

# Improving Standards and Building Capacity for SEA

Coordinated by Maria do Rosario Partidario, New University of Lisbon, Portugal, [mp@fct.unl.pt](mailto:mp@fct.unl.pt)

## Session E1 Professional and Institutional Capacity Building for SEA

*Topic chairs: Maria Partidario, DCEA/FCT-UNL, [mp@fct.unl.pt](mailto:mp@fct.unl.pt); Lee Wilson, Lee Wilson and Associates, [lwa@lwaf.com](mailto:lwa@lwaf.com)*

Introduction. Improvements in SEA performance require building of capacity for individuals and organizations. Of particular importance are SEA capacities that influence decision-making in an effective and positive manner, and that do so in ways that are transparent and accountable. Capacity-building will benefit from the “lessons learned,” and thus the focus of the workshop will be to share experiences in SEA capacity-building. Workshop discussions will focus on two fundamental aspects related to the “how to” in SEA capacity-building:

1. Basic principles on how to improve the capacity of SEA to impact decision-making.
2. How to generate SEA capacity-building approaches, including forms of communication, guidance documents, training programs, or other, that clearly effect on decision-making.

### Workshop E1.1 Successful Stories on Capacity-Building Efforts

Professional and Institutional Capacity Building for Cultural Heritage in SEA. Arlene Fleming, Ian Campbell

Building Capacity for SEA Consultation Response. Lucia Susani

The Environmental Projection Agency's SEA Experience in Ireland - the first twelve months. Tadhg O'Mahony, Gerry Byrne, Alison Donnelly

Sustainable Development and Strategic Environmental Assessment Capacity Building in Iran. S. Ferdowsi, A.H. Hakimian, S.M. Monavari, M. Partidario, H.F. Rad

### Workshop E1.2 Workshop discussion: Principles for how to improve the capacity of SEA to impact decision-making

*Topic chair: Maria Partidário, DCEA/FCT-UNL*

The Role and Impacts of the Audit Process within Strategic Environmental Assessment. Keynote presentation by George Stuetz

Facilitated debate

Wrap-up of key learning points

### Workshop E1.3 Workshop discussion: Professional and institutional forms of improving SEA capacities to impact decision-making

*Topic chair: Lee Wilson, Lee Wilson and Associates*

Professional and Institutional Forms of Improving SEA Capacities to Impact Decision-Making. Keynote presentation by Linda Ghanime

Facilitated debate

Wrap-up of key learning points

### **Professional and Institutional Capacity Building for Cultural Heritage in SEA**

*Arlene Fleming, Ian Campbell; Consultants to the World Bank, Afleming1@worldbank.org; icampbell@worldbank.org*

The emerging directives, conventions and national policies for SEA include cultural heritage as well as biophysical and social issues. EIA also includes cultural heritage impacts, but often treats the subject in a cursory fashion or ignores it altogether. The same mistake should not be made in the formulation and implementation of SEA.

Tangible cultural heritage can be a key factor in strategic development because in many countries it constitutes an actual or potential socio-economic asset. Furthermore, ignoring it can jeopardize the sustainability of policies, programs and strategies.

Thus, a special effort is required to ensure that cultural heritage is fully covered in SEA, and that the concerned institutions participate in the process. The professional and institutional capacity building requirements needed to achieve this are substantial, especially in view of the fact that the concerned institutions in many countries have been marginalized in national decision-making.

In the case of EIA, a number of methods and instruments are being developed to improve coverage of cultural heritage. To meet the needs of SEA, further developments are required. For example, at the strategic level, an entire cultural landscape may be affected. Similarly, biophysical and social impacts such as changes in settlement patterns, can affect the utilization and physical status of cultural heritage by changing the basic character of an area. Furthermore, the socio-economic value of heritage may change as a result of policies such as the decision to promote tourism. Therefore, new models, databases, training strategies and capacity building approaches are required. The authors present and discuss a number of such innovations in this important field.

### **Building Capacity for SEA Consultation Response**

*Lucia Susani, Environment Agency, UK, lucia.susani@environment-agency.gov.uk*

The Environment Agency of England and Wales is one of the statutory SEA consultees in the UK, to be contacted by plan and programme makers at specific stages during the SEA process. We are also responsible for providing environmental data relevant to establishing SEA baselines.

This consultative role will result in our exposure to every SEA prepared in England and Wales — an excellent opportunity to guide, monitor and influence the SEA process. Approximately 100-200 SEAs per year are expected.

We have therefore developed a number of capacity-building initiatives to facilitate and maximise our role as effective consultees, and to prepare our staff to respond to consultation requests. Such initiatives include:

- Identification of a suite of SEA objectives, to be offered as part of our consultation response, reflective of key drivers for the Agency.
- Compilation of in-house baseline data packages useful for SEA preparation, to be distributed electronically to plan/programme makers.
- A dedicated internal guidance document on SEA and the consultation process - to ensure that responses are consistent, effective, and representative of Agency concerns.
- A one-page “Do’s and Don’ts” guide as a pro-memoriam for plan makers.

The effectiveness and success of these tools will be reviewed.

### **The Environmental Protection Agency’s SEA Experience in Ireland - the first twelve months**

*Tadhg O’Mahony, Environmental Protection Agency, Ireland, t.omahony@epa.ie; Gerry Byrne, Environmental Protection Agency, Ireland, b.byrne@epa.ie; Alison Donnelly, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, alison.donnelly@tcd.ie*

The EPA has been designated as an environmental authority in Ireland that must be consulted by competent authorities while screening for or undertaking SEA. This paper outlines in brief the EPA’s role in

SEA in Ireland, the procedures we have put in place with respect to fulfilling this role and our experience to date in Screening and Scoping and in the SEA process in general. The development of the EPA's SEA Web Page ([www.epa.ie](http://www.epa.ie)) has provided invaluable guidance to plan/programme makers and SEA Practitioners. The EPA's statutory roles in State of the Environment Reporting and in national environmental air and water monitoring programmes provide relevant background information on the current state of the environment and assists in the identification of environmental problems and issues. GIS has been a key tool in Screening and identifying key issues in Scoping exercises. To date, the EPA has received over 60 Screening Requests from over twenty different authorities. This paper will outline our experience to date in Screening and subsequent Scoping. Issues relating to Screening and Scoping will be highlighted and key actions will be described.

#### **Sustainable Development and Strategic Environmental Assessment Capacity Building in Iran**

*S. Ferdowsi, UNDP, [saeid.ferdowsi@undp.org](mailto:saeid.ferdowsi@undp.org); A.H. Hakimian; S.M. Monavari; M. Partidario, International Consultant, [mp@fct.unl.pt](mailto:mp@fct.unl.pt); H.F. Rad, Management and Planning Organization and team member*

In spite of the continued efforts being made by various actors, Iran is facing serious environmental challenges like air pollution in urban areas, the depletion of scarce water resources, degradation of natural vegetation, soil erosion and the loss of biodiversity.

While environmental impact assessment (EIA) approaches have long been practiced in Iran, and notwithstanding the results of applying the current EIA regulations on different types of development projects, needs have been spelled out for upstream integration of environmental concerns in policies, plans and programmes (PPPs) before such PPPs are translated into development projects on the ground; hence the need for a more holistic approach to environmental assessments by employing strategic environmental assessment (SEA) approaches and techniques. In mid-2004, the Department of the Environment, in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), embarked on the SEA Capacity Building Project.

A rather new model of capacity building was put into practice by which a "core group" of national professional from various sectors (including non-governmental organizations) was brought together. The core group was exposed to the technical and conceptual assistance by a leading international expert in the field of SEA. The national team was entrusted with assessing the needs for SEA, devising a national SEA model and developing technical guidelines that ensure effective application of SEA to PPPs in Iran. Project outputs should contribute to, and promote, the ongoing government activities regarding the Sustainable Development Strategy. This presentation will bring to the attention of the international SEA community the achievements of this innovative process in the IR of Iran as well as the lessons learned.

#### **The Role and Impacts of the Audit Process within Strategic Environmental Assessment**

*George Stuetz, Office of the Canadian Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, [George.Stuetz@oag-bvg.gc.ca](mailto:George.Stuetz@oag-bvg.gc.ca)*

The audit function is an essential component to all management systems and processes. It is essential in terms of process design, feedback, improvement and learning, and it is essential in terms of accountability. This presentation will focus on the audit process and its relationships to strategic environmental assessment. Three key questions will be answered in this presentation: What is the audit process and how does it relate to strategic environmental assessment? Within an audit context, what key issues should be considered when designing systems and undertaking activities? What should the SEA practitioner expect from the audit process and how should the SEA practitioner best prepare for an audit? The recent strategic environmental assessment audit, conducted by the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development within the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, will be used to illustrate the presentation. A discussion on the role of other national audit offices with regards to strategic environmental assessment will also be addressed.

Discussion topic: Following earlier examples of successful stories and the keynote speech, discussion of how SEA should impact decision-making and whether we could establish principles for increasing that capacity in SEA: what does it mean for SEA requirements, for SEA content, format, timings, SEA relationship with other decision tools, how to enhance the relevance and acceptance of SEA outcomes for decision-makers.

## Professional and Institutional Forms of Improving SEA Capacities to Impact Decision-Making

Linda Ghanime, UNDP, [linda.ghanime@undp.org](mailto:linda.ghanime@undp.org)

Recent global assessments are showing that progress towards environmental sustainability has been disappointingly weak. Lack of progress is attributed, in part, to inefficient and inadequate institutional capacities, from enforcing environmental legislation to monitoring environmental indicators.

Developing capacity to address effectively the global lag of environmental sustainability involves further integrating environmental assessment in national institutions and systems of policy making. Strategic environmental assessment (SEA) offers the potential to develop capacity for making complex development/public investment choices in relation to policies, plans and programmes and major investment decisions. Capacity development for SEA is an ongoing process of transformation that requires resources, a willingness to learn, and the use of existing capacities.

An example of institutional support is the OECD/DAC Environet Task Team Good Practice Guidance on SEA in Development Cooperation (in preparation). Support of capacity development in SEA processes includes linking poverty alleviation strategies to environmental assets and constraints, assessing the needs and opportunities for using SEA in the poverty-environment process, SEA capacity building needs analysis and action plans, and developing national regulatory framework for undertaking SEA.

## Session E2 SEA Theory and Research

*Topic chairs: Olivia Bina, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, [olibina@gmail.com](mailto:olibina@gmail.com); Tabatha Wallington, Murdoch University, [T.Wallington@murdoch.edu.au](mailto:T.Wallington@murdoch.edu.au); Wil Thissen, Delft University of Technology, [thissen@tbm.tudelft.nl](mailto:thissen@tbm.tudelft.nl);*

Since its inception more than 15 years ago, the notion of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has drawn increasing attention at conferences, in literature, and in assessment practice and policy regulation. We feel there is an urgent need to reflect more deeply on the essence of SEA. In order to achieve the celebrated purpose of contributing to environmentally and/or broadly sustainable development, and the role of improving policy-making processes, the implicit and explicit assumptions of existing models of SEA (both normative and operational) must be examined, and conventional wisdom about its purpose must be questioned. These 15 years have witnessed both illuminating and confusing progress, which our session seeks to explore in order to direct future theory and research in this field.

The session will be run through group work around key issues of SEA theory, involving facilitated discussions and brief statements from the contributors (listed below), who will present their argument when it becomes relevant as the debate evolves. It should be treated as a single event, divided into three 1.5 hour workshops, and it is our intention to spend considerable time on discussion of key issues, rather than to have formal paper presentations. Each workshop will focus on a set of issues drawn from an analysis of the draft papers and from the position paper prepared for the IAIA Prague preliminary programme.

We expect that the workshops will engage with some of the following issues:

- The different purposes of SEA, including discussion of the different values being promoted and the difference between the purpose of individual SEAs and that of the SEA system introduced in institutional and organizational contexts to influence long-term learning, frame changes, organizational culture and capacity, etc.
- The relevance of context: the constraints and opportunities it may involve in relation to the development of effective SEA systems and to the case-by-case application of SEA to development proposals.
- Different theoretical perspectives on the social PPP formation and implementation processes. These may include: (a) communicative and/or argumentative, interpretations; (b) network, strategic behavior of actors and coalition formation, negotiation, interdependencies, rational planning; and (c) institutional and cultural mechanisms and factors, as well as different forms of learning (social, rational, organizational).

Below is the list of the 15 papers that will be discussed throughout the session, followed by the ab-

stracts. They are in alphabetical order (surnames):

- Cashmore and Nieslony - The contribution of EIA to sustainable development: Lessons for SEA theory?
- Cherp - SEA and Strategy Formation Schools
- D'Ieteren - Contextual issues in ensuring an added value of SEA to tourism planning: the case of the Walloon Region
- Fischer - SEA Tiering - Useful concept or useless chimera?
- Harashina - A communication theory of SEA
- Hilding-Rydevik and Bjarnadóttir - Purpose and Effectiveness of Strategic Environmental Assessment and its dependence on the implementation context
- Jackson and Illsley - An examination of the theoretical rationale for using strategic environmental assessment of public sector policies, plans and programmes to deliver environmental justice, drawing on the example of Scotland
- Joao - SEA as a platform for dialogue and a springboard for innovation
- Kørnøv and Nielsen - Institutional change - A premise for IA integration
- Leknes - SEA and Types of Decision-making Processes – a decision-taker's perspective
- Markus - Alternatives in SEA
- Nilsson - The role of assessments and institutions for policy learning: cases in nuclear and climate policy formation in Sweden
- Nooteboom - Impact Assessment as incentive for social learning
- Richardson - Addressing power, multiple rationality and ethics in theorising Strategic Environmental Assessment
- Vicente and Partidario - SEA – affecting decision-making through communication

---

#### Session E2 abstracts (in alphabetical order by primary author's surname)

##### **The Contribution of EIA to Sustainable Development: Lessons for SEA Theory?**

Matthew Cashmore, InteREAM, University of East Anglia, m.cashmore@uea.ac.uk; Cordula Nieslony, Germany

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been portrayed as a 'frontline' tool in facilitating the transition to sustainability, but there is a widespread perception that it is failing to achieve its potential in practice (Sadler, 1996; Benson, 2003; Nieslony, 2004). Rather than focusing on the more tangible limitations of EIA practices, it is argued that the underlying reason it is failing is because the relationship between EIA and sustainable development is inadequately conceptualised. This paper, therefore, aims to advance scientific understanding of their relationship by 'unpacking' what sustainable development means for the theory and practice of EIA. The lack of a consensual definition of sustainable development has been interpreted as a significant, if not intractable, barrier to interpreting how it can be implemented (George, 1999; O'Riordan, 1993). It is suggested, however, that one way in which EIA makes a significant contribution is by providing a forum in which societal interpretations of sustainability can be debated. Furthermore, a richer conception of their relationship can still be developed, by examining causation in EIA. It is argued that the breadth of ways in which EIA contributes to sustainable has been inadequately appreciated, the importance of certain forms of causation has been significantly underestimated, and that some expectations of what EIA can achieve in practice have been entirely unrealistic. It is postulated that, when such factors are taken into account, EIA can be considered to be operating as a 'frontline' tool in operationalising sustainable development, but in a markedly different manner to conventional expectations. This conclusion has important implications for environmental assessment at all tiers of decision-making.

##### **SEA and Strategy Formation Schools**

Aleg Cherp, Central European University, cherpa@ceu.hu

SEA literature commonly focuses on the impact of SEA on "decision-making" and the ways to enhance this impact. However, this focus may be too narrow because "decisions" are only a minor part of the strategies that SEA is supposed to influence. The contemporary literature on strategy formation – as developed primarily in relation to private sector organizations – may expand the theoretical debate on the essence, the appropriate forms, and the limits of SEA.



Particularly significant implications for SEA theories may be associated with those schools of strategy formation that transcend the notion of strategies as pre-conceive formal plans designed to achieve certain objectives. These give rise to the following challenges for the notion of SEA as a “systematic analysis of consequences of planned activities”:

1. Extending “beyond decisions” to accommodate the notion of “emergent strategies” where significant strategic actions are not necessarily preceded by decisions.
2. Extending “beyond decision-makers” to recognize that strategies are essentially learning collective process not only in their design, but even more so in their implementation.
3. Extending “beyond analytical formalization” to accommodate the limited ability of strategic actors to comprehend uncertain and confusing world.

The paper will examine these challenges by systematically analyzing the implication for SEA theories of the ten dominant schools of strategy formation: design, planning, positioning, entrepreneurial, cognitive, learning, power, cultural, environmental and configuration.

### Contextual Issues in Ensuring an Added Value of SEA to Tourism Planning: The Case of the Walloon Region

*Emmanuel d'Ieteren, Université Libre de Bruxelles, editer@ulb.ac.be*

Since July 2004 the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC is effective. It is therefore to be expected that tourism plans, which fall under the scope of the Directive, will soon have to be submitted to SEA procedures. This new legal framework and its requirements raise methodological questions on how to adapt and integrate SEA processes in tourism planning processes.

Before the 1980 institutional reforms in Belgium, tourism planning in the Walloon Region was integrated with spatial planning on a national level. After the reforms, tourism, environmental and land-use planning competences were transferred to the regional governments. These changes in the institutional arrangements resulted in a shift in tourism development planning and tourism sector organisation from an integrated economic/spatial/environment based approach to an economic dominated sectoral approach. The development of an effective SEA process in the Walloon Region tourism sector must therefore take into account the characteristics and trends of the current policy-making context where tourism planning and environmental planning are not linked.

Based on the case of the Walloon Region, this contribution aims to emphasise the importance of analysing the organisational and planning context before developing a SEA process. Furthermore, it underlines the added value of SEA as a tool which can contribute to integrate environmental concerns into sectoral tourism planning. As a result, SEA can be seen as promoting a more sustainable tourism development through a proactive, integrative, cooperative and participative planning process.

### SEA Tiering – Useful Concept or Useless Chimera?

*Thomas Fischer, University of Liverpool, Fischer@liv.ac.uk*

A number of authors have advertised SEA tiering as a useful concept, particularly in sectoral planning (see Fischer, 2000, Jansson 2000, Brokking et al, 2004, Marshall and Fischer, 2004). Ultimately, if done in a logical way, tiering is thought to be able to support addressing the right issues at the right time. As a result, it is hoped that strategic planning may become more transparent and systematic, allowing for a more effective consideration of environmental aspects. Using terminology originally introduced by Lee and Wood (1978), SEA tiers are often referred to as policies, plans and programmes (PPPs).

Whilst there appears to be some broad agreement among the SEA community that policy-related SEAs might need a different, more ‘flexible’ approach from more rigorous, EIA-like plan and programme SEAs, there are currently no commonly agreed on definitions for the different tiers. Furthermore, in the academic literature, whereas some authors have chosen to use the terms policy, plan and programme making, others have preferred to talk about policy design, planning and programming. In this context, whether this signifies differing understanding has yet to be established. What is also clear is that, outside the academic world, in planning practice, terms are not used in a systematic manner, but interchangeably. For example, what is referred to as a programme in one system may be very similar to a plan, policy, concept, strategy or vision, in another.

In this paper, differences in the use of terminology regarding SEA tiers are examined. It is argued that the concept of SEA tiering may be more than a chimera, but that, in order to be useful, some agreement on what stands behind the various terms is needed. In this context, it is suggested that the clearest and most meaningful distinction probably exists between SEAs that are applied in political decision making, i.e., after a PPP submission to cabinet or parliament (as practiced, for example in Canadian SEA, Danish environmental assessment of bills and the Dutch e-test), and those SEAs that are conducted in public and, at times, private administration-led planning processes, which may or may not need later political approval (as practiced in most planning systems world-wide). Furthermore, it is suggested that in both situations, SEA can take various forms that may be expressed by different planning tiers. It is hypothesised that whereas structured and more rigorous, rational-like approaches may have an important role to play in administration-led planning, it is questionable whether they can be valuable to the same extent in political processes.

An important reason for some of the confusion is that certain authors appear to have used the term policy to describe the political SEA-category, whereas others have used it in terms of a distinct 'planning' tier. Furthermore, normally, no proper distinction is made between the terms plans and programmes. For example, in transport planning, the terms network-plans and programmes appear to have been used for the same 'thing' by different authors. Based on the findings of the paper, it is suggested that a more careful and consistent use of terminology is urgently needed, if we are to advance on both SEA theory and practice.

### A Communication Theory of SEA

*Sachihiko Harashina, Tokyo Institute of Technology, sahara@depe.titech.ac.jp*

I consider that the role of SEA is to conduct discussions in a public space to ensure the environmental and social considerations. One of the characteristics of SEA is a way for exchanging information between decision-makers and stakeholders based on various kinds of paper documents. This is due to information transaction problems in public participation. Though we see many stakeholders in the process of project EIA, the situation is different on the strategic level of decision making. The information exchange could be conducted through meetings by representatives of stakeholders and experts related to the topic, as the number of explicit stakeholders groups are usually limited. It, therefore, is possible to conduct the process based on meetings in the case of SEA on higher stages of decision-making. This is a new style of SEA.

I have a communication theory of SEA which could illustrate the social technology for making the decision-making process transparent to the society. I classify two kinds of SEA process: meeting-based and paper-based. The paper based way is the communication process mainly through papers such as documents, letters and so forth. It is a usual EIA process. In the process, meetings such as that for informing, hearing, and discussions are conducted complementarily. The usual EIA process, therefore, is a combination of communication by papers and by meetings, and a major part is based on exchanging various kinds of papers. Another style of SEA by meeting is mainly based on very open discussions conducted by a group of representative selected ad-hoc who address the problem, and papers are also produced in the process. As the new SEA based on meetings was applied in a consensus building process of waste management problem in a region in Japan, I would like to make an input of the theory by illustrating this example. The SEA process by highly transparent meetings was conducted and they could build a consensus on the strategic decision-making process.

### Purpose and Effectiveness of Strategic Environmental Assessment and its Dependence on the Implementation Context

*Tuija Hilding-Rydevik, Holmfridur Bjarnadóttir; Nordregio, Stockholm, Sweden, tuija.hilding-rydevik@nordregio.se*

Our starting point for this contribution is the assumption that there exist a number of implicit models of how Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) works and which impacts it has on policymaking. What normative assumptions that underpin these models and what normative values and principles that ought to be driving is on the whole unaddressed and unanswered by scholars in the field.<sup>1</sup>

The aim of this paper is to put these normative statements in perspective and thus contribute to the discussion concerning the purpose and effectiveness of SEA implementation. A set of normative statements concerning the purpose and the effectiveness of SEA will be picked out — for example from a key document like the EU directive 2001/42/EC.

This set of statements will be contrasted with results from empirical studies concerning the experiences of integrating environmental perspectives with other sector perspectives in different local and regional planning contexts in Sweden. We will then discuss the implications of these results for formulating the purpose of SEA implementation and for expectations concerning possible achievements of SEA implementation (effectiveness) in relation to different contexts. As a basis for the discussion theories concerning learning (individual as organizational), professions, planning and institutions will be applied.<sup>2</sup>

1 These statements are originally made by Bartlett and Kurian (1999) concerning Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). We find these valid also for SEA. Bartlett, R V and Kurian, P A (1999) "The theory of environmental impact assessment: Implicit models in policy making," Policy and Politics, vol 27, no 4, pp 415-433.

2 In relation to the position paper this contribution will address all three themes identified for the Theory and Research session. We will also respond to some of the statements made in the position paper.

### **An Examination of the Theoretical Rationale for Using Strategic Environmental Assessment of Public Sector Policies, Plans and Programmes to Deliver Environmental Justice, Drawing on the Example of Scotland**

*Tony Jackson, Barbara Illsley; University of Dundee, a.a.jackson@dundee.ac.uk*

Analysis of the legislation and official guidance issued by the various UK jurisdictions for implementing the European Union strategic environmental assessment (SEA) Directive reveals significant variation not only in the range of public sector policies, plans and programmes (PPPs) to be covered, but also in the methodological underpinnings of this technique. This reflects the different interpretations of the strategic purpose of environmental assessment made by the country's public sector decision-makers. The Scottish Executive has linked SEA firmly to its commitment to environmental justice and 'open government,' seeing this technique as meeting a need for enhanced public scrutiny of the processes of public sector decision-making with regard to the environment. It has placed an Environmental Assessment Bill before the Scottish Parliament that is specifically drafted to this end, extending SEA to all Scottish PPPs. In the rest of the UK, the public sector has subsumed the SEA Directive within various initiatives to promote sustainability development through planning processes reliant on a technical-rational methodology. In this setting, SEA provides one element of a quality assurance proofing process to test governmental decision-making for its compatibility with pre-determined policy objectives for the delivery of sustainable development.

We assess the range of United Kingdom official guidance on this technique for its insights into the current debate on the theoretical rationale for SEA. This has seen the purpose of SEA subjected to fundamental examination, which is attempting to establish its contribution towards the realisation of public sector planning objectives. Drawing on our research on measuring plan performance outputs, we consider the capacity of officially-recommended analytical tools for SEA, such as sustainability indicators and frameworks, to deliver their intended outcomes. Our findings send support to those who question the efficacy of basing SEA methodology on a technical-rational conceptualisation of planning. The Scottish approach is considered to offer SEA a sounder theoretical basis, according the technique a deliberative and discursive role intended to enhance public participation in governmental decision-making processes that impact on the environment.

### **SEA as a Platform for Dialogue and a Springboard for Innovation**

*Elsa João, University of Strathclyde, elsa.joao@strath.ac.uk*

The paper starts by arguing that SEA is about people working together to achieve common good, and for this, dialogue is crucial. This dialogue often starts within a single organisation, for example between the planning department and the transport department of a local authority (often more like separate fiefdoms in practice). Interestingly, SEA training can provide the much-needed platform for dialogue. At a recent SEA course run for a Scottish local council, staff had been handpicked to use the SEA training as an opportunity to start the dialogue between the different parts of the council (including some that traditionally had not dealt with environmental assessments). A barrier for this dialogue is the perception that SEA will be a burden and that there are not enough resources to go around. The motivation for starting the SEA process might therefore be greatly reduced. However, necessity (in this case for more resources) can lead to creativity and innovation. This paper will describe three case studies where the local authorities have come together with ingenious solutions that allowed them not only to save resources but also to perform the SEA process more efficiently and with higher quality.



## Institutional Change - A Premise for IA Integration

Lone Kørnøv, Eskild Holm Nielsen; Aalborg University, [lonenk@i4.auc.dk](mailto:lonenk@i4.auc.dk), [ehn@plan.auc.dk](mailto:ehn@plan.auc.dk)

IA processes create a formal opportunity for learning, whereby knowledge, know-how and preferences are acquired and constructed as an ongoing process. However, IA functions in institutions – defined as a setup of formal and informal rules, procedures and mechanisms for monitoring and sanctions. These institutions either hinder or support the potential learning as part of impact assessment in planning and policy-making. The understanding of mechanisms by which institutions permit, empower, constitute, limit and show path dependency [what is this? ooops] in relation to integrating IA is the focus in the paper.

This paper takes as a point of departure that IA practices have not been fully integrated into the policy making processes, but has rather been appendage activities. There are many explanations to this. First of all, IA methods and guidelines must be appropriated to existing policy making processes. Existing institutions are often dominated by a sector oriented approach, which means that it does not provide IA with an updated framework in terms of environmental aim and objectives. One of the crucial objectives for IA is to predict the likely significant effects on the environment, and in order to cope with this, it requires for the organisation to have sufficient baseline data, staff with knowledge from many disciplines etc. From an institutional point of view, the IA organisations must have the capacity to work proactively rather than reactively, which have been the common trajectory in the past. IA and the proactive approach is a challenge for existing institutions.

Based upon theories on learning and institutional change, the paper analyses three perspectives on knowledge and know-how acquired through IA in institutions. The three perspectives relate to: (1) Procurement, (2) Organisation and (3) Use of knowledge in relation to IA activities. For each perspective, the paper will analyse and present institutional mechanisms influencing the integration of IA and learning. On the basis of these findings, recommendations relating to institutional change are put forward.

## SEA and Types of Decision-making Processes – A Decision-Taker's Perspective

Einar Leknes, Rogaland Research, [elek@rf.no](mailto:elek@rf.no)

The logic of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is to inform public decision-making by generating knowledge about external impacts of proposed policies, plans or programs. The decision making process itself will be of major importance for the SEA's ability to contribute to policy-making. This paper will therefore try to take the decision-takers perspective:

1. How can SEA contribute to “my” decision-taking?
2. How will different types of decision-making processes set limitations for SEA's contribution to the decision making processes?

Public decision-making encompass multiplicity of logics. The departure point is principal types of decision making processes encompassing among others negotiation, voting, administrative assessment, experiments and rule compliance. Each of the types has characteristics that make up the context elements of the decision making process and will be described.

Based on these types and by using two SEA-cases as examples, this paper tries to illuminate (a) how SEA typically will be used in the different decision-making process, and (b) possibilities for adapting SEA to the types of decision-making processes. The paper tries to pinpoint the conditions for contribution of SEA to good governance in the different types of decision making process.

## Alternatives in SEA

Eric Markus, Blekinge Institute of Technology, [eric.markus@bth.se](mailto:eric.markus@bth.se)

This contribution looks at alternatives in SEA and questions the view that SEA is (or ought to be) a policy-level version of EIA. The contribution presents the case study of the Swedish-Danish Öresund Bridge, its decision-making process, and discusses general conclusions drawn from this study to EA and planning. The case study has as its focus the handling of alternatives in SEA. From this perspective, the conference contribution will attempt to shed light on the relationship between strategic decisions and projects and identify some of the theoretical and empirical difficulties with alternatives in strategic decisions and assessment. Projects can also be seen as shaping (or strongly influencing) policy formulation, thus reinforcing the argument that linear, rational planning is not what *de facto* happens on the ‘non-project’-level.

The overall conclusion is that SEA, if applied as a clone of project-EIA, cannot comfortably fulfil a useful role in the decision-making process in planning. This, in turn, opens up for the questioning of the workings of SEA: is SEA truly necessary for achieving more sustainable planning? Can SEA be an obstacle to sustainability in planning? The answers naturally depend on the issues of tiering, the breadth of the concepts of 'sustainability' and 'environment'—and, by extension, on the definition and form of SEA itself.

### **The Role of Assessments and Institutions for Policy Learning: Cases in Nuclear and Climate Policy Formation in Sweden**

*Måns Nilsson, Stockholm Environment Institute, mans.nilsson@sei.se*

The integration of environmental concerns into sector policies is a key principle in European policymaking. It can be treated analytically as a process of policy learning by which actors in a policy sector reframe their goals, strategies and activities towards sustainable development. This paper examines, in climate and nuclear policy processes in Sweden, how policy learning is affected by the institutional arrangements surrounding the policymaking process and the advancement of knowledge through different types of assessments. First, it identifies patterns of policy learning in the construction of arguments and policies, and determines whether learning occurs mainly incrementally or in more profound reframing processes. Second, it examines the influence of the institutional context in terms of rules and procedures surrounding policymaking, and the role assessments play for learning through their effect on knowledge assimilation and social interactions. Based on the empirical analysis, suggestions are given on how to enhance the potential for learning towards policy integration in the process in terms of designing the assessment process and substance, as well as the institutional context in which it functions.

### **Impact Assessment as Incentive for Social Learning**

*Sibout Nooteboom, DHV Consultants, Sibout.Nooteboom@dhw.nl*

In a social constructivist worldview, learning organizations are the only way to effectively link knowledge to complex decision-making — i.e., achieving an alternative development rather than only mitigating and compensating adverse impacts. SEA helps a lot as incentive for social learning, though it may become encapsulated and its value forgotten. Impact assessment procedures make sectoral actors vulnerable and therefore create an incentive to come to an understanding with adversaries. Transparency is needed to create interdependencies in networks of sectoral actors and affected groups like future generations or their representatives, but closedness is also needed for these networks to develop influential views that create sustainable breakthroughs. This can be seen in Dutch case examples. Closedness is needed for trust to develop away from the spotlights because supporters initially don't understand that adversaries work together for a better future. Increase interdependencies through transparency, but don't make everything transparent.

### **Addressing Power, Multiple Rationality and Ethics in Theorising Strategic Environmental Assessment**

*Tim Richardson, University of Sheffield, tim.richardson@sheffield.ac.uk*

This paper engages with debates in the environmental assessment literature about the lessons that can be learned from planning theory, and explores implications for the conceptualisation of SEA. It argues that the current communicative turn in EA echoes a movement in planning theory, but that the lessons from this planning debate have yet to be integrated into the conceptualisation of SEA.

The paper seeks to do this by examining SEA from a perspective which is ambivalent about the claims made for the communicative approach, and by combining concepts of power, rationality, value and ethics in a different way.

First, the paper briefly sets out how planning theory has engaged with these concepts. It then argues that SEA needs to engage with competing multiple rationalities, and the inescapable presence of value conflicts within SEA. It then turns to recent debates to show how the question of value has become a very difficult issue in theorising SEA. These issues are illustrated with cases where the practice of SEA opens spaces of struggle where values and knowledge are contested, and where power geometries are mediated and consensus sought, suggesting a situated, context dependent understanding of SEA. Finally, the paper reflects on how SEA might be conceptualised reflexively and ethically in the face of power.

## SEA – Affecting Decision-Making through Communication

Gustavo Vicente, Maria do Rosário Partidário; New University of Lisbon, Portugal, [gv@fct.unl.pt](mailto:gv@fct.unl.pt), [mp@fct.unl.pt](mailto:mp@fct.unl.pt)

One of the acknowledged differences between project-based analysis and strategic levels of assessment is the subjectivity associated to problem perception, much of which depend on individual, or group of individuals, personal values. At this level of values a variety of ideologies, cultural beliefs, world visions, conflicting interests, different needs and political options come into play, inter-cross and create multiple combinations that lead to different views on why a problem is a problem, for whom is it a problem, and whether it is a problem.

To cope with this multifaceted reality, SEA should be able to engage such different perceptions, including the assessors and the decision-makers' perspectives, since the actions and decisions of these two key groups will ultimately reflect in their own values systems, or not, the values of the other different groups in the society. This value integration, or value acknowledgement, is key in permitting the visibility of the society values every time a strategic decision is taken.

In this contribution it is argued that focus should be put at earlier stages of problem identification, when the perception of the problem, or problems, start taking shape, to enable those that take, or strongly influence decisions, to fully understand the problem(s), inherent issues and the widespread of its relevance, and subsequently engage in the implementation of SEA, before findings and recommendations are even sought.

To face up to this challenge, the authors suggest the development of communication strategies, capable of exploring and revealing the possible synergies and understandings between the environmental assessors and the decision-makers, this way facilitating SEA's influence in decision-making processes. In this context this contribution explores the communicational nature of SEA and its potential to affect the context within which decisions are taken.

## Session E3 Developing SEA Guidance

---

Governments and donor organisations around the world are busy implementing their specific versions of SEA. Consistently, such introductions of SEA are accompanied by the development of some sort of SEA guidance. This session draws on practical experience in developing such guidance material to distinguish lessons learned, so that we may avoid continual "reinvention of the wheel" in SEA guidance development.

Sessions E3.1 and E3.2 will start with two presentations, followed by in-depth discussion on the session theme.

### Workshop E3.1 Solving Common Challenges in Developing SEA Guidance and Increasing Effectiveness of SEA Guidance Material

---

*Topic chair: Bobbi Schijf, Ameco Environmental Services, The Netherlands, [bobbischijf@wanadoo.nl](mailto:bobbischijf@wanadoo.nl)*

Development and Use of SEA Guidance for the EU SEA Directive. Riki Therivel

SEA Guideline for Japan. Kenichiro Tomiyasu, Yasusuke Kurosaki

Discussion on the session theme facilitated by the session chair

### Workshop E3.2 What Should Be Common to All SEA Guidance Material?

---

*Topic chair: Bobbi Schijf, Ameco Environmental Services, The Netherlands, [bobbischijf@wanadoo.nl](mailto:bobbischijf@wanadoo.nl)*

Keeping It Short: The Environment Agency SEA "Do's and Don'ts Guide." Lucia Susani

Analysis of Objectives in Strategic Environmental Assessment of EU Structural Funds Planning Process. D. Pereira, B. Ocon, J.J. Rodriguez, J.J. Oñate

Discussion on the session theme, facilitated by the session chair

### Development and Use of SEA Guidance for the EU SEA Directive

Riki Therivel, Oxford Brookes University, [riki@ukoxford.freemove.co.uk](mailto:riki@ukoxford.freemove.co.uk)

The development of SEA guidance in response to the European SEA Directive raised remarkably similar issues in different countries. These included how to integrate SEA with existing planning systems, how to make SEA manageable and practical, how to ensure that SEA was as effective and powerful as possible, and how to ensure that the guidance promotes legal compliance with the Directive. However, the process of writing and using the guidance varied dramatically, with different organisations involved and different levels of use and ownership. The development and use of five guidance documents — for Iceland, the Lombardia region of Italy, Portugal, Scotland and England — is reviewed, with a focus on England. The presentation is based on an article co-written by five SEA experts: Therivel et al. (2004) 'Writing Strategic Environmental Assessment Guidance', *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 22(4), pp. 259-270.

### SEA Guideline for Japan

Kenichiro Tomiyasu, Ministry of the Environment, Government of Japan, [KENICHIRO\\_TOMIYASU@env.go.jp](mailto:KENICHIRO_TOMIYASU@env.go.jp); Yasusuke Kurosaki, Nippon Koei Co., Ltd., [a3492@n-koei.co.jp](mailto:a3492@n-koei.co.jp)

The Ministry of the Environment, Government of Japan (MOE) developed a provisional strategic environmental impact assessment (SEA) guideline for the waste management sector in November 2003. In this presentation, we describe objectives and features of the guideline and a case study. The guideline shows SEA procedures and important points when municipalities design those plans. Although some municipalities already have SEA frameworks, there have been only a few SEA cases. Therefore, we hope this helpful guideline contributes to promoting SEA in Japan. Before the guideline was developed, a case study was conducted in order to make clear important procedures of SEA. Main characteristics of the case study are that it shows 1) who should do what in each step of SEA procedures, 2) how to design an environmental consideration policy and developing alternatives based on this policy, 3) timing and methods of public participation, and 4) examples of documents for consultation.

### Keeping It Short: The Environment Agency SEA “Do’s and Don’ts Guide”

Lucia Susani, UK Environment Agency, [lucia.susani@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:lucia.susani@environment-agency.gov.uk)

In the UK, a number of SEA guidance documents have been prepared. The documents range in length from eight to 80+ pages, and, although thorough, can sometimes prove overwhelming. To combat SEA “information overload,” the Environment Agency of England and Wales has developed a one-page Guide summarising key SEA principles, in particular for local development documents prepared by local Authorities. The “SEA Do’s and Don’ts Guide” has been designed for accessibility and user-friendliness. On the document, a flow diagram indicates each of the key stages of SEA: Screening, Baseline, Scoping, Assessment and Reporting, Consultation and Decision Making, and Monitoring. For each stage, a number of relevant “Do’s” and “Don’ts” provide snappy reminders of SEA principles. For example, for baseline development, plan makers are urged to “do stick to relevant issues; don’t collect excessive detail.” In scoping, “do consider a range of options; don’t be afraid of being creative.” For assessment and reporting, “do ensure assessment is evidence-based; don’t hide uncertainties.” A handful of process-wide “do’s and don’ts” are also suggested.

The one-page document was distributed widely and made available electronically. A positive and enthusiastic response was received on the effectiveness and accessibility of the information. The importance of brevity, visual clarity, and immediacy in guidance documents is highlighted.

### Analysis of Objectives in Strategic Environmental Assessment of EU Structural Funds Planning Process

D. Pereira, B. Ocon, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, [d.pereira@upm.es](mailto:d.pereira@upm.es); J.J. Rodríguez, *Análisis e Información Ambiental*, [aia@aiaconsult.com](mailto:aia@aiaconsult.com); J.J. Oñate, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, [juan.onate@uam.es](mailto:juan.onate@uam.es)

The strategic level of impact assessment must face up the analysis of objectives and goals. How we can resolve this problem is a key methodological decision, specially when evaluators pursue the inclusion of the main findings of environmental assessment process in the political and social agenda, and the measures included in the planning document are not clearly defined (number, size, design properties, spatial location and moment of development and others).

Using the experience of the preceding period of EU structural funds planning process (2000-06), we raise some reflections about methodological issues related with this kind of analysis and the means to integrate it inside the environmental and sustainability policy framework. Those questions are focused on the qualitative analysis of objectives and goals and how make it operative through the tiered chain of planning documents and evaluations during the whole planning process. This analysis is based on planning documents (from regional development plans to operative programs and related documents), strategic environmental assessments, and intermediate evaluations conducted during 2000-06 UE structural funds planning process in several EU countries.

## Session E4 Search for Appropriate Organisations

---

*Topic chairs: Holger Dalkmann, Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, holger.dalkmann@wupperinst.org; Lone Kørnøv, Aalborg University, lonek@i4.auc.dk*

Having in mind that planning and decision making processes are not rational and linear, value free and technical processes only, central questions are raised in relation to the development and use of SEA. Different kind of SEA types and varied frameworks provide different opportunities for the integration of SEA processes and results.

The main aim of the session is to focus on 'hit factors' for SEA from the perspective of decision-making, actors' constellations and process organisation. This discussion will be based on the actual situation, where new SEA procedures often meet old decision-making structures with existing routines and formal as well as informal processes.

When discussing appropriate organisations for integrating SEA, the session will address the following questions:

1. How can we in the SEA process cope with formal and informal organisational structures and decision-making processes? How could the process be organised in a more formal and transparent manner?
2. How can we when organising the SEA work support the dialogue and thereby challenge the different rationalities and exchange expertise and preferences?
3. When organising the SEA work, how can we produce and bring knowledge at the right time and at the right level of detail to the decision makers and the broader public to ensure use of the results?
4. When organising the SEA work, how can we cope with the political system and support a transparency in relation to the decision making process? Which role could public participation play in relation to the political processes?

### Workshop E4.1 Challenges for a Successful SEA Implementation

---

Political Decision Making and the Influence of an SEA Process. Marc Van Dyck

An Independent Body to Oversee SEA: Bureaucratic Burden or Efficient Accountable Administration? Anna McLauchlan and Elsa João

Implementation of SEA — Challenge or a Bridge Too Far. Astrid Paulussen, Emilija Savanovic, Petra Boonman

Actor's Teamwork Developing a National Strategy for Waste Prevention and Processing for Austria – A Proactive Step Towards Bridging the Gap Between Experts' Work and Political Decision-Making. Sabine Mayer

### Workshop E4.2 Roundtable Discussion: Search for Appropriate Organisations

---

A short introduction will focus on 'hit factors' for SEA from the perspective of decision-making, actors' constellations and process organisation. The introduction, insight from workshop 1 and statements from invited contributors forms the basis for a roundtable discussion focusing on a) appropriate organizations to integrate SEA in decision making and b) how to get there.



### **Political Decision Making and the Influence of an SEA Process**

Marc Van Dyck, Resource Analysis NV, [mvd@resource.be](mailto:mvd@resource.be)

The serious and sometimes controversial political decisions that have to be taken on plans or programmes with a huge spatial, social and economical impact on the affected population, ask for input from the SEA process. However, not all of this input fits into the politicians agenda. And that is why the influences between the SEA process and the political level go both ways.

When a political decision making culture is not based on planning processes, this information exchange is deficient or does not exist at all, and the influence of the SEA processes may lead to inadequate decision-making, which in its turn will give rise to protest or to a bad image for both the planning instrument SEA and the political decision-makers.

SEA is vulnerable to political influence and meets boundaries that limit the positive influence of SEA research processes on political decision making. In the SEA sessions in Boston (IAIA'05) these boundaries (institutional, societal and information boundaries) were addressed and illustrated with a few case examples.

This paper will try to take the analysis of the cases a step further and relate the planning culture to the effectiveness of SEA output in political decision making. A proposal for specific adaptation of the SEA process to the political decision making culture as well as the planning culture will be presented. The supporting factors to overcome the difficulties in streamlining the SEA assessment with the ongoing political decision making process, as well as the pitfalls, will be identified.

### **An Independent Body to Oversee SEA: Bureaucratic Burden or Efficient Accountable Administration?**

Anna McLauchlan, Elsa João; University of Strathclyde, [anna.mclauchlan@strath.ac.uk](mailto:anna.mclauchlan@strath.ac.uk),  
[elsa.joa@strath.ac.uk](mailto:elsa.joa@strath.ac.uk)

This paper addresses two questions posed by the position paper: "How could the process be organised in a more formal and transparent manner?" and "When organising the SEA work, how can we cope with the political system and support a transparency in relation to the decision making process?"

Through a review of the international experience in the context of "good practice" SEA, this paper proposes a number of services that a hypothetical independent organisation could perform to improve SEA practice (e.g., providing guidance, auditing). It then proposes alternative organisational structures that could facilitate such supporting services, questioning what aspects of such structures would be appropriate in different European countries. This paper reflects the current debate in Scotland about whether an independent organisation to administer SEA is needed to support Scottish SEA practice. The paper also briefly explains how the SEA Directive is being implemented in Scotland as, interestingly, Scotland is going beyond the SEA Directive requirements by also considering the SEA of policies.

### **Implementation of SEA - Challenge or a Bridge Too Far**

Astrid Paulussen, Emilija Savanovic, Petra Boonman; Ministry of Transport, Public Works & Water Management, [a.m.paulussen@dwv.rws.minvenw.nl](mailto:a.m.paulussen@dwv.rws.minvenw.nl), [p.c.m.boonman@dwv.rws.minvenw.nl](mailto:p.c.m.boonman@dwv.rws.minvenw.nl)

How to assure good implementation of SEA? What are the major issues that affect the overall 'climate' for and acceptability of environmental assessment at the policy plan and program level? This paper discusses some issues and challenges related to the development and successful implementation resulting in meaningful strategic environmental assessments of government policy and program proposals.

The Dutch Ministry of Transportation, Public Works and Water Management has no experiences of doing a formal SEA within the legal framework of European Directive 2001/42/EC. It finds itself facing the task to implement SEA in its organization. Moreover, being a government organisation, the Ministry is responsible and obliged to take this new directive seriously in order to give a good example and to make SEAs, which have an added value to the policy- and plan-making process. Is it possible to implement SEA in such a way that it not only appraise plans and programs but also contributes to the development of policies, plans or programs? The Ministry has much experience with EIA at the project level, having the responsibilities of competent authority as well as proponent/developer.

This experience might be useful for the integration of SEA into the mainstream of policy- and decision-making. This paper is an invitation to discuss the challenges and to exchange experiences from other countries.

### **Actor's Teamwork Developing a National Strategy for Waste Prevention and Processing for Austria – A Proactive Step Towards Bridging the Gap Between Experts Work and Political Decision-Making**

*Sabine Mayer, Federal Environmental Agency, [sabine.mayer@umweltbundesamt.at](mailto:sabine.mayer@umweltbundesamt.at)*

Within the framework of compiling the 'Federal Waste Management Plan 2006,' a consensus-building process similar to SEA has been initiated by the governing authorities in order to develop an innovative national strategy for waste prevention and processing for Austria. At the time the process started, SEA had not been implemented in the Austrian Waste Management Act. Accordingly there was no legal requirement to undertake an SEA for the whole Waste Management Plan. Even though this process is not legally obliged to meet all SEA requirements, it practically covers all necessary elements, but leaves more flexibility in the process design.

This initiative shall provide for a consensual suggestion from relevant stakeholders, outlining which steps the Ministry of Environment shall take in order to achieve advanced waste prevention such as an efficient reduction of amount and content of harmful substances in wastes and waste processing. The given time frame is four years (2006-2010). The stakeholders identified should not only represent a qualified cross-section of opinions and positions, but should also be in positions which can effectively influence the final political decision and also enhance the chance for practical implementation of the agreed outcome.

The presentation will focus on key factors of successful active participation with links to experiences with this high-level waste-experts teamwork. This begins with setting objectives such as limits for the process, stakeholder identification, constitution of different roles and agreeing upon general principles and process rules. Moreover, it will provide an insight into the mode of operation in reaching consensual results without sacrificing quality, strengthening the crucial role of facilitation. In addition, experiences and findings will be outlined with a view to move towards SEA requirements in dealing with competent authorities' structures such as relevant stakeholders.

## **Session E5 Operating SEA Knowledge Centres**

---

*Topic chair: Petrie van Gent, Commissie M.E.R. Netherlands Commission for Environmental Impact Assessment, [pgent@eia.nl](mailto:pgent@eia.nl)*

The application of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) increased quickly over the last years, not only in number but also in ways of application. In view of introducing or improving the use of SEA in countries and institutions, it is important to know about actual developments. During this session we would like to discuss the dissemination of SEA information and experiences and how this can be facilitated by "SEA knowledge centres." What kind of information is required, which tools do we need to reach different user groups and what may (or may not) we expect from these centres?

### **Workshop E5.1 Where Do You Look for SEA Information? And Do You Find What You Are Looking For?**

---

Facilitated round-table discussion on how/where participants look for SEA information and experiences, and whether they can find it, yes or no. The debate will be supported by various posters\* on SEA information and knowledge centres. There also will be access to internet to be able to discuss digital information sources. The discussion will result in an overview (matrix as suggested in the position paper) of the kind of information and experiences that is sought after, and whether that is available.

*\* including Academy of Sciences, Republic of Tajikistan (Prof. M. Isobaev, [coordin@yandex.ru](mailto:coordin@yandex.ru)); Netherlands Commission for EIA (Petrie van Gent, [pgent@eia.nl](mailto:pgent@eia.nl)) and others.*

## Workshop E5.2 How to Facilitate (Better) Availability, Accessibility and Applicability of Good SEA Information

---

Continued round table discussion. Based on the outcomes of the Workshop 5.1: if we know what is out there, we can try to define the gaps in information provision and exchange. Special attention will be given to those groups with less access to facilities.

The session will come up with recommendations and concrete suggestions on whether “SEA knowledge centres” have a role to play in effective information provision. If yes, how? If not, what else can we do?

### Session E5 abstract

---

#### **The Ways for Better Environment Assessment at the Central Asian Regional Level** (poster)

M.J. Isobaev, Academy of Sciences, Republic of Tajikistan, [coordin@yandex.ru](mailto:coordin@yandex.ru)

The Central Asian (CA) region has a lot of ecological problems. The priority in this set should be given to the drinking water, childrens’ environmental health, and air pollution. Some joint actions toward combating these issues have been done and number of strategic environmental programs have been created. The Strategic Environment Assessment’s key question is access and sharing of environmental information. With the goal of creating a basis for effective sharing of environmental information, the project named Capacity Building in Environmental Information Management System in Central Asia has been launched by CA NIS including Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Kyrgyzstan. The project is financially supported by the Government of Finland and is to be continued for two years. The author of the presentation has been appointed as analytical laboratory expert in charge of highlighting the main problems which had arisen at the initial stage of the project. The regional information system should have an electronic database concerning the environmental pollution. This means that all analytical investigations are to be carried out by using standardized methodic and common indicators for the purposes of environmental monitoring. Since the project’s inception, two regional workshops have taken place (Dushanbe 2004, Almaty 2005) and the problem was discussed thoroughly, but no decision on this subject was elaborated.

To date, some actions on improving the situation with standardized methodic and common indicators have been taken by CA NIS national experts and it is expected that one additional workshop dedicated to this issue will take place soon. The Strategic Environment Assessments should be based on available laboratory instrumental data information. That is why the organizations involved in Environmental Information Management System projects should have modern equipments and the results of analyses should be taken continually.

Unfortunately, the laboratory equipment which was examined in many governmental and scientific organizations in the Republic of Tajikistan is not responding to the project’s needs. Some actions towards improving situations in this area should also take place. In the local level we are also planning to conduct trainings of laboratory technicians on topics of efficient use of standardized methodic and common indicators for the purposes of environmental monitoring.

## Session E6 Distance Learning and E-learning in SEA

---

Topic chairs: Brendan Barrett, Gerard Brady, United Nations University, [barrett@hq.unu.edu](mailto:barrett@hq.unu.edu), [brady@hq.unu.edu](mailto:brady@hq.unu.edu)

The purpose of this session is to:

- Examine recent experience in the development of online and distance learning on SEA
- Explore potential synergies between existing SEA e-learning initiatives internationally and regionally
- Illustrate various methodologies designed to produce good, quality assured distance and e-learning on SEA

## Workshop E6.1 Distance Learning and E-Learning in SEA

---

Online Learning for SEA in Coastal Management for the Mediterranean (poster), by A. G. Abul-Azm, Gonzalo Malvarez, Paola Minoia, Ivicia Trumbic, Maja Fredotovic

Oxford Brookes University Distance Learning Course in SEA. Riki Therivel

SEA E-Course Module and Ayuquila River E-Case Study. Brendan Barrett, Gerard Brady

### Session E6 abstracts (in order of presentation):

---

#### Online Learning for SEA in Coastal Management for the Mediterranean (poster)

A.G. Abul-Azm, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency, [ecma@access.com.eg](mailto:ecma@access.com.eg); Gonzalo Malvarez, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, [gcmalgar@dhuma.upo.es](mailto:gcmalgar@dhuma.upo.es); Paola Minoia, Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Coastal Areas (CESD), [minoia@unive.it](mailto:minoia@unive.it); Ivicia Trumbic, Priority Action Plan/Regional Activity Center (PAP/RAC), [ivica.trumbic@ppa.htnet.hr](mailto:ivica.trumbic@ppa.htnet.hr); Maja Fredotovic, University of Split, [mfredot@efst.hr](mailto:mfredot@efst.hr)

This poster presents the outline and the initial steps taken by four universities and one institution in the Mediterranean to create and implement a new postgraduate course in Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) in the Mediterranean Region, filling the gaps of existing education programmes with particular emphasis on the managerial aspects. Strategic Environmental Assessment is one of the important tools of ICAM. However, the poster deals with the crucial issue to introduce through an EU standardised curriculum the possibility for stakeholders to achieve the necessary capacity building that is required to manage the complex coastal environments of the Mediterranean. The project is funded by TEMPUS, and the Joint Educational Programme (JEP) is intended to create an effective network of higher education institutions to share resources and capabilities available in the consortium members and in line with the EU principles and regulations including the Bologna Declaration for developing advanced concepts in education.

#### Oxford Brookes University Distance Learning Course in SEA

Riki Therivel, Oxford Brookes University, [riki@ukoxford.freemove.co.uk](mailto:riki@ukoxford.freemove.co.uk)

Oxford Brookes University's distance-learning course in SEA is a web-based course designed to support a masters-level programme and also as a stand-alone course for training and professional development. The course provides extensive coverage of SEA theory and practice and allows students to carry out the many steps involved in SEA and also to analyse a range of supporting reports, regulations and guidance. The course also provides practice in critical analysis, succinct written presentation, use of information technology (Web searches, Adobe, e-mail), and possible participation via the Internet. This presentation will focus on key aspects of the course and provide a demonstration of the course module.

#### SEA E-Course Module and Ayuquila River E-Case Study

Brendan Barrett, Gerard Brady, United Nations University, [barrett@hq.unu.edu](mailto:barrett@hq.unu.edu), [brady@hq.unu.edu](mailto:brady@hq.unu.edu)

UNU Online Learning works on a variety of educational technology projects to support the fundamental mandate of the UNU in terms of conducting research and capacity development activities. Based in the Media Studio located in the UN House at Tokyo, UNU Online Learning's approach focuses on creativity, innovation and good design of open content, in collaboration with our partners. Drawing on this approach UNU Online Learning is currently working on the development of "e-course modules" and "e-case studies," which will be used among our partners for education in sustainable development. Key to this presentation is the e-Course Module on SEA, which integrates video, tables and figures and text into a user-friendly interface, incorporating content from Oxford Brookes University's Distance Learning Course in SEA. This course is to be used to support a unit for the UNU-Global Virtual University's online Master's Programme on Global Environment and Development Studies. This presentation will provide a demonstration of the e-Course Module in SEA and also demonstrate how other e-learning objects as the Ayuquila River e-Case Study can support the course.

## Session E7 Capacity Development Manual for the Implementation of the Protocol on SEA

---

*Sponsored by the Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Physical Planning and the Environment*

*Topic chairs: Nicholas Bonvoisin, U.N. Economic Commission for Europe, [nicholas.bonvoisin@unece.org](mailto:nicholas.bonvoisin@unece.org); Ausra Jurkeviciute, The Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC), [ausra@rec.org](mailto:ausra@rec.org)*

The Protocol on SEA to the Espoo Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context was signed in May 2003 by thirty-six states and by the European Commission. Now, within the workplan of the Espoo Convention, a Capacity Development Manual is being developed to support the implementation of the Protocol. The Manual will provide comprehensive materials for use in activities planned to develop capacity in the practical implementation of the Protocol. The conference will provide an opportunity for participants to comment on the draft Manual and to influence its eventual content, distribution and use. Participants who wish to attend this session should ask topic chairs to provide them with the latest version of the Manual before the conference.

### Workshop E7.1 Introductory Workshop

---

*Topic chair: Ausra Jurkeviciute, REC, [ausra@rec.org](mailto:ausra@rec.org)*

Introduction to the session and workshops: clarification of the objectives. Ausra Jurkeviciute

Capacity development framework for the UNECE Protocol on SEA (workplan, overview of activities). Nick Bonvoisin, UNECE

Purpose of the Manual. Jiri Dusik, REC

Overview of Module 1 - Structure of the Manual, target audience and users' guide. Nick Bonvoisin

Relevance of the TM to the implementation of the Directive. David Aspinwall, EC

Module 2 – Trends and developments in SEA with particular reference to implementing the UNECE Protocol on SEA. Barry Sadler

### Workshop E7.2 Workshop on the Application Modules

---

*Topic chair: Ausra Jurkeviciute, REC, [ausra@rec.org](mailto:ausra@rec.org)*

Module 3A and 3B – Key issues in the application of the Protocol on SEA, and application of the Protocol on SEA to plans and programmes. Nick Bonvoisin

Module 8 - Presentation of the outline of the case studies. Ausra Jurkeviciute

### Workshop E7.3 Workshop on the Practical Implementation

---

*Topic chair: Jiri Dusik, REC, [jdusik@rec.org](mailto:jdusik@rec.org)*

Module 4 - Implementing the Protocol on SEA within planning and programming processes. Nick Bonvoisin

Module 5 - Overview of basic applicable methods and tools. Barry Sadler

Module 10 - Tasks for practical work on SEA case studies within capacity development programmes for the Protocol on SEA. Ausra Jurkeviciute

### Workshop E7.4 Workshop on the Capacity Development Module and on the Pilot National Manuals

---

*Facilitated by Henrieta Martonakova*

Module 9 - Capacity development for the Protocol on SEA: presentation of capacity-building methods and tools. Ausra Jurkeviciute

Capacity development activities (Capacity-building needs analysis in selected countries of East-



ern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, Manual). Henrieta Martonakova, UNDP Regional Center for Europe and CIS (focusing on the selection processes of the capacity building and manuals)

Implementation of the Protocol on SEA in Georgia. Lia Todua, Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia

Strategic Environmental Assessment Practices in Moldova. Dumitru Drumea, Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning, Moldova

National Capacity Development Manual for the UNECE Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment: Experience of Ukraine. Olena Borysova and Evgenia Varyvoda, Kharkiv National Karazin University, Ukraine

Future development. Jiri Dusik and Nick Bonvoisin

## **Session E7 abstracts (in order of presentation)**

---

### **Implementation of the Protocol on SEA in Georgia**

*Lia Todua, Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia, [liatodiua@gol.ge](mailto:liatodiua@gol.ge)*

At the moment in Georgia there is a special situation with regards to SEA introduction. There are several points to be taken into account:

- Lack of planning regulations and need for urgent development of those. The country has no formal planning regulations: soviet planning system completely collapsed and no new one is developed so far. Actually the country is in the process of development (actually at the very beginning) of a new planning system, both at central and at local level.
- Formal existence of SEA-type procedure declared at legislative level. Georgian legislations provides for EIA procedure for a list of plans and programs. But in reality it never works. Formally that means that at least formally the country does not have to introduce SEA, but just to improve the procedure so that it works.
- Changes in permitting-licensing system with the goal to ease the process for entrepreneurs. Meaning that it is a right moment to also change something with regards to plans and programs.

The challenge in this situation is to develop SEA procedure in parallel with development of planning system in Georgia. We consider it as promising and interesting. Accordingly, I will present:

1. The situation in the country with planning practices, EIA, and perspectives for SEA introduction
2. Our work on manual, its target groups and suggested way of use, its outline and already developed parts
3. Correlation of the 1 and 2 and perspectives

### **Strategic Environmental Assessment Practices in Moldova**

*Dumitru Drumea, Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning, Moldova, [drumead25@yahoo.com](mailto:drumead25@yahoo.com)*

Actual practices on Environmental Assessment in Moldova are based mainly on evaluation of the damages caused to environment due to a certain types of social and economic activities. According to legislation, each type of these activities needs an environmental impact assessment study. Actually there is rather good experience in developing of such studies in the country, which allows the development and then implementation of adequate measures aimed at environmental protection and rational use of natural resources.

Strategic Environmental Assessment issues have become a point for discussion after the country declared its intent to join to the European Union. The willingness of the Moldovan State to enter the EU demanded development of national and regional strategic programs aimed at sustainable development in the country, overcoming of actual economic constrains, etc. Actually there are some nationwide programs, which are under implementation like "Moldavian village," "drinking water supply in rural areas," "development of the organic agriculture," etc. All these documents need a strong strategic environmental assessment and this is widely recognized by different levels of political and sectoral authorities.

Development of the manual on Strategic Environmental assessment in Moldova started on the national workshop on this topic, where representatives of main stakeholders recognized the vital necessity for this. In the framing of the manual development, a series of consultation meetings were held in 2005. During these field trips, local authorities were informed about the manual's development and draft of its outline was discussed with them. On the basis of such discussions, one could conclude that soon a guideline-type manual should be developed in Moldova with indication of concrete steps, phases etc., which could be used further by potential users in development of strategic documents.

#### **National Capacity Development Manual for the UNECE Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment: Experience of Ukraine**

*Olena Borysova, National Academy of Municipal Economy, Ukraine, borysova@velton.kharkov.ua; Evgenia Varyvoda, Kharkiv National Karazin University, Ukraine, yarogtchuk@yahoo.com*

Elaboration of the national SEA capacity building manual as the tool for UNECE SEA Protocol implementation in Ukraine was recognized as a priority for strategic environmental assessment system development. This study presents national features, needs and concerns related to the elaboration of the national manual. The manual outline is based on the findings of the regional overview prepared for the capacity building needs assessment for the UNECE SEA Protocol project. At present, it is envisaged that national manual will include Introduction to the capacity building manual, Introduction to SEA, Key issues in the implementing of the SEA Protocol, Key elements of the SEA process, Overview of basic applicable methods and tools, Public participation in SEA, Implementing SEA Protocol with planning processes, SEA process management, Evaluating the quality of the practical application of the SEA Protocol, and Capacity building for the SEA Protocol. The national manual shall serve as guidance for the SEA Protocol implementation, provide resource materials for theoretical and practical introduction to SEA, and supply examples of SEA best practice. Target groups of the national manual are identified as planners, impact assessment professionals, government officials, researchers and NGOs.