested by the project had heard of the SA project, and had seen its publications. Of the five respondents randomly selected by the evaluation team, two had vaguely heard of the project, but none could recall any of the project publications.

Interview Question	Responses of WWF Staff						
	Staff Suggested by Project			Randomly Selected			Total (n=15)
	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	?	Yes
Have you heard about WWF's project on SAs?	9	1		2	2	1	11
Have you seen the BalancedTrade website?	3	7		2	3		5
Have you read or used any of the project's publications?	9	1		0	4	1	9

We noted that this evaluation itself contributed to raising awareness of SA in the WWF Network. One ecoregion coordinator who had never heard of the project said "It is exciting to see the SA initiative – there are huge opportunities for this here."

Communications within the WWF Network

The project clearly needs to redouble its efforts on internal communications within WWF, and in particular liaising more closely with the organization's Target Driven Programmes and ecoregions. The most effective communications in WWF are face-to-face, and the best way the project could improve its internal communications would be to ensure that SA has a slot on the agendas of key meetings, and to send a representative to make presentations at TDP, Advisory Group, ecoregion, regional Sub-Committee, and/or sub-regional team meetings. For example, an Asia/Pacific regional workshop was recently held for ecoregion conservation – this would have been an ideal opportunity to introduce ecoregion coordinators to SA as a tool for ecoregion conservation. The SA project team should also think of inviting ecoregion people to its own meetings, especially to meetings with stakeholders for the case studies.

"You need to talk to stimulate interest."
(WWF respondent)

"You need to know who needs to know, and then go to them."
(Project team member)

In addition, there appears to be a need for the project to clarify, within the WWF Network, how sustainability assessment is both different from and complementary to WWF's work on root causes analysis (RCA) carried out by the Macroeconomic Policy Office in Washington. RCA has been widely adopted in WWF as an important tool for directing ecoregion efforts. The project should make an effort to communicate the added value that SA brings (going beyond research, giving recommendations, getting into dialogue with stakeholders).

One factor that makes internal communications more difficult is that WWF is only now developing a Network-wide trade and investment strategy. Such a strategy should help to position SA within WWF's overall work on trade.

Communications on SA are challenging because the subject is complicated, and the tool is not obvious. Suggestions for improving communications within WWF would include:

- Break down different target audiences within WWF, and prioritize them.
- Give priority to getting to the right WWF meetings, and being given a presentation slot.
- One of the best ways to communicate internally is to do external communications, such as Op Eds in influential newspapers as suggested above. When staff see a WWF topic featured in the media, they easily grasp its importance.
- Write an article for the *WWF Features*.
- Continue to use the *WWF Bulletin* for news.
- When the project sends out formal reports, the WWF Trade and Investment Core Team requested email updates in the form of short summaries with a link to the report, rather than emailing the whole report itself.
- Publicize the existence of the email list for updates on SA, and find out who else would be interested in being on this list.
- Avoid over-reliance on email. Most people in WWF are suffering from email overload, and many people, in the interest of prioritizing, delete messages without reading them.
- Publicize the website internally by producing and distributing little stickers with the URL, and make the website more visible from panda.org.
- Think carefully about to whom documents and emails are sent, and do not assume they will be forwarded to the appropriate person.
- Consider road shows, lunch-time presentations, competitions, and other interactive methods to engage WWF staff.

Communications within the Project

Communications within the project itself seem to be satisfactory. Team members appreciate the efforts of the Coordinator to keep them informed of developments.

There are communications challenges that are inherent in decentralized, geographically dispersed teams. One team member said the team should avoid so much travel, citing the February 2002 workshop; another team member said it was good to get the team together in February. In general, elsewhere, experience has shown that face-to-face meetings at least once a year are critical to the efficient functioning of a decentralized team.

Suggestions for improvement included finding a way to share information more effectively, e.g., by providing a regular update of what is going on in the various countries where the project is working – perhaps a short monthly report on what each unit is doing, modelled on the weekly reports at WWF US.

5.7. TRADE-RELATED ASSESSMENTS IN GENERAL

5.7.1. Emerging Concept or Mainstream Tool?

The vast majority of our respondents felt that sustainability assessments are still in their infancy. SAs are the more holistic child of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which has been around for many decades. When the EC began its work on SIAs in 1999, the methodology was in its infancy, and had to be developed. The development of the methodology is still very much a work in progress.

"Two years ago people in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would think I was crazy to talk about SA. Today they accept the concept, but are far from implementing it."

(Respondent from Latin America)

Our respondents in Latin America and Asia reported major advances over the last two years in government and NGO receptivity to SA as a tool. We were told that in Brazil, SA has become an important tool for landless farmers.

One problem is that SAs are still seen as a concept. To become more of a mainstream tool, they need to become more tangible. Essentially more experience is needed before SAs are commonly used. This is one reason why the project's focus on case studies is so important.

SAs are being practiced under a variety of names (see section on approaches above). Indonesia, for example, has set up a multi-stakeholder export panel using the protocols of the Marine Aquarium Council to assess the sustainability of the marine aquarium trade.

Unfortunately, the debate at the WSSD did not serve to move the concept of SA forward, and most of the summit was spent just holding the line. However, the fact that SA was not dropped in the WSSD prepcoms shows that there is broad interest in the concept. That SA was actively debated at the WSSD and the prepcoms could be considered a success in itself, though progress was disappointing.

In the EU, one could say that SIAs have moved beyond the stage of an emerging concept because they are actually being carried out, but the integration of SIA results into trade policy has not yet begun.

"There is now a network of people who are aware of SIAs and their complexity. But the results are not yet sufficiently demonstrative to say they are mainstream. On the process side, there is good understanding of the importance of openness, e.g., consulting NGOs, sharing experience in developing countries. I think there is some awareness, but the methodology is very complex, and the work itself is very complex. There is a lot of work to make the methodology work."

(Respondent from the international policy group)

Considering that SA was practically unheard of two to three years ago, the concept has made huge advances in a very short time.

5.7.2. Lessons in Assessment Methodologies

A wide range of case studies, conducted by different governmental and non-governmental organizations, and highlighting the linkages between trade liberalization and environmental and social impacts, currently exist. While they share a common aim, their means of assessing the impacts of trade often differ. Some of these studies use complex modelling, while others rely primarily on anecdotal evidence.

There are many different techniques and tools employed to assess the impacts of trade. These include macroeconomic modelling through general equilibrium or partial equilibrium models, sector-based or micro-analysis, as well as socio-political assessments. Other tools used to derive information and recommendations include cost-benefit analysis, multi-criteria analysis, social impact assessments, risk assessment, environmental impact assessment, and environmental valuation methodologies. The appropriate assessment techniques are determined primarily by the focus of the studies. Most organizations carrying out trade assessments outline a basic "assessment framework", and offer analysts a suite of different tools by which to carry out the assessment. In most case studies the methodology must be tailored to the specific context of the study at hand.

Assessments of trade tend to serve two main functions:

- to inform deliberations within national governments aimed at formulating approaches to trade policy and liberalization, and
- to assess potential impacts of proposed trade agreements and to provide input into bilateral or multilateral trade negotiations.

The studies carried out by the EU, for example, are geared entirely towards future negotiations within the WTO, whereas UNEP, WWF and CEC have focused more on informing deliberations within national governments on trade policy, sometimes looking *ex post* at the impacts of past trade liberalization.

A sectoral approach to sustainability assessment, examining the impacts of trade liberalization on a sector, or even on a specific commodity within a sector, is considered the most feasible. Sectoral analysis requires the development of clear criteria for the selection of which sectors to investigate. In addition, the CEC and UNEP also stipulate criteria for selecting related sectors that might have important upstream or downstream impacts on the primary sector under investigation. Because a sectoral approach is often more feasible than one that is economy-wide, a substantial body of work has developed in a wide range of sectors, such as forestry, fisheries, energy and agriculture.

In contrast with the US, Canada and Norway, which focus only on the environmental aspects of a trade agreement, the assessments done by UNEP, the EC and WWF include social aspects as well, and the analysis becomes more complex. This complexity is compounded when the assessment attempts to cover global trade agreements with significant and far-reaching impacts on a country's economy. The EC, for example, has carried out an SIA of the potential impact of different WTO scenarios for the major food crop sectors. One of the principal weaknesses of this study, which relied on macroeconomic modelling, was that it generated aggregated results that lost much critical information at the micro level, and there was a real gap between the macro-level economic analysis and the links to the sustainability impacts in the field.

The Manchester methodology used by the EC, based on modelling with a few highly aggregated indicators, is criticized as opaque and difficult to apply. WWF has argued that there should be far more indicators.

It was also found that, when using these macroeconomic models, the margins of error were very significant. This makes it difficult to base any concrete policy recommendations on the results, although the models can be effective in predicting trends.

Sustainability Assessment (WWF) and Integrated Assessment (UNEP) attempt to overcome these obstacles by making the links between the macro and micro levels clearer, incorporating a strong public participation element, and reducing the scope of the analysis. This makes the studies more useful, credible, and independent, though some people have reservations about their analytical rigour. Compared to modelling approaches, SA and Integrated Assessment are based on a more bottom-up, focused analysis with clear links to the field and input from stakeholders.

One methodological question that arises with SA is how to weight the environmental, social and economic impacts in the overall analysis and recommendations. How to integrate the results is an aspect of the methodology where transparency and stakeholder input are critical.

A substantial remaining problem in all methodologies is the difficulty of disaggregating the actual, additional impacts that result from changing trade patterns, from changes that are already occurring as a result of economic reform or other factors.

A number of respondents expressed concern that in all of the methodologies, trade liberalization is taken as a given, and that the recommendations only look at ways to reduce any negative environmental and social impacts, rather starting from a commitment to sustainable development as the overriding goal, and recommending trade patterns that would be consistent with this.

5.7.3. Monitoring the Effectiveness of SAs

It is early days yet for monitoring the effectiveness of SAs. WWF does attempt to review every official document that is produced. This is currently being done in the US, EU and Norway. In the EU and the US, WWF has produced critiques jointly with other organizations such as Oxfam and CIEL.

Beyond the phase of soliciting public comment, there do not seem to be any official processes to monitor implementation of SAs. The key to effective monitoring will be to increase transparency, especially regarding the translation of recommendations into policy. In its recent position paper on critical elements for a multi-stakeholder process, the project advocates that:

...the results be disseminated widely and address, in writing, the nature of the issues raised and how they have been taken into account in the SA and, where relevant, why they have not been included. Outcomes should also reflect areas of disagreement, whether or not they have been handled.

"I don't yet see the findings from SAs used in discourse or policy briefs in the everyday workings of WWF. But it will be a great contribution when it is done."

(Respondent from the international policy group)

5.7.4. Major Problems and Constraints of Trade-related Assessments

The evaluation has identified the following problems and constraints of trade related assessments.

Political support:

A major problem, which is central to promoting sustainable development, is that there simply is not the political support in many countries to carry out SAs. Governments work to short-term political cycles, and are preoccupied with economic urgency, not sustainable development. Poorer countries in particular must resolve short-term priorities such as increasing export production and foreign exchange earnings in order to have the luxury to look at the longer-term issues of sustainable development. However, as some of the case studies show, this focus on the short term may well hurt their economic prospects over the longer term.

Even in countries that do carry out assessments, the major constraints are political. Several respondents said that there has been no real effort in either the US or the EU to carry out meaningful assessments, largely to avoid conflicts with economic interests. They question whether the US or the EU would accept an assessment that found that trade would have significant negative impacts on the environment. This points to the importance of advocacy work in ensuring that SAs are actually used to inform policy.

"The EU SIA process is based on the premise that the trade liberalization process should not be criticized per se. SIA is really just an academic exercise, because the EC is not willing to make policy changes as a result of an SIA."

(Anonymous respondent)

Methodology:

For those involved in trade-related assessments, there is often confusion over what methodology to adopt, and how to apply it. Past applications have shown that the information generated has significant margins of error, often producing vague recommendations that may be of little use in deciding policy. Some view trade-related assessment as a technical issue of limited effectiveness, and therefore are not interested in its application. Furthermore, there are real difficulties in making robust links between trade policy and field impacts. Many distrust the ability of these tools to accurately forecast impacts. New and better indicators are needed to grapple effectively with the complexity of the task. In general, the scientific tools for assessment need to be improved, and this is an ongoing challenge for practitioners.

Information:

A real obstacle, particularly in developing countries, is the lack of updated statistical information on social indicators, the environment, and other sectors and issues. Access to good empirical data is important for effective assessment of the impacts of trade policies at the field level. When data are not available, a first productive step is to identify the critical information gaps, and then fill them.

Resources and capacity:

Given the scope of SA – examining the social, environmental and economic impacts of trade agreements – the resources and technical expertise required to carry them out can be considerable. This is an obstacle to its application everywhere, and even more so in developing countries. Many simply do not have the staff, institutional mechanisms, or resources to invest in SAs. Furthermore, the capacity of civil society to engage in trade issues is weak because of the complexity of these issues.

Trade negotiation realities:

The momentum behind trade negotiations is to improve a country's trade relationships. Several of our respondents affirmed that negotiators tend not to be interested in the outcome of the SA, except in so far as it helps enhance the trading position of their country. Concerted attempts to really understand the impacts of trade are compromised when the issues are highly politicized.

"If SAs were not so political, then they could be done honestly. Then you would actually look at what some of the negative effects might be. In the US and Canada, anything that is negative will be taken by opponents and used to stop the agreement. That is a big reason why in the US, SAs are almost greenwashing, i.e., tools to justify US trade objectives."

(Anonymous respondent)

Confidentiality of negotiation positions:

Some information is extremely sensitive, and governments will not want to put this information (for example on the effects of changes to trade flows) into the hands of their trading partners, for fear of compromising their trading position.

Integrating divergent viewpoints:

SA is based on an interdisciplinary approach that requires input from government agencies responsible for trade, environment and development, and from a diverse range of stakeholders, often with divergent views. It can be a considerable challenge, when bringing these parties together, to find a common solution.

Green protectionism:

Many developing countries fear that SA could be used as conditionality on their trade. They ask "Will the results be used to boycott us – to keep our products out?" The anxiety of these developing countries is linked to the broader political debate on trade and environment, and is split along North-South lines, as is the debate on subsidies. In addition, there is resistance, since SA is perceived as a Northern tool.

Greenwashing:

Any impact assessment can be made into a greenwash. In a highly politicized situation, consultants can be pressured to pick the parameters and weight the indicators to skew the results in a desired direction, and produce a study that still appears impartial. On the other hand, trade assessments could be a valuable tool if they are done objectively and impartially, and in accordance with stringent methodological standards. This highlights the critical role for NGOs and the public as a watchdog for SA, and the importance of building capacity to engage by commenting critically on the methodology, the results, and the recommendations.

Awareness:

Sustainability assessments are generally perceived as very technical and complex. There is a lack of awareness of what the tool can do, and people do not see the scope of benefits they could derive from it. SA needs to be made more appealing so that more people recognise its importance and are willing to use it in their

"What you are still seeing is the field-policy disconnect. The people in the field have lots of day-to-day problems, and trade is not on their radar screen."

(WWF respondent)

work. This can be achieved by producing more solid examples, as this project is attempting to do through its case studies, to demonstrate the relevance of SA to stakeholders and policy makers.

5.7.5. Ingredients of a Good Trade-Related Assessment

The project has recently published a position paper defining the critical elements for sustainability assessment:

- *Objectives*: The purpose of SA is to develop and implement policies to ensure that the benefits from trade are realised and that potential adverse impacts are mitigated or avoided.
- *Timing*: SA should be conducted sufficiently early in the policy-making process to have an impact on the development of policies.
- *Multidisciplinary responsibility*: All relevant government departments must be equally and effectively involved in the process.
- *Participation and process*: SA should be open and transparent. It should include all relevant stakeholders in an ongoing process, which continues after the agreement/policy is implemented, and which provides follow-up and monitoring.
- *Method*: The SA should clearly identify its overall approach and methodology.
- *Starting with sustainability*: SA should identify a clear "sustainability" baseline for the issue/sector under investigation, describing current economic, developmental and environmental conditions.
- *Sustainability impacts*: SA should identify positive and negative effects, including economic, environmental, developmental and regulatory impacts, at domestic and international levels.
- *Trade focus*: SA should consider trade policy in a broad sense.
- *Considering alternatives*: SA should focus not only on the trade policy measure or trade agreement being reviewed, but also on alternatives.
- *Policy recommendations*: SA should provide concrete policy recommendations related to trade and non-trade factors.

Further to the project position paper, we would emphasize the following.

Putting sustainability at the core:

The purpose of any SA must be to promote sustainable development. A basic step is to have a vision, and a clear set of indicators – economic, social and environmental – defining what sustainability is in the sector or sectors concerned. This benchmarking is absolutely necessary. The SA must then identify positive and negative impacts of changing trade patterns related to these indicators, and assess whether the changes are leading to more or less sustainable activities. Based on this, the assessment should recommend the appropriate action. A good SA should have an options assessment that examines different alternatives to reach sustainable development.

Participation and process:

A clear approach to effective multi-stakeholder participation will bring legitimacy, credibility and independence to the assessment, and improve its quality and usefulness. The stakeholders must be able to access sufficient information to make informed inputs. Owing to the interdisciplinary nature of the assessment, a wide variety of stakeholders from diverse backgrounds need to be consulted. Policy recommendations coming out of the SA should reflect the inputs of all the stakeholders.

Timing and independence:

Negotiating realities will also dictate the timing of the assessment. SA should be conducted sufficiently early so that policy makers can take full advantage of the results of the assessment to help them develop policies and direct negotiating positions. The assessment should have considerable input from those involved in the negotiating process. At the same time, it should be independent, but should not be only an academic exercise. It is difficult to build some scenarios for the SA, if the negotiation process is not sufficiently advanced, and people are still hiding their positions. Then only some general scenarios can be assessed. Timing must be sufficiently early to influence negotiations, but at the same time, late enough to know more about precise elements of the negotiations, which helps focus the SA.

Method:

There is no generic methodology that should be adopted; it should be decided on a case-by-case approach and respond to local realities and needs. There are a number of existing frameworks, such as the UNEP manual on Integrated Assessments that can help guide the process. The assessments should use a mix of qualitative and quantitative tools to get a balance between analytical rigour and an understanding of the environmental and social impacts at the field level. Grassroots participatory research methods have not been sufficiently used in SA to date, and WWF should advocate for this. It is important that the indicators and results are disaggregated, for example in social analyses by examining impacts on poverty, human rights, health, gender inequalities, minorities, etc. A sound and participatory assessment is necessary to generate the information needed to inform basic policies. The assessment should look at both environmental and social impacts at national and international levels. *Ex-post*, as well as *ex-ante* assessments should be carried out to provide a retrospective examination of the environmental, economic and developmental effects of trade policy in order to develop corrective actions and provide lessons for future assessments. The most important aspect of a good methodology is that it is transparent and objective.

Capacity and resources:

In developing countries in particular there are a lack of resources and expertise to carry out assessments of trade agreements. It is new language and a new tool that requires a wide range of expertise. It is also very demanding in terms of information – economic, environmental, and social – which is often lacking in poorer countries. A critical ingredient for SAs, especially in developing countries, is resources and capacity.

Government commitment:

For a sustainability assessment to have an impact on policy development, there must be a high-level commitment to its use. The results are unlikely to be taken seriously unless it is formally enshrined in national legislation. However, a lack of legislation should not imply that an assessment should not be carried out. If SAs are carried out and provide constructive information, governments may be more willing to formally accept their use.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

External Perceptions of the Project

When asked "What do you think about WWF's project on SA?", all of our external respondents who were familiar with the project were positive about it, and many were enthusiastic, saying that the project is "great", "really important", "much needed", and that they are glad WWF is doing this.

The seriousness and rationality of the scientific approach was praised, as was the effort the project has made to focus on developing countries. External respondents reported that the project has been very useful for introducing sustainability issues to those who are engaged in policy-making, and that it has had an impact on putting sustainability assessments on agendas.

"It's great that WWF took the leadership in this – great in participation too. The project seems to have engaged well known people in the field, and is on the road to something really good, even though it is only in mid-stream at this point."

(Respondent from the international policy group)

"We count on the expertise and knowledge of WWF in this field. WWF is known to be the lead NGO on SA."

(Respondent from the international policy group)

WWF is perceived as very well respected in the policy arena. One of the organization's strengths is that it is seen as making constructive comments. Several respondents welcomed the fact that the project has attempted to go beyond general discussions on SA, and to provide strong, fact-based arguments.

"I think it is a trail-blazing activity. The results are really interesting."

(Respondent from Asia)

A broad cross-section of our respondents emphasized the importance of SA as a tool for enhancing participation, and many said this was equally or even more important than its function of gathering information. One of the major benefits of SAs to date has been in providing a platform for debate, and helping people to become more knowledgeable about trade and its environmental and social impacts.

Many external respondents praised WWF's balanced approach to trade. WWF has carved a "middle ground" niche for itself, recognizing that trade has the potential to contribute, perhaps more than anything, to poverty alleviation, but that objective and principled analyses are needed to ensure that potentially harmful impacts can be identified and appropriate mitigation measures applied.

Progress towards Objectives

SA is a tool that is still being tested. This project is making a positive contribution to the debate about the value and relevance of SA by helping to test what SA is all about – how to do it on the ground, and how to use the information generated to inform government decisions on trade. One of the greatest values of SAs is that, where they have been initiated, they are making people think, and ask questions they would not otherwise ask. SAs offer a formidable platform for dialogue, giving civil society and other stakeholders an opportunity to engage in trade issues. SA provides an opportunity for entry, so that civil society can question whether a government's trade policy is consistent with its commitment to sustainable development.

In general, the project is making progress towards each of its objectives, as shown in the monitoring matrix on page 10. Then again, as with any advocacy project, political processes are largely beyond the control of WWF.

The project is on the right course in its advocacy work, lobbying for transparency, rigour, and stakeholder representation in the SA process. The two new position papers on critical elements of SA and on stakeholder involvement bring important and constructive contributions to the debate.

Progress has definitely been made on institutionalization of SA in the EU, the US, and the Philippines. However, there is a high level of mistrust of SA in many developing countries, who fear it will be used to prevent them from gaining market access. The project plans to address this challenge at the upcoming Ministerial meeting in Quito in November 2002, and the 5th WTO Ministerial Meeting in September 2003.

Questions arose, however, on the goal of institutionalizing SA. If it is not done properly, there is a risk that institutionalization of SAs may not actually contribute to sustainable development. WWF and other NGOs need to ensure the quality of this tool as it is institutionalized.

Even in countries where trade assessments are carried out, there is little evidence as yet that they have had a positive influence on trade policies and decisions. WWF and other NGOs have a critical role to play in ensuring that SAs are designed and carried out with integrity, and that their findings actually do promote sustainable development.

Work on capacity building is considered a priority, but in many cases, has progressed more slowly than expected. At the present stage, it is important to feed into SAs that have methodological and procedural implications, e.g., when to involve stakeholders, how much, how to do ToR, how to select the sector, how to scope out the assessment, timing issues, and the process of two-way dialogue with

the negotiations. As SAs are completed, best practice and poor practice are going to emerge. It is critical when SAs are put out for comment, that WWF, other NGOs, and civil society have the capacity to respond technically to assessments before they are finalized.

The case studies in Brazil and the Philippines are near completion, and a proposal has been submitted for funding for a third case study in Turkey. One lesson that can be learned from results to date is that sustainability is enhanced when a project acts as a facilitator rather than an implementer. In the Philippines, for example, the project – rather than carrying out the case study itself – created an independent Technical Working Group to oversee and manage the case study. The difference between the two case studies in Brazil and the Philippines is striking. We believe that one of the reasons for success in the Philippines is the project’s strategy to bring representatives of government agencies and of producers into the case study early – at the design stage – and to give full responsibility for, and ownership of, the case study to this carefully selected, multi-stakeholder group. The TWG also appears to function as an effective means for building capacity.

"If SA is to be a major plank of WWF's work, it needs more resources to relate SAs more to the major thematic issues of WWF's work."
(WWF TDP Director)

Trade policy is one of the major issues that cut across virtually all of WWF’s work. We interviewed the directors of WWF’s forest, freshwater, marine and species programmes, who all felt that this is a very important project for WWF. In fact, among all the WWF respondents who knew enough about the project to have an opinion on it, there was unanimity on the importance of the project for WWF. However, little progress seems to have been made in mainstreaming SA within WWF or in incorporating SA into WWF’s ecoregional work. WWF runs a very real risk that trade will continue to undermine conservation goals unless sustainable development becomes the foundation of trade policies.

"The SA project is one of the few toeholds WWF still has on trade issues. SAs could be very central to WWF's lobbying, to TDPs, and to ecoregion work. This is a little project with a big task."
(WWF respondent)

"I would recommend that SAs be used in all WWF NOs. This is a fabulous tool. This is something we should disseminate to a large audience. It is key to achieving conservation goals."
(Lory Tan, President, WWF Philippines, cited with permission)

Realism of Project Objectives

The project was set up with the intention of operating for a limited, three-year timeframe, and within that short time, to generate momentum to keep the interest in SA alive in governments, in other NGOs, and within WWF itself.

The project’s assessment of the political climate over the duration of the project period seems now to have been a bit optimistic. Even so, the project’s objectives, targets, and indicators are, in general, reasonable, as demonstrated by the considerable achievements detailed in the project monitoring matrix above. Nevertheless, the short timeframe of the project poses problems for some objectives. It now looks as though it may be difficult to achieve the targets for capacity building within the three-year project period. Likewise institutionalization – and especially ensuring the quality of institutionalization – takes time.

The project has been steadily building momentum during its first year and a half of operation, and we predict that this gain in momentum will increase throughout the remainder of the project. Given the likelihood

"I would not like to see this project gone. If you leave this regionally, this effort we have all worked for for years will be forgotten. We don't want that."
(Respondent in Latin America)

that the project will be at its most effective in year three, and the lack of a clear exit strategy, we question the wisdom of shutting it down after that time.

Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

The first two sets of six-monthly project reports produced were largely descriptive, and did not provide a strategic or systematic basis for monitoring progress. However, great progress was made with the development of targets and indicators, and the third set of six-monthly reports including the use of the monitoring matrix. This, together with the project's commitment to carrying out both mid-term and final evaluations, provides a good basis for effective M&E.

Internal and External Communications

The project has produced an excellent website (www.balancedtrade.panda.org), to which a number of improvements could be made. The publications produced by the project – glossy documents, policy papers, technical papers, etc. – have been widely requested and, in general, well received.

Communications within the WWF Network have remained a challenge, and will require more effort during the second half of the project. Within the project itself, communications seem to be satisfactory, and the work of the Project Coordinator in this regard is much appreciated.

Problems / Constraints, and Recommendations

As discussed above (pages 29-34), trade-related assessments have their own set of problems and constraints:

- Political support is lacking in many countries to carry out SAs. Even in countries that do trade assessments, economic interests predominate.
- The methodology is in its infancy, and scientific tools for assessment need to be improved.
- Empirical data are often lacking on social, environmental and economic indicators.
- Many countries do not have the staff, institutional mechanisms or resources to invest in SA.
- Trade negotiations are highly politicized, and the concern of negotiators is not sustainability, but the enhancement of their country's negotiating position.
- Trade negotiating positions are often confidential, which makes it difficult to design a relevant trade assessment.
- SAs are still seen as a concept, and need to become more tangible (e.g., through case studies).
- In all methodologies, trade liberalization tends to be taken as a given.
- The integration of the results of trade assessments into trade policy has not yet really begun.
- Critical information is lost when results are aggregated in macro-economic modelling. Furthermore, the margins of error in these models make it difficult to base policy recommendations on the results.
- It may not be clear how to weight environmental, social, and economic impacts when integrating SA results.
- It is challenging to find a common position with a diverse group of stakeholders, who often have divergent views.
- It is difficult to distinguish the actual impacts from changing trade patterns from other changes that are already occurring, i.e., to make robust links between trade policy and field impacts.
- Beyond the phase of soliciting public comment, official processes to monitor the implementation of SAs are lacking.
- There is generally a lack of awareness of what SA can do, and the benefits that parties can derive from it.

Given this long list of difficulties, it is clear that the WWF SA project has a truly daunting task to create the context for, and catalyse effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment. The following table presents the major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered by the project, and recommendations for resolving them and for enhancing the positive impact of the project.

Table 2. Problems / Constraints, and Recommendations for Enhancing Project Impact

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
<p>1. <u>Sustainable development as an over-riding goal</u>: If outcomes of SAs must fit into current governance models of how economic liberalization is undertaken, there may be little they can change.</p>	<p>1. What is needed is a paradigm shift of trade actually pursuing the goals of sustainable development, and WWF should reinforce its advocacy work in this sense. Every SA should have: - a clear set of economic, social, and environmental indicators that define what sustainability is in the sector concerned - an options assessment examining alternatives for sustainable development.</p>
<p>2. <u>Risk of greenwashing</u>: The litmus test of the value of SAs will be reflected in whether they actually make a positive influence on trade negotiating agendas. Many NGOs point to the grave danger that the SA process could easily be subverted to greenwashing, by going through the motions of assessing sustainability, while allowing economic and political forces alone to drive trade agendas.</p>	<p>2. WWF and other NGOs have a critical role to play in ensuring that SAs are designed and carried out with integrity, and in making sure that their findings actually do influence trade policies and promote sustainable development.</p>
<p>3. <u>Institutionalization</u>: There is a risk that institutionalization of SAs – unless their application is rigorous and principled – may not actually contribute to sustainable development.</p>	<p>3. WWF and other NGOs need to ensure the quality of the institutionalization of this tool. It would be worthwhile in the second half of the project to focus the advocacy on the actual quality of institutionalization, and to give higher priority to the objectives of capacity building (especially with civil society and negotiators), case studies, and internal communications within WWF.</p>
<p>4. <u>Scepticism of developing countries</u>: The high level of mistrust in many developing countries that SA is a Northern tool aimed at preventing market access for the South is an important problem.</p>	<p>4. The project is addressing this, but countering this scepticism is a major challenge that will likely require substantially more resources than the project currently has available.</p>
<p>5. <u>Assistance to developing countries</u>: A good deal more work is needed to encourage governments or trading blocs to provide financial and technical assistance to developing countries for capacity building in SAs.</p>	<p>5. This should be given a higher priority in the project's communications and advocacy efforts.</p>
<p>6. <u>Capacity to engage</u>: Capacity is limited in the WWF Network, in other NGOs, and in civil society to comment critically on the methodology, the results, and the recommendations of SAs when they are put out for comment.</p>	<p>6. It is very important to build this capacity so that the WWF Network and other NGOs can fulfil their watchdog role to ensure that SAs are done with integrity and promote sustainable development.</p>

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
<p>7. <u>Language</u>: The project has translated some documents into Spanish. Nevertheless, in Latin America the project's capacity building work has been limited by the lack of documents and internet resources available in Spanish and Portuguese.</p>	<p>7. Since the project is focusing on Brazil and Latin America, it would be helpful to translate as many publications as possible into Spanish and Portuguese, and raise funds for a Spanish version of the website.</p>
<p>8. <u>Capacity building strategy</u>: Although capacity building is a priority, the project lacks a capacity building strategy.</p>	<p>8. We recommend that the project take a more strategic approach to capacity building, identifying: critical areas where trade has the biggest impact, key targets for building capacity, and the needs of these target populations. If the project requests funding for a second phase, the project proposal should contain a well-researched capacity building plan. South-South capacity building has been shown to be effective elsewhere – perhaps in future work, experts from the Philippines, for example, could help build capacity in other countries.</p>
<p>9. <u>Need for long-term capacity building</u>: Respondents from Latin America, for example, fear that SA would die in the region without strong organizations like WWF, to supporting the SA work that has been done, and to push for more.</p>	<p>9. Before closing the SA project, WWF needs a realistic exit strategy for how SA work will continue.</p>
<p>10. <u>Action learning for advocacy</u>: The project could be more systematic in its efforts to learn and share lessons from its own advocacy work.</p>	<p>10. One way to improve project performance would be to build feedback loops into the project's advocacy work, making sure that lessons are learned – and shared – each time the project engages in a particular advocacy effort. One way to do this would be to commission an external consultant to do a lessons learned paper for key advocacy efforts. But, more importantly, the project team should commit itself to drawing lessons as they carry out their advocacy work. Perhaps the most useful question one can try to answer in advocacy reports – in addition to what one's objectives were, what was and was not accomplished, and strategies for follow-up – is "What would we do differently next time?"</p>
<p>11. <u>SA methodology</u> is complex, and is often top-down in its design and execution.</p>	<p>11. WWF should aim to make the SA methodology more participatory and easier for stakeholders to use. The Project should advocate for greater use of participatory research methods in SA, to ensure more accurate stakeholder representation. For example, the research in the Brazil case study was done by a group of academics. In this case, emphasizing participatory research would have meant developing methods whereby direct stakeholders such as the soy producers themselves would carry out certain aspects of the research directly.</p>
<p>12. <u>Case studies</u>: The case studies presently underway in Brazil and the Philippines have not yet been completed, and were not ready for evaluation.</p>	<p>12. The case studies should figure prominently in the ToR of the project's final evaluation. Case studies are the best hope of demonstrating the relevance and usefulness of SA, and for learning lessons that will</p>

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
	improve methodologies. Budgets for case studies should systematically include provision for a press trip upon completion of the study, so that communications materials can be professionally prepared and disseminated to the media. It would also be valuable for the project to do case studies in the North as well as in the South, for example looking at the consequences of liberalized trade in Europe in the transport sector, or on Northern consumption patterns such as a meat-based diet. In the interest of synergy within WWF, case studies should focus on priority ecoregions and get ecoregional buy-in.
13. <u>Collaboration with UNEP</u> : UNEP has carried out a number of valuable case studies worldwide. However, for the most part, the reports from these are available only as technical documents, and the information has not been packaged in an easily digestible way that could be used to raise awareness of the value of SA.	13. The project has signed an MoU with UNEP on joint work in Southeast Asia. We recommend that the project explore further collaboration with UNEP, offering WWF's considerable strengths in communications to repackage and market these case studies.
14. <u>National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plans</u> :	14. By 2005 all parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity are required to have NBSAPs. This provides an excellent hook for promoting SA in almost every country, as part of its sustainability strategy. Assistance packages could be developed for countries that are interested to include sustainability assessments of trade as a key element of their national sustainability strategy.
15. <u>Technical papers</u> :	15. Several respondents expressed the desire for more in-depth, specialist technical papers, and more detail on the methodology of carrying out SAs in different sectors.
16. <u>Communications</u> : The project could do more to make its work more accessible.	16. The project should try to make technical papers more relevant and more understandable by ensuring that lengthy reports are accompanied by: a) well written, pertinent summaries, b) position papers that present and defend the policy implications of the work, and c) short articles targeted at the general public. Efforts should be made to make documents for the public shorter, clearer and more popular in style. Other media such as videos or a moderated e-group could be considered.
17. <u>Visibility and awareness of SA</u> :	17. To improve visibility and build awareness, it would be good to build relationships with economists at key newspapers such as the <i>Financial Times</i> and the <i>International Herald Tribune</i> , and feed them news on SAs. For communications, especially in developing countries, it is important to link environmental concerns to social conditions, especially in developing countries; messages on SA should give clear examples of its contribution to human well-being.
18. <u>Influencing the debate</u> :	18. Following each case study, effort should be made to publish a serious article in a peer-reviewed journal

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
	(for example in journals on trade policy, EIAs, agricultural economics, foreign affairs, etc.) – this is an essential strategy that is often neglected in WWF's efforts to legitimize its work, and is one of the most credible ways to influence the debate on SA.
19. <u>Website</u> : There are some technical and substantive improvements that could be made to the project website.	19. Suggestions for improvement are detailed in the section on the BalancedTrade website on page 26 above. In addition, the project should make more effort to market the website.
20. <u>Internal communications</u> : SA needs to be more mainstreamed in WWF.	20. The project should make a concerted effort to get the ecoregions, the regional programmes, and the TDPs engaged, through face-to-face meetings, so that WWF has a critical mass of people throughout the Network who are committed to SA. Some specific recommendations for improving internal communications are given on page 29.
21. <u>Ecoregion conservation</u> : WWF should experiment with SA as a tool for ecoregion conservation.	21. The project needs to reach out to the regional and ecoregional programmes, and clarify the added value of SA with respect to root causes analysis, which is currently used in ecoregion planning.
22. <u>WWF's trade and investment strategy is in the formative stages</u> .	22. This strategy should position SA within WWF's overall work on trade throughout the Network.
23. <u>WWF support</u> : People in leadership positions in WWF are convinced of the critical importance of trade for the achievement of biodiversity conservation. Nevertheless, the organization devotes few resources to its trade and investment work. WWF's target-driven programmes are unlikely to be successful in the long term if economic forces do not move in the direction of sustainable development.	23. We believe that a well-resourced trade and investment programme with a sharply focused strategic plan and strong core support will be critical to WWF's long-term success. Given the initial successes of the SA project, and the potential importance of the tool, work on SA should be a key element of a WWF strategy on trade and investment. In a very short time span, WWF has created a reputation as the leading NGO on sustainability assessments – it would be a shame for WWF to discontinue its work on SA because of a lack of core support.
24. <u>Communication challenges inherent in decentralized, geographically dispersed teams</u> :	24. Face-to-face meetings at least once a year are important for the efficient functioning of a decentralized project team. Monthly updates with news from each member of the team would be helpful.
25. <u>Project monitoring</u> : During the first year of the project, the six-monthly reports and associated activities matrix did not provide a very strategic or systematic basis upon which to monitor progress.	25. It is recommended that the monitoring matrix, as developed for this evaluation, be used by the project team on a six-monthly basis, both to monitor their own progress, and to report on progress to the Project Coordinator, who would collate the inputs from the project team into an overall matrix, as in Table 1 above, and then complete the matrix as necessary. This will provide a periodic snapshot of the progress of the project overall, together with adaptive strategies to address any difficulties encountered.
26. <u>Adaptive management</u> :	26. The project monitoring matrix should serve as a tool for ongoing, adaptive management, and should provide a solid foundation for the final evaluation.

Problems / Constraints / Issues	Recommendations
	<p>One word of caution: the updated targets and indicators contained in the project monitoring matrix should not be seen as cast in stone – they should be revised as necessary in the spirit of <i>learning by doing</i> in the context of the realities of project implementation. Any revisions in the targets and indicators should be noted in the “Comments” column.</p>
<p>27. <u>Project Design</u>: The SA project was conceived as a time-bound project, to finish after three years. Mid-way through the project, however, it looks as though this may have been a design flaw. We thoroughly endorse the intent of the project to set up a process so that it does not have to remain as an active funder in the different countries where it is working. However, a three-year timeframe seems very short for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - launching the project, - developing a robust, adequate, and stakeholder-friendly methodology, - launching and completing the case studies, - building capacity to levels where others can continue the work in a sustainable way, and - developing and carrying out an exit strategy. 	<p>27. We recommend a longer time horizon in order to enhance the sustainability of the project’s results. The project is on track to generate case-studies which will be used to inform debate on how best to build upon the internal capacity that WWF has generated through this work over the course of the last year and a half. A process should be put underway now to consider how this expertise and capacity can be best built upon, and how the project should phase itself out, so that the work can be carried on by others.</p>
<p>28. <u>Funding</u>: As is clear from the preceding chapters, the project has taken on a daunting task. We predict that it will have made a valuable contribution to the debate and to the body of knowledge on SA by the end of its three-year lifetime. We further predict that if the project could be funded at the same level for another three years, its impact will be greatly enhanced, and the cost-effectiveness of the funding invested in the first three years of the project will be substantially improved.</p>	<p>28. We recommend that WWF and the project donors consider a second three-year phase for the project at similar or increased funding levels.</p>

Annex A.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Brief overview of the project and context

As globalisation widens, how we trade and invest across borders has profound implications for human development and the health of our planet. While increased trade and investment cannot be blamed for all the poverty and environmental problems around the world, they can directly aggravate these issues. WWF is advocating for the use of sustainability assessment to identify and address the economic, environmental and social impacts of trade and investment policies. By involving a broad range of government and non-government stakeholders involved in, and affected by trade, sustainability assessments help determine how to maximise the positive effects and mitigate/avoid the adverse impacts of trade and investment policies.

In March 2000 in Quito, WWF and Fundacion Futuro Latino Americano based in Ecuador organised an International Experts Meeting on Sustainability Assessment, which provided a unique and timely opportunity for more than 100 representatives of governments, intergovernmental bodies and NGOs to discuss the purpose, utility and policy relevance of sustainability assessments (SA). The Quito meeting made clear that there is interest in sustainability assessments as tools to facilitate the consideration of economic growth and social and environmental variables in trade-policy making. However, it also revealed concerns about their potential use as instruments of 'green conditionality' in international economic relations. Many participants emphasised therefore that the building of trust is essential for the further development of sustainability assessments. And this depends upon the following two elements: (i) participation and involvement of all countries and relevant stakeholders in the dialogue; (ii) experience/capacity building at the national and sectoral levels.

Whilst the meeting constituted a first step towards laying the foundations of trust between developed and developing countries, the process of establishing a workable relationship and constructive dialogue needs to continue. In this context, WWF launched a three-year project aimed at **fostering the dialogue on sustainability assessment and building confidence and capacity to undertake these assessments.**

The sustainability assessment project is a joint effort undertaken by WWF International and WWF US, which started in January 2001 and will end in December 2003. It is being implemented in partnership with a range of organisations worldwide and has activities in the following countries/regions: Philippines, Brazil, the US, Norway, Latin America, and the EU. It is funded by ten European governments and one US foundation.

2. Project's vision and objectives

The overall vision for the WWF's project on sustainability assessment of trade is as follows:

To reform trade policy decision-making processes and their outcomes in favour of sustainable and equitable development, by creating the context for, and catalysing effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessments in key countries/regions, in conjunction with targeted advocacy for meaningful implementation of these assessments.

The ultimate goal of the project is to catalyse and establish a process owned and trusted by local stakeholders, so that discussion and action on sustainability assessment of trade are pursued and strengthened beyond this project's duration. Four main objectives have been developed:

1. Get national governments to adopt and implement politically effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment processes ('institutionalisation of SA' goal).
2. Build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate and advocate for the use and promotion of sustainability assessments ('capacity-building and advocacy' goal).
3. Strengthen trade reform by developing strong fact-based arguments built on sustainability assessments ('analytical/case-study' goal)
4. Demonstrate how trade policy may either pose a threat to, or be an opportunity for the achievement of WWF's targets in the TDPs, priority biomes and ecoregions ('internal WWF conservation' goal).

3. Purpose of the evaluation

The current evaluation is a mid-term project evaluation, aimed primarily at enhancing the performance of the SA project, to help ensure that the project will effectively meet its objectives by the end of its three-year lifetime in December 2003. As such, the focus of this evaluation is on the use of the evaluation results by the primary intended users, namely the project team. The evaluation will be designed to promote learning, and support team-building among the members of the SA team. This mid-term evaluation will also provide a foundation for the final evaluation of the project, planned for the end of 2003.

This evaluation seeks to:

- A. provide an assessment of progress made towards realising the project's objectives
- B. assess the realism of these objectives and the extent to which they lend themselves to ongoing evaluation;
- C. assess in particular effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems
- D. review internal and external communication activities;
- E. identify any major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered during the first 18 months of this project in pursuit of the project objectives;
- F. propose recommendations for resolving the above mentioned difficulties so that they do not negatively impact upon the project's implementation, and to enhance positive impacts/results;

The purpose of the evaluation is thus to assess the progress of the SA project after 18 months of implementation, and provide concrete recommendations for enhancing its impact on the ground and on its key target audiences.

4. Methodology

To enhance the use of the evaluation results, the methodology will be utilization-focused, and will be developed in close collaboration with the project SA team.

A first step will be a self-evaluation by the members of the SA team, based on a monitoring matrix of the project's targets and indicators.

The evaluation team will formulate and prioritize the key questions to be asked of each stakeholder group during the evaluation. Once the key questions and the list of appropriate people to be contacted are determined, questionnaires will be sent out, and interviews arranged, either in person or by telephone.

The evaluators will review the project documentation, analyse the data collected from the interviews, synthesize the evaluation findings, groundtruth these findings with key members of the project team, and prepare a draft evaluation report to be sent out for comment to the project team. Given the demanding and varied schedules of the project team, a month will be allowed for comments, after which the final report will be submitted.

5. List of data, information sources or reports to be consulted

Practically all information on the SA project is available on the internet site that we developed in the context of this project: www.panda.org/balancedtrade.

6. List of individuals/stakeholders to be consulted and interviewed

Possible key informants from four different groups of stakeholders are listed below.

1. SA team:

Mikel Insausti - WWF European Policy Office
Keith Tyrell - EU regional coordinator
Miguel Pellerano - LAC regional coordinator (former SA team member)
Alvaro Luchiezi - WWF Brazil
Svein Erik Haarklau - WWF Norway
Joe Padilla - WWF SEAPP
Nilo Brucal - WWF SEAPP
Priscilla Stephan - WWF US
Claudia Saladin - WWF US
Mireille Perrin - WWF International
Sarah Richardson - consultant
Denise Meredith - consultant communication

2. Internal WWF People

Gordon Shepherd - WWF Intl
Aimee Gonzales - WWF Intl
Tom McShane - Forests
Carole St Laurent - Rio+10
Jason Clay - WWF US
Kyla Evans - press

Chris Elliott - Forests TDP
Simon Cripps - Marine TDP
Jamie Pittock - FW TDP
Sue Lieberman - Species TDP
Jennifer Morgan - Climate TDP
Clifton Curtis - Toxics TDP

+ add key ERC people

3. Local-national partners

(N.B.: the evaluation team may need help in Portuguese and Spanish for some of these interviews)

Brazil:

Carlos Klin, IPAM - Instituto de Pesquisas Amazonicas (Institute for Amazonian Research),

Donald Sawyer - ISPN - Instituto Sociedade População e Natureza (Institute Society, Population and Nature)
Mauricio Galinkin, Fundação CEBRAC - Fundação Centro Brasileiro de Referência e Apoio Cultural (Brazilian Foundation Centre on Reference and Cultural Support)
Ministry of Environment, - Antonio Sérgio Lima Braga Secretariat for Sustainable Development, Secretary or Luiz Miranda, Advisor
Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Audo Araujo Faleiro - DPB Divisão de Agricultura e Produtos de Base - Division of Agriculture and Basic Products

Philippines:

Geronimo Reyes - International MarineLife Alliance
Rodolfo Sambajon - Pamalakaya
Felix Gonzales - Centre for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Raphael Lotilla - Deputy Director, National Economic Development Authority (or Assistant Deputy Director)
Amelia Supetran - Director, United Nations Development Program
Preceles Manzo - Department of Agriculture
Jose Victor Chan Gonzaga - Department of Foreign Affairs
Salvador Buban - Department of Trade and Industry
Marcial C. Amaro - Department of Environment and Natural Resources

US:

Steve Porter - Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)
Jake Caldwell - Program Director for Trade and Environment
Kevin Gallagher - Tufts University, Global Development and Environment Institute, Cabot Intercultural Center
Jenifer Havercamp - United States Trade Representative (USTR)
Barbara McCleod - Acting Trade and Environment Coordinator, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

LAC

Maria Amparo Alban - CEDA
Hernan Blanco - CIPMA

EU:

Alexandra Wandel, FoE
Robert Madellin or Eric Peters - DG Trade
Laurence Graff - DG Environment

Norway:

4. International policy groups

Penny Fowler - Oxfam
Mathew Stilwell - CIEL
Sophia Murphy - IATP
Charles Arden-Clarke - UNEP
Scott Vaughan - CEC
Dale Andrew - OECD
Rene Vossenaar - UNCTAD
Jan-Eirik Sorensen - WTO
Ulf Jaeckel - Germany
Lars Knutrud - Norway
Manuela Jost - Switzerland

Sandra Smithy - Mott foundation

Others if needed:

Philippines:

Margarita Songco, Sheila Encabo, Joselito Bernardo, Amelia Menardo - National Economic Development Authority

Sandra Arcamo - Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

US:

David Wascow - Friends of the Earth (FoE)

LAC:

Marijke Hallo de Wolf - FFLA

Sara Larrain - Chile Sustentable

Gustavo Alanis - CEMDA

7. Use of the evaluation findings

The findings should be used first and foremost by all team members working on the SA project and should help guide our activities until end of 2003. The evaluation report will also be distributed to donors for accountability of the work we are doing.

8. Evaluation team

The evaluation will be an external exercised led by Meg Gawler (independent consultant and evaluation specialist in the field of conservation). The team will also include Tom Crompton and Richard McNally, who have specific expertise on economics and trade issues.

9. Expected outputs of the evaluation

The expected output of the evaluation is a short report with upfront a concise executive summary providing:

- an evaluation of progress towards achievement of the project goal and objectives;
- main obstacles/difficulties encountered (and steps to resolve them if they already exist);
- recommendations for enhancing project success and addressing difficulties encountered;
- recommendations for increasing effectiveness of project M&E systems and of internal and external communication.

10. Timetable

The preparation and design of the evaluation will be carried out from March to June 2002, with the bulk of the interviews scheduled for July and September 2002. The draft report should be submitted by 25 September 2002. Comments on the draft report will be due by 25 October, and the final report by 31 October 2002.

Annex B.

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

Maria Amparo Alban	Executive Director, Centro Ecuatoriano De Derecho Ambiental	Ecuador
Sandra Arcamo	Chief, Coastal Resources Division, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources	Philippines
Hernan Blanco	Regional Coordinator, Recursos e Investigación para el Desarrollo Sustentable	Chile
Nilo Brucal	WWF Southeast Asia Policy Project	Philippines
Adriano Campolina	Public Policy Director, ActionAid	Brazil
Jason Clay	Vice-President, WWF US	USA
Simon Cripps	Director, WWF Endangered Seas Programme	Switzerland
Chris Elliott	Director, WWF Forests for Life Programme	Switzerland
Audo Faleiro	Trade & Environment Specialist, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Brazil
Penny Fowler	Policy Advisor, Oxfam	UK
Mauricio Galinkin	Technical Director, Fundação Centro Brasileiro de Referência e Apoio Cultural	Brazil
Kevin Gallagher	Research Associate, Global Development and Environment Institute, Tufts University	USA
Aimee Gonzales	Senior Policy Advisor, Trade & Investment Programme, WWF International	Switzerland
Svein Erik Haarklau	Environment and Development Officer, WWF Norway	Norway
Jenifer Havercamp	Environment and Natural Resources, United States Trade Representative	USA
Mikel Insausti	Trade Coordinator, WWF European Policy Office	Belgium
Carlos Klink	President, Instituto de Pesquisas Amazonicas	Brazil
Sue Lieberman	Director, WWF Species Programme	UK
Paolo Lombardi	Director, WWF Mediterranean Programme Office	Italy
Alvaro Luchiezi	Trade and Environment Programme, WWF Brazil	Brazil
Tom McShane	Senior Conservation Advisor, WWF ICD Programme	Switzerland
Denise Meredith	Project communications consultant	UK
Luiz Miranda	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Brazil
Sophia Murphy	Trade Director, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy	USA
Jose Padilla	Senior Policy Officer, WWF Southeast Asia Policy Project	Philippines
Mireille Perrin	Policy Adviser, Trade & Investment Unit, WWF International and Project Coordinator	Switzerland
Eric Peters	EU Commission DG Trade, Unit for Sustainable Development	Belgium
Jamie Pittock	Director, WWF Living Waters Campaign	Netherlands
Ketut Sardjana Putra	Coordinator, WWF Banda Flores Seas Ecoregion	Indonesia
Sarah Richardson	Project consultant	Canada
Claudia Saladin	Senior Programme Officer, WWF Sustainable Commerce Program	USA
Gordon Shepherd	Director, International Policy, WWF International	Switzerland
Jenny Springer	WWF contact for Sichuan/Yunan Temperate Forests Ecoregion	USA
Priscilla Stephan	Program Officer, WWF Sustainable Commerce	USA

	Program	
Amelia Supetran	Portfolio Manager, UNDP/Asia & Pacific/Philippines	Philippines
Lory Tan	President, WWF-Philippines	Philippines
Romy Trono	Executive Director, WWF-Philippines and Coordinator, Sulu Sulawesi Seas Ecoregion	Philippines
Elizabeth Tuerk	Staff Attorney, Centre for International Environmental Law	Switzerland
Jerry Tupacz	Contact for Andaman Sea Ecoregion, Wildlife Fund Thailand	Thailand
Keith Tyrell	EU Regional Coordinator, WWF	UK
Alexandra Wandel	Trade and Sustainability Coordinator, Friends of the Earth Europe	UK
Imogen Zethoven	Great Barrier Reef Campaign Manager, WWF- Australia	Australia

Annex C.

LIST OF DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

Project Reports and Publications

Sustainability Assessment Project Plan: January 2001 – December 2003. 9pp.

Balanced Process, Balanced Results: Sustainability Assessments and Trade. 2001. 12pp.

Creating the Context for Sustainability Assessments and Building Capacity – Technical Report, January 2001 – December 2001. 95pp.

Sustainability Assessment Team Meeting – 06 to 08 February 2002 – Workshop proceedings. 51pp.

Understanding the links between WWF's project on sustainability assessment (SA) of trade & investment, the freshwater, marine, and species TDPs and specific EAPs. 2002. 6pp.

Making trade & investment work for sustainable development. 2002. 4pp.

Negotiations on the MEA-WTO relationship. 2002. 4pp.

The Relationship between Multilateral Environment Agreements and World Trade Organisation Rules. 2002. 2pp.

Foreign Investment and Sustainable Development. 2002. 2pp.

Services Assessment and the Market Access Phase of the WTO Services Negotiations. 2002. WWF & CIEL. 4pp.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the first draft of the Brazil case study on soy production. 2002. 76pp.

Technical reports by the project team for the period 1 January – 30 June 2002.

Webserver statistics for www.balancedtrade.panda.org. 2002. 71pp.

WWF work on sustainability assessment at WSSD: Assessment. 2002. 1p.

Sustainability Assessment of Trade-Related Policies in the Philippines. 2002. 4pp.

Balanced process, balanced results: how to get there? Critical elements for sustainability assessment. 2002.

An effective multistakeholder process for sustainability assessment: critical elements. 2002. 4pp.

Other Reports and Publications

Blanco, H. 2002. Evaluacion de la Sustentabilidad de Acuerdos Comerciales y su Aplicacion en el Contexto Latinoamericano y del ALCA. 26pp.

Government of Australia. 1982. *Wildlife Protection Act 1982 (Schedule 4):* Benchmarks for Environmental Assessment of Fisheries. 11pp.

von Moltke, K. 2002. *European Union / Mercosur Negotiations: The Environment and Sustainable Development Dimension.* 34pp.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers. 2002. Project for the sustainability assessment on trade liberalisation agreements – Project No 9Z1305.01 – Statement of income and expenditure, year ended 31 December 2001.

UNEP. 2001. *Reference Manual for the Integrated Assessment of Trade-Related Policies.* 83pp.

Annex D.

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The four main project objectives are to:

1. Get national governments to adopt and implement politically effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment processes ('institutionalisation of SA' goal).
2. Build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate and advocate for the use and promotion of sustainability assessments ('capacity-building and advocacy' goal).
3. Strengthen trade reform by developing strong fact-based arguments built on sustainability assessments ('analytical/case-study' goal)
4. Demonstrate how trade policy may either pose a threat to, or be an opportunity for the achievement of WWF's targets in the TDPs, priority biomes and ecoregions ('internal WWF conservation' goal).

This evaluation seeks to:

- A. provide an assessment of progress made towards realising the project's objectives
- B. assess the realism of these objectives and the extent to which they lend themselves to ongoing evaluation
- C. assess the effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems
- D. review internal and external communication activities
- E. identify any major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered during the first 18 months of this project in pursuit of the project objectives
- F. propose recommendations for resolving the above mentioned difficulties so that they do not negatively impact upon the project's implementation, and to enhance positive impacts/results.

The four major groups of project stakeholders are:

- 1) the SA team
- 2) key staff within the WWF Network
- 3) local-national partners and
- 4) international policy groups.

The following table shows the strategy of the interview questions.

RELATION OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS TO RESPONDENT GROUPS AND TO EVALUATION AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES				
Group	Q	Interview Question	Eval. Obj.	Proj. Obj.
all	1-1 2-1 3-1	We would like to first of all invite you to tell us what you know about environmental reviews or impact assessments in the context of trade policy, or about Sustainability Assessments (SAs) as promoted by WWF. How are these assessments or case studies used (or not used) in your country, or in the international process you are working with?	all	all
all	1-2 2-2 3-2	Do you share the perception that SAs (or trade-related assessments) have moved beyond the stage of an emerging concept to one that is more commonly used or debated?	A	1
1	1-3	Please take us through the monitoring matrix you sent in, highlighting what you consider to be the most important successes and constraints in your progress to date towards the project objectives:	A, B, C, E, F	1, 2, 3

Group	Q	Interview Question	Eval. Obj.	Proj. Obj.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - institutionalisation of SA - capacity building and advocacy - case studies - internal WWF conservation (TDPs and ERs) 		
1, 3	1-4 3-3	<p>What methodology / approach have you used?</p> <p>What has worked best?</p> <p>Have you used or developed any specific techniques?</p> <p>How replicable do you think this methodology might be?</p>	A, E, F	1, 3
1, 3	1-5 3-4	What has been done in your country or programme to build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate in, and advocate sustainability assessments?	A, B	2
1, 3	1-6 3-5	What mechanisms have been put in place to monitor the effectiveness of SAs or other trade-related assessments?	A, E, F	1
1, 3	1-7 3-6	What do you consider to be the ingredients of a good SA or trade-related assessment?	A, E, F	1, 3
1	1-8	With regard to the monitoring matrix and the WWF project targets and indicators, how realistic do you consider them to be?	B	all
1	1-9	Aside from the monitoring matrix, are there any other indicators have you been using since the inception of your own set of activities to monitor progress?	C	all
2, 3	2-3 3-7	<p>Have you heard about WWF's project on SAs?</p> <p>If so, where have you heard about it?</p> <p>What do you know about it?</p>	D	3, 4
all	1-10 2-4 3-8	<p>Have you seen the web site on assessment launched by this project (http://www.panda.org/balancedtrade)?</p> <p>What do you think of it?</p>	D	all
all	1-11 2-5 3-9	<p>Have you read or used any of the project's publications or resource papers?</p> <p>What do you think of them?</p>	D	1, 2, 3
2, 3, 4	2-6 3-10	Overall, what do you think about WWF's project on SAs?	A	1, 2, 3
3	3-11	<p>How are SAs being, or to be, integrated into existing government or intergovernmental processes?</p> <p>How are SAs (as promoted by WWF) coordinated with, and how do they compare with, other ongoing initiatives on assessments of environmental and developmental impacts of trade (similarities / differences / lessons learned) – e.g. UNEP's Integrated Assessments, the US's Environmental Reviews, Canada's Environmental Frameworks, etc.?</p> <p>Are SAs perceived primarily as a tool for enhancing participation, or for collecting information?</p>	A	1
1	1-12	<p>What major communications messages have you developed for external audiences?</p> <p>How have these been received?</p>	D	1, 2, 3
2	2-7	How relevant do you consider trade policy to be to the overall process of sustainable development and biodiversity conservation?	D	4
2	2-8	What is your perception of how trade policy poses a threat to, or provides an opportunity for, the achievement of your TDP or ER targets?	D	4
2	2-9	Are you aware of the use of SAs as a tool to assess the impact of trade on your conservation priorities?	D	4
2	2-10	What potential do you see, or not see, for the SA link(s) identified	D, E,	4

Group	Q	Interview Question	Eval. Obj.	Proj. Obj.
		for your TDP or ER? Do you have other suggestions? or recommendations?	F	
1, 2	1-13 2-11	How do you view the effectiveness of the project's internal communications? Do you have any recommendations for improvement?	D, E	all
all	1-14 2-12 3-12	What do you see as the major problems, difficulties and constraints in developing and implementing SAs, and building capacity for this?	E	all
all	1-15 2-13 3-13	What lessons learned or recommendations do you have for resolving these major problems?	F	all
1	1-16	What strategies have been put in place to ensure sustainability of this work after the end of the project in December 2003?	F	all
1		<i>(+ use monitoring matrices to develop specific questions for individual respondents!)</i>		

Annex E.

QUESTIONNAIRES USED

Respondent:	
Telephone:	
Email:	
Date:	
Interviewer(s):	

This mid-term evaluation addresses WWF’s three-year Sustainability Assessment project, for which the ultimate goal of the project is:

To catalyse and establish a process owned and trusted by local stakeholders, so that discussion and action on sustainability assessment of trade are pursued and strengthened beyond this project's duration.

Four main project objectives have been developed:

5. Get national governments to adopt and implement politically effective stakeholder-oriented sustainability assessment processes ('institutionalisation of SA' goal).
6. Build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate and advocate for the use and promotion of sustainability assessments ('capacity-building and advocacy' goal).
7. Strengthen trade reform by developing strong fact-based arguments built on sustainability assessments ('analytical/case-study' goal)
8. Demonstrate how trade policy may either pose a threat to, or be an opportunity for the achievement of WWF's targets in the TDPs, priority biomes and ecoregions ('internal WWF conservation' goal).

This mid-term evaluation seeks to:

- A. provide an assessment of progress made towards realising the project’s objectives
- B. assess the realism of these objectives and the extent to which they lend themselves to ongoing evaluation
- C. assess the effectiveness of the project’s monitoring and evaluation systems
- D. review internal and external communication activities
- E. identify any major problems, difficulties and constraints encountered during the first 18 months of this project in pursuit of the project objectives
- F. propose recommendations for resolving the above mentioned difficulties so that they do not negatively impact upon the project’s implementation, and to enhance positive impacts/results.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS – GROUP 1 – THE WWF SA TEAM

- 1) We would like to first of all invite you to tell us what you know about environmental reviews or impact assessments in the context of trade policy, or about Sustainability Assessments (SAs) as promoted by WWF.
How are these assessments or case studies used (or not used) in your country, or in the international process you are working with?
- 2) Do you share the perception that SAs (or trade-related assessments) have moved beyond the stage of an emerging concept to one that is more commonly used or debated?

- 3) Please take us through the monitoring matrix you sent in, highlighting what you consider to be the most important successes and constraints in your progress to date towards the project objectives:
 - institutionalisation of SA
 - capacity building and advocacy
 - case studies
 - internal WWF conservation (TDPs and ERs).

- 4) What methodology / approach have you used?
What has worked best?
Have you used or developed any specific techniques?
How replicable do you think this methodology might be?

- 5) What has been done in your country or programme to build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate in, and advocate sustainability assessments?

- 6) What mechanisms have been put in place to monitor the effectiveness of SAs or other trade-related assessments?

- 7) What do you consider to be the ingredients of a good SA or trade-related assessment?

- 8) With regard to the monitoring matrix and the WWF project targets and indicators, how realistic do you consider them to be?

- 9) Aside from the monitoring matrix, are there any other indicators have you been using since the inception of your own set of activities to monitor progress?

- 10) Have you seen the web site on assessment launched by this project (<http://www.panda.org/balancedtrade>)? What do you think of it?

- 11) Have you read or used any of the project's publications or resource papers? What do you think of them?

- 12) What major communications messages have you developed for external audiences?
How have these been received?

- 13) How do you view the effectiveness of the project's internal communications?
Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

- 14) What do you see as the major problems, difficulties and constraints in developing and implementing SAs, and building capacity for this?
 - 15) What lessons learned or recommendations do you have for resolving these major problems?
 - 16) What strategies have been put in place to ensure sustainability of this work after the end of the project in December 2003?
-

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS – GROUP 2 – INTERNAL WWF

1. We would like to first of all invite you to tell us what you know about environmental reviews or impact assessments in the context of trade policy, or about Sustainability Assessments (SAs) as promoted by WWF.
How are these assessments or case studies used (or not used) in your country, or in the international process you are working with?
2. Do you share the perception that SAs (or trade-related assessments) have moved beyond the stage of an emerging concept to one that is more commonly used or debated?
3. Have you heard about WWF's project on SAs?
If so, where have you heard about it?
What do you know about it?
4. Have you seen the web site on assessment launched by this project (<http://www.panda.org/balancedtrade>)? What do you think of it?
5. Have you read or used any of the project's publications or resource papers? What do you think of them?
6. Overall, what do you think about WWF's project on SAs?
7. How relevant do you consider trade policy to be to the overall process of sustainable development and biodiversity conservation?
8. What is your perception of how trade policy poses a threat to, or provides an opportunity for, the achievement of your TDP or ER targets?
9. Are you aware of the use of SAs as a tool to assess the impact of trade on your conservation priorities?

10. What potential do you see, or not see, for the SA link(s) that may have been identified for your TDP or your ecoregion? Do you have other suggestions? or recommendations?
11. How do you view the effectiveness of the project's internal communications?
Do you have any recommendations for improvement?
12. What do you see as the major problems, difficulties and constraints in developing and implementing SAs, and building capacity for this?
13. What lessons learned or recommendations do you have for resolving these major problems?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS – GROUP 3
LOCAL / NATIONAL PARTNERS AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY ORGANIZATIONS

- 1) We would like to first of all invite you to tell us what you know about environmental reviews or impact assessments in the context of trade policy, or about Sustainability Assessments (SAs) of trade policy. How are these assessments or case studies used (or not used) in your country, or in the international process you are working with?
- 2) Do you share the perception that SAs (or trade-related assessments) have moved beyond the stage of an emerging concept to one that is more commonly used or debated?
- 3) What methodology / approach have you used?
What has worked best?
Have you used or developed any specific techniques?
How replicable do you think this methodology might be?
- 4) What has been done in your country or programme to build local capacity for stakeholders to undertake, participate in, and advocate sustainability assessments?
- 5) What mechanisms have been put in place to monitor the effectiveness of SAs or other trade-related assessments?
- 6) What do you consider to be the ingredients of a good SA or trade-related assessment?
- 7) Have you heard about WWF's project on SAs?
If so, where have you heard about it?
What do you know about it?

- 8) Have you seen the web site on assessment launched by this project (<http://www.panda.org/balancedtrade>)? What do you think of it?
- 9) Have you read or used any of the project's publications or resource papers? What do you think of them?
- 10) Overall, what do you think about WWF's project on SAs?
- 11) How are SAs being, or to be, integrated into existing government or intergovernmental processes? How are SAs (as promoted by WWF) coordinated with, and how do they compare with, other ongoing initiatives on assessments of environmental and developmental impacts of trade (similarities / differences / lessons learned) – e.g. UNEP's Integrated Assessments, the US's Environmental Reviews, Canada's Environmental Frameworks, etc.? Are SAs perceived primarily as a tool for enhancing participation, or for collecting information?
- 12) What do you see as the major problems, difficulties and constraints in developing and implementing SAs, and building capacity for this?
- 13) What lessons learned or recommendations do you have?

SHORT BIOGRAPHIES OF THE EVALUATORS

Meg Gawler

Meg Gawler is the Founding Director of *ARTEMIS Services – for Nature Conservation and Human Development*, a consulting firm specifically for the conservation and development sector, specializing in evaluations, strategic planning, project and programme design, workshop facilitation, training, report preparation, photography, etc. Originally an aquatic ecologist, Meg has done scientific research in both coastal and freshwater ecosystems. A dual national (American & French), she worked for over ten years in the Africa & Madagascar Programme of WWF International, and was active in fostering in WWF a culture of learning, strategic planning, and monitoring and evaluation. Meg holds a BSc with highest honours in Conservation of Natural Resources, and an MSc in Applied Ecology, both from the University of California at Berkeley. She has carried out over 20 evaluation exercises worldwide, 16 of which as team leader or sole author, and with a wide variety of stakeholders, objectives, and methodologies.

Richard McNally

Born in Belfast in 1972, Richard McNally earned an undergraduate degree in Mathematics, and Masters degrees in Development Studies and Ecological Economics. He has worked for WWF-UK for the last five years coordinating WWF's Economics, Trade and Investment work within the UK. His main area of work is identifying socio-economic drivers of biodiversity loss and tackling them. Richard also works on trade policy issues, and in particular efforts to influence proceedings in the WTO.

Tom Crompton

Tom Crompton read Natural Sciences at Cambridge University, and took a doctorate in population genetics at Leicester University, both in the UK. He has worked on agriculture and trade policy issues for several small developing country NGOs, for FAO, UNIDO, and the RSPB. He now co-ordinates trade and investment work for the WWF network.