

**STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:
A sourcebook and reference guide
to international experience**

By

Barry Dalal-Clayton and Barry Sadler

Earthscan OECD UNEP IIED

Logos`

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

**STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:
A sourcebook and reference guide
to international experience**

By

Barry Dalal-Clayton and Barry Sadler

*Work funded by
The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and
The United Nations Environment Programme*

as a contribution to the work of the OECD DAC Environet Task Team on SEA
and the UNEP initiative on Strategic Integrated Planning

IIED

3 Endsleigh Street
London WC1H 0DD, England, UK
Tel: +44-207-388-2117
Fax: +44-207-388-2826
Website: <http://www.iied.org/>

PREFACE

Strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of policies, plans and programmes is a rapidly evolving field. New approaches and areas of application are emerging all the time - particularly in the fields of development cooperation and international trade. Despite much recent progress, there is still much to do make SEA effective and more widely applied.

This review has been prepared in response to these trends and to support recent initiatives to address SEA frameworks and tools that can be applied by international agencies in their work. For example, the Network on Environment and Development Cooperation (ENVIRONET) of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has established a Task Team on the role, scope and contribution of SEA in support of development cooperation. A major objective of this review of international experience is to provide a baseline and reference guide for developing SEA briefing papers, guidance and other outputs under the ENVIRONET work programme.

This review also intends to support a UNEP programme, initiated in 2003, on integrated assessment and planning (IAP) for sustainable development. The programme aims to develop a generic framework for such planning and involves pilot applications and policy experimentation in a number of countries. It builds on earlier UNEP work on an integrated approach to EIA and SEA and on integrated assessment of trade policies. We anticipate that the IAP framework will become a reference point for a shift towards applying what UNEP initially called “strategic integrated assessment” or what others call sustainability impact assessment or sustainability appraisal. This ‘frontier’ end of the SEA spectrum is also a focus for the DAC ENVIRONET Task Team on SEA.

Both the UNEP and OECD/DAC initiatives respond to the changes taking place in the agenda for international development and, in particular, the increasing shift away from individual projects toward policy-based lending and sector-level programming. This transition has placed a new emphasis on approaches and tools for strategic environmental assessment, broadly interpreted. It is an ‘upstream’ continuation of a larger, decade-long process of mainstreaming environmental and social considerations into development cooperation. Recently, there has been a call for more proactive, integrated approaches, notably in the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

A review of international experience with SEA is timely to help examine its role and potential in relation to these developments. In this book, we cover SEA practice in developed countries, developing countries, countries in transition and development cooperation agencies. The aim has been to draw together information about SEA approaches and cases that illustrate current practice and lessons from experience. This provides baseline material for the work programme of the ENVIRONET Task Team and the UNEP IAP initiative. We hope this will also be of wider interest and help to SEA practitioners and observers. As far as we know, such a broad review has not been attempted so far.

It is apparent that the role and methods of SEA are unclear in some quarters. It is also perceived to be too difficult, too time-consuming, too costly, etc. In other circumstances, various methods have been used to assess environmental dimensions and integrate these in the development of strategies, policies, plans and programmes. But these approaches have not been called SEA and those involved do not necessarily recognise them as a form of SEA.

We take a broad pragmatic view of SEA as comprising a diverse family of approaches which also includes ‘*para SEA*’ processes – a term we use for processes which do not meet formal definitions of SEA or their specification in law or policy but which have some of their

characteristics and elements. The concern is to look at SEA and 'para-SEA' from three perspectives:

1. What is in place in developing and transitional countries, whether applied domestically or in relation to development assistance and lending?
2. How well do these processes and approaches work, especially from the standpoint of addressing the environmental and resource management agenda agreed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD)?
3. Which options and measures could strengthen SEA application in the formulation of policies, plans, programmes, legislation and other higher level proposals.

The first chapter sets SEA in its international context, whilst Chapter 2 discusses terms, principles, benefits and the evolution of SEA. Chapters 3-6 represent the core of the book and deal with SEA experience and practice in different regions/areas of application. But their structure varies. Chapters 3 (developed countries) and 6 (developing countries) are set out on a country-by-country basis. Chapter 4 (development cooperation) is organised into two main sections dealing with multilateral development agencies and bilateral aid agencies. Chapter 5 (countries in transition) is presented in a more thematic manner. This is partly a reflection of different experiences in applying SEA. In the CEE region and NIS, there has been a focus on regional learning, much helped by the EIA and SEA programme work of the Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC), which has enabled sharing and distillation that we have been able to draw upon. Finally, in Chapter 7, we present our conclusions and recommendations and consider future directions and challenges for SEA.

This review is intended to provide a source book and reference guide to key trends and issues of SEA, and to the different approaches being used in particular countries and by a range of agencies. Inevitably, the coverage is uneven and varies in extent, depth and tone, reflecting available information and contributions. This book cannot claim to be complete or comprehensive. SEA is a fast-moving field where information quickly becomes dated. As far as possible, we have tried to present the latest position but, inevitably, by the time this review is published, things will have progressed again.

Barry Dalal-Clayton and Barry Sadler
London, UK; and Victoria, BC, Canada
October 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report builds on an earlier draft (Dalal-Clayton and Sadler 1998a), summarised in Dalal-Clayton and Sadler (1998b), prepared with financial assistance provided by the DGIS, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands. A large number of people provided information, suggested contacts or made available case material for the first draft and grateful thanks are particularly due to the following individuals for information, case materials and comments:

Ron Bisset (Cordah Consultants); Elizabeth Brito (IADB, Washington); Aleg Cherp (Central European University, Budapest); Andriy Demydenko ((UNDP Aral Sea Basin Capacity Development Project); Jiri Dusik (Regional Environment Center for Central and Eastern Europe); Gilberto Gallopin (Stockholm Environment Institute); Jan Joost Kessler (AIDEnvironment, The Netherlands); Nenad Mikulik (State Dept. of Environment and Nature Protection, Croatia); Parvaiz Naim (IUCN-Pakistan); Nick Robins (IIED); Anna Spencely; Keith Wiseman (Cape Metropolitan Council South Africa); Professor Chris Wood (EIA Centre, University of Manchester); and Hans van Zijst (Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, The Netherlands).

Financial support for this updated and completely revised report has been provided by the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). We are particularly grateful to Inger-Marie Bjonness (MFA) for her support and encouragement, to Knut Opsal (NORAD) for technical advice and discussion on the scope of the work, and to Hussein Abaza (UNEP) for his support and encouragement.

We are grateful to the following for their contributions:

Koassi d'Almeida (University of Quebec) for drafting text on SEA in francophone countries;
Kulsum Ahmed and Jean Roger Mercier (World Bank) for helpful comments on SEA experience at the World Bank and edits on the manuscript;
Pierre Andre, University of Montreal, for comments on the section on SEA in France;
David Annandale, Murdoch University, Australia, for documents and information on SEA application by multi-lateral development banks;
Kerstin Arbter (Arbter SEA Consulting and Research) and Ralf Aschermann (Austrian Institute for the Development of Environmental Assessment), for information on SEA application in Austria;
Gideon Asfaw (Project Manager, Nile Transboundary Environment Action Project) for reviewing Nile Basin Initiative case study;
John Ashe (consultant) for information on SEA in Australia;
Ralf Aschermann, Austrian Institute for the Development of Environmental Assessment, for reviewing the section on Austria;
Michelle Audoin (CSIR, South Africa) for comments and SEA materials;
Leyli Bektashi (University of Manchester) for information on SEA in the Russian Federation, Azerbaijan and Slovakia;
Elizabeth Brito (Inter-American Development Bank) for information on SEA in Latin America;
Susie Brownlie (South Africa) for information on Spatial Development Frameworks;
Aleg Cherp (Central European University, Hungary) for contributions to Chapter 5;
Eben Chonguica (Southern Africa Regional Office of the World Conservation Union) for checking the section on Zimbabwe;
Ray Clark (USA) for information on SEA in the USA;
Peter Croal (CIDA) for suggested text on the role of donors in promoting SEA in developing countries;
Holger Dalkmann (Wuppertal Institute) for reviewing section on SEA use in Germany;
Jenny Dixon (Department of Planning, University of Auckland) for information on the Resource Management Act and SEA in New Zealand;
Sean Doolan, Jon Hobbs, Claire Ireland, Angus Mackay, Jean Paul Penrose and John Warburton (UK Department for International Development) for information on SEAs supported by DFID;
Jiri Dusik (Regional Environment Center for Central and Eastern Europe) for contributions to Chapter 5;

Gerard Early (Department of the Environment and Heritage, Canberra) for information on SEA in Australia;

Paulo Eglar (Brazilian Academy of Sciences);

Anders Ekblom (University of Göteborg, Sweden) for editing the section on Sida;

Kerstin Ehrhardt (German Federal Ministry of the Environment) for comments on SEA in Germany;

Dora Fu (Sustainable Development Unit, Hong Kong) for information on Computer-aided Sustainability Evaluation Tool;

Thomas Fischer (University of Liverpool) for contributing text on SEA in Germany, and for helpful comments on the first draft of the report;

Richard Fuggle (University of Cape Town) for comments on SEA in South Africa;

Clive George (University of Manchester) for information on sustainability impact assessment of WTO multilateral trade negotiations;

Petrie van Gent (Netherlands Commission for EIA) for editing the section on Netherlands;

Linda Ghanime (United Nations Development Programme) for reviewing the section on SEA use by UNDP;

Helene Gichenje (Canadian International Development Agency) for edits to the section on CIDA;

Domingos Gove (Centre for Sustainable Development for Coastal Zones, Mozambique) for information on SEA in Mozambique and case study 6.4;

Kogi Govender (CSIR Environmentek, South Africa) for comments on the manuscript and information on SEA in Mozambique;

Stuart Heather-Clark (CSIR Environmentek, South Africa) for case study of SEA of the port of Cape Town;

Fabien Harel, for providing information on SEA use in France;

Liichiro Hayashi (Mitsubishi Research Institute) for information on SEA in Japan;

Mikael Hilden (Finnish Environment Institute) for reviewing section on Finland;

Astrid Hillers (World Bank) for information on the Nile Basin Initiative;

David Howlett (DFID/UNDP) for information on SEA in Tanzania;

Emma Kambewa for information on EA in Malawi;

Kagiso Keatimilwe (CSIR, Environmentek, South Africa) for contributing to section on Botswana;

Jan Joost Kessler (AIDEnvironment, The Netherlands) for drafting text on SEAN methodology and for comments on the draft text;

Bothepea Kgabung (University of Botswana) for contribution to section on Botswana;

Young-Joon Lee (Korea Environment Institute) for information on PES system in Korea;

Themba Mahlaba (University of Swaziland) for information on SEA in Swaziland;

Joseph Milewski (IADB) for information on SEA experience at the Inter-American Development Bank;

Julian Mlangeni for information on SEA in Swaziland;

Bore Moptsamai for information on SEA in Lesotho;

Mushibeyi Muliya (Roads Department, Zambia) for information on SEA in Zambia;

Felicidade Munguambe (Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Mozambique) for information on SEA in Mozambique;

Sue Lane and Robin Carter (South Africa) for an SEA case study 6.11;

Matt McIntyre (South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Samoa) for information on SEA in the South Pacific;

Peter Nelson (Land Use Consultants, Bristol) for information of SEA of Ghana PRSP and on the sustainability test;

Professor Raphael Mwalyosi (Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam) for information on SEA in Tanzania and case studies;

Maria Partidario (NewUniversity of Lisbon) for providing a review of experience with SEA in Portuguese and Spanish speaking countries;

Stephanie Pfahl (Adelphi-consult) for suggested text on the integrative function of SEA;

Nigel Rossouw (CSIR Environmentek, South Africa) for updating the section on SEA in South Africa;

Aboulaye Sene for information on SEA in Senegal;

Eugene Shannon (African Development Bank) for information on ADB activities on SEA;

Steve Smith (Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick consultants, UK) for revising section on SEA in the UK;

Peter Tarr and Gudrun Denker (Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment) for organising a regional workshop on SEA in southern Africa, and for contributing text and case studies on SEA in Namibia;

Urszula Rzeszot (Institute of Environmental Assessment, Warsaw) for case study 5.2;

Bill Sheate (Imperial College, University of London) for permission to quote work that he and colleagues led on SEA in the European Union;
Dewi Utami (Asian Development Bank) for information on SEA experience at ADB;
Rob Verheem (Netherlands EIA Commission) for information on SEA in the Netherlands and for Box 3.18;
Bryony Walmsley (WSP Walmsley consultants, South Africa) for case study 6.10;
Martin Ward (New Zealand) for comments on the text;
Mike Warren, Dirk Versfeld, Obed Baloyi and Gavin Quibell (Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa) for information on SEA for water use;
Edward Zulu (National Environment Council, Zambia) for information on SEA in Zambia.

The following provided information on SEA in Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries:

- Olivia Bina (Cambridge University, UK);
- Miguel Carballo (Guatemala);
- Maria João Coelho (New University of Lisbon);
- Juan Carlos Garcia de Brigard (Colombia);
- Fernando Garrote Garcia (Universidad Politecnica de Madrid, Spain);
- Claudia Perazza (Inter-American Development Bank);
- Lídia Biazzu Lu (Tetraplan, Brazil);
- Joseph Maria Mallarach (Higher-Education Studies in Olot, Catalunya, Spain);
- Rosa Maria Arce Ruiz (Madrid University, Spain);
- Arcindo dos Santos (Inter-American Development Bank);
- Izabella Teixeira (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil); and
- Custódio Voabil (Ministry of Environment and SEACAM, Mozambique).

Grateful thanks must also be extended to the participants of two regional SEA workshops which fed into the preparation of this review: first a workshop in Windhoek, Namibia (13-16 May 2003) hosted by the Southern Africa Institute for Environmental Assessment (SAIEA); and secondly a workshop in Szentendere, Hungary (28-30 April 2003) hosted by the Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC). Specific individual contributions from these workshops are acknowledged above.

We would like to acknowledge the contributions of the members of the *OECD DAC Environet Task Team on SEA* (Box A) and the *Steering Group of the UNEP Initiative of Integrated Assessment and Planning* (Box B).

Finally, we are very grateful to Rob Verheem (Netherlands Commission for Environmental Impact Assessment) and to Professor Chris Wood (University of Manchester) for reviewing and critiquing the final manuscript. If we have inadvertently failed to acknowledge anyone who has helped us in this work, we are sincerely sorry. Needless to say, all errors of omission and commission are our responsibility.

Box A: OECD DAC Environet Task Team on SEA (as at October 2004)

(a) Environet members

Chairperson:	Jon Hobbs (DFID)
Vice Chairperson:	Linda Ghanime (UNDP)
Kulsum Ahmed	World Bank
Tomas Andersson	SIDA
Steve Bass	DFID
Inger-Marie Bjonness	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway
Georg Caspary	OECD
Miriam Ciscar	AECS, Spain
Naïg Cozannet	Agence française de développement
Etienne Coyette	EC-DG Environment
Arnold Jacques de Dixmude	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Belgium
Anders Ekblom (Univ Gothenberg)	SIDA
Jouko Eskelinen	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland
Joseph Gamperl	KfW, Germany
Helene Gichenje	CIDA
Jill Hanna	EC- DG Environment
Laura Lee	UNDP
Simon Le-Grand	EC DG Environment
Kaoru Kanoyashi	Japan
Tamara Levine	CIDA
Harald Lossack	GTZ, Germany
Jean Roger Mercier	World Bank
Matti Nummelin	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland
Remi Paris	OECD
Stephan Paulus	GTZ, Germany
Merete Pedersen	DANIDA
Jan Riemer	DANIDA
Jan-Peter Schemmel	GTZ, Germany
Ellen Shipley	DFAT, Australia
Daniel Slunge	University of Gothenburg/Sida
Kojma Takeharu	Japan
Elsbeth Tarp	DANIDA
Rob van den Boom	DGIS, Netherlands
Francoise Villette	EC-DG Environment
Bob Weir	CIDA

(b) Other members

Hussein Abaza	UNEP
Charles Arden-Clarke	UNEP
Elizabeth Brito	IADB
Peter Croal	SAIEA, Namibia / CIDA
Jiri Dusik	Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe Czech Republic
David Hanrahan	World Bank
David Howlett	UNDP, Tanzania
Andrew McCoubray	DFID, Kenya
Richard McNally	DFID, UK
Jean-Paul Penrose	DFID, UK
James Leaton	WWF, UK
Elizabeth Smith	EBRD
Peter Tarr	SAIEA, Namibia
Alex Weaver	CSIR, South Africa

Gregory Woodsworth	UNDP
(c) SEA specialists	
David Annandale	Murdoch University, Australia
John Horberry	ERM Consultants, UK
Peter Nelson	Land Use Consultants, UK
Barry Sadler	Consultant, Canada
Steve Smith	ScottWilson Consultants, UK
Rob Verheem	EIA Commission, Netherlands
(d) Technical Secretariat	
Barry Dalal-Clayton	International Institute for Environment and Development, London
Task Team website: www.seataskteam.net	

Box B: Steering Group of UNEP Initiative on Integrated Assessment and Planning

Hussein Abaza	UNEP, Switzerland
Nurul Amin	Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand
Laurent Bardon	European Commission, Brussels
Ron Bisset	BMT Cordah Environmental Management Consultants, Scotland
Dieudonné Bitondo	Association Cameronnaire pour l'évaluation environnementale
Nick Bonvoisin	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Switzerland
Elizabeth Brito	Inter-American Development Bank, USA
Nuria Castells	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
Mark Curtis	McGill University, Canada
Barry Dalal-Clayton	IIED, London
Carlos Dora	World Health Organization, Switzerland
Jiri Dusik	Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe, Hungary
Thomas B Fischer	University of Liverpool, UK
Henk B.M. Hilderink	GLEAM (RIVM), Netherlands
Jan Joost Kessler	AIDEnvironment, Netherlands
Marina V. Khotuleva	Ecoline EA Centre, Russia
Colin Kirkpatrick	University of Manchester, UK
Kin Che Lam	Chinese University of Hong Kong
Nicolas Lucas	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, USA
Patrick Mendis	WWF International, Switzerland
Jean-Roger Mercier	World Bank, Washington
Konrad von Moltke	International Institute for Sustainable Development, USA
Rachid Nafti	CITET, Tunisia
Sarah Richardson	Maeander Enterprises, Canada
Barry Sadler	Consultant, Canada
Abdoulaye Sene	Universite Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar, Senegal
Salah el Serafy	Consultant, USA
Fuali Sheng	Conservation International, USA
Robert The	World Trade Organisation, Switzerland
Mathew Stilwell	Legal Counsel
Eliécer Vargas	Centro Agronomico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE), Costa Rica
Rob Verheem	EIA Commission, Netherlands
Zhijia Wang	UNEP, Nairobi
Claudia S. de Windt	Inter-American Forum on Environmental Law (FIDA), USA
Gregory Woodsworth	UNDP, Kenya
Suh Sung Yoon	Korean Environment Institute

ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
ANSEA	Analytical strategic environmental assessment
ASE	Analyse stratégique de l'environnement
BOMEDCO	Border Metropolitan Development Corporation, South Africa
B-T	Biodiversity-tourism
CAS	Country assistance strategy
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCA	Common country assessment
CCI	Cross-cutting issues
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CDS-ZC	Centre for Sustainable Development for Coastal Zones
CEAA	Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
CEA	country environmental assessment
CEC	Commission of the European Community
CEE	Countries of Eastern Europe
CEP	Copperbelt environmental project, Zambia
CEQ	US Council for Environmental Quality
CH ₄	Methane
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CMA	Catchment Management Agency
CONAMA	Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente, Chile
COSS	Country operational strategy studies
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CP	Country programme
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, South Africa
CSP	Country strategy and programme
DAC	Development Cooperation Committee (of OECD)
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs, Namibia
DEAP	District environmental action plan
DEAT	Department of Environment and Tourism, South Africa
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DMC	Developing member country (of Asian Development Bank)
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa
EAP	Environmental action plan
	Environmental Action Programme for Central and Eastern Europe
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EC	European Community
E-c-E	Economic-cum-environmental planning
ECZ	Environment Council of Zambia
EEA	European Environment Agency
EER	Energy and environment review
EIA	Environmental impact assessment
EIS	Environmental impact statement
EMG	Environmental management guidelines
EMP	Environmental management plan/programme

EO	Environmental overview
EPA	environmental Protection Agency
EP-CR	Energy Policy of Czech Republic
ESE	Environmental, social and economic
ESMAP	Energy sector management assistance programme (World Bank)
ESW	Economic and sector work
E-test	Environment test (The Netherlands)
ETOA	Environmental threats and opportunities assessment
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross domestic product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEMP	Generic environmental management programme
GEO	Global Environmental Outlook
GIS	Geographical information system
Gj	Giga joules
GMA	Game management area
GMP	General management plan
GMS	Greater Mekong sub-region
GPRS	Ghana poverty reduction strategy
GWD	great Western Development (strategy), China
HIA	Health impact assessment
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IAIA	International Association for Impact Assessment
ICARM	Integrated coastal area and river basin management
ICMP	Integrated corridor management plan
IDASA	Institute for Democracy in South Africa
IDZ	Industrial development zone
IEA	Integrated ecosystem assessment
IEE	Initial environmental examination
IEM	Integrated environmental management
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IMSSA	Independent Mediation Services of South Africa
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPAT	Integrated assessment and planning tool
IPCC	international Panel on Climate Change
IPP	Independent power plant
ISPP	Integrated spatial development planning process
ITA	Integrated trade assessment
IUCN	World Conservation Union
IUNC-ROSA	World Conservation Union – regional Office for Southern Africa
KINAPA	Kilimanjaro National Park, Tanzania
LFA	Logical framework analysis
LUP	Land use plan
MA	Millennium ecosystem assessment
MAWRD	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, Namibia
MDB	Multi-lateral development bank
MDGs	Millennium development goals
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Namibia
METAP	Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme

MFMR	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Namibia
MICOA	Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Mozambique
MLD	Ministry for Local Development, Nepal
MMSD	Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development
MoPE	Ministry of Population and Environment, Nepal
MRC	Mekong River Commission
MZP	Management zone plan
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NCAA	Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, Tanzania
NEQS	National environmental quality standards
NPC(S)	National Planning Commission (Secretariat)
NDP	National development plan
NEAP	National environmental action plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act, South Africa
NEMC	National Environmental Management Council, Tanzania
NEMS	National environmental management strategies
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act, USA
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
Nile-Com	Nile Basin Initiative Commission
Nile-SEC	Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat
Nile-TAC	Nile Basin Initiative Technical Advisory Committee
NIS	Newly independent states (of former Soviet Union)
NOX	Nitrogen oxides
NPA	National Ports Authority, South Africa
NSDS	National strategy for sustainable development
NTC	National Tourism Council
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, UK
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OVOS	Assessment of environmental impacts (Soviet Union process)
PA	Policy appraisal
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenols
PEA	Programmatic environmental assessment
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PEIA	Preliminary environmental impact assessment
PER	Public environmental expert review
PES	Preliminary environmental scan
PIA	Policy impact assessment
PIC	Pacific island countries
PMA	Plan for modernisation of agriculture, Uganda
PPA	Participatory poverty assessment
PPP	Policies, plans and programmes
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSIA	Poverty and social impact analysis
PST-II	Second Transport Sector Programme, Senegal
RDEIA	Regional development environmental impact assessment
REA	Regional environmental assessment
REC	Regional Environment Centre for Eastern and Central Europe
RMA	Resource Management Act (New Zealand)
RMC	Regional member country (of African Development Bank)
RUL	Rössing Uranium Limited

SA	Sustainability appraisal/assessment
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAIEA	southern Africa Institute for Environmental Assessment
SAL	Structural adjustment loan
SCEP	State Committee of Environmental Protection (Soviet Union)
SDF	Spatial development framework
SDI	Spatial development initiative
SEA	Strategic environmental assessment
	Strategic effects assessment
	Sectoral environmental assessment
SEACAM	Secretariat for Eastern African coastal area management
SEAM	Strategic environmental assessment and monitoring
SEAN	Strategic environmental analysis
SEF	Strategic environmental framework
SEIA	Strategic environmental impact assessment (The Netherlands)
SEP	strategic environmental planning
SEPA	State Environmental Protection Administration, China
SER	State environmental review (also known as state ecological expertise) (Soviet Union process)
SFRA	Stream flow reduction activity
SIA	strategic impact assessment
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
SIP	Strategic integrated planning
SNV	Netherlands Development Organisation
SO	Strategic objective
	Strategic overview
SO ₂	Sulphur dioxide
SoE	State of environment
SOER	State of environment report
SOP	Sectoral operational programme
SPREP	south Pacific Regional Environment Programme
SVP	Shared Vision Programme (of Nile Basin Initiative)
TA	Technical assistance
TANAPA	Tanzania National Parks
TBT	Tofo, Barra, Tofinho and Rocha beaches area, Mozambique
TDP	Tourism development plan
TDS	Territorial development strategy
TEA	Transboundary environmental action (project) (of the Nile Basin Initiative)
TerKSOP	Territorial integrated scheme for nature protection (Soviet Union)
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCED	UN Conference on Environment and Development
UNCTAD	UN Commission on Trade and Development
UNDAF	UN development assistance framework
UNDESA	UN Department for Environmental and Social Affairs
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNECE	UN Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNESCO	UN Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation
UPPAP	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

WB	World Bank
WBCSD	World Business Council on Sustainable Development
WCED	World Commission on Sustainable Development
WMA	Water management areas
WMP	Waste management plan
WRI	World Resources Institute
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg 2002)
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WWF-SPP	World Wide Fund for Nature – South Pacific Programme
ZCCM	Zambia Consolidated Copper Mines

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Acknowledgements	viii
Acronyms and abbreviations	xii
1 SEA in international perspective	1
2 Surveying the field of SEA	7
2.1 Overview of the SEA literature and key references	7
2.2 Terms and definitions	10
2.3 SEA principles	14
2.4 Rationale, benefits, capacity requirements and preconditions for SEA	19
2.5 Opportunities and constraints	24
2.6 Evolution and trends in SEA	26
2.6.1 SEA in the context of EIA history	26
2.6.2 The status of SEA systems	27
2.6.3 International legal instruments	29
2.6.4 Evolution of para SEA, including global and integrative approaches	29
3 SEA experience in developed countries	33
3.1 Brief overview of SEA institutional arrangements in developed countries	33
3.2 SEA experience in the European Union	41
3.2.1 EU legal and policy frameworks	43
3.2.2 New areas of application	44
3.2.3 The EU SEA Directive in perspective	45
3.2.4 Toward implementation	47
3.3 National experience with SEA	49
3.3.1 Australia	49
3.3.2 Austria	53
3.3.3 Canada	55
3.3.4 Denmark	59
3.3.5 Finland	64
3.3.6 France	66
3.3.7 Germany	71
3.3.8 The Netherlands	73
3.3.9 New Zealand	79
3.3.10 Norway	85
3.3.11 United Kingdom	86
3.3.12 USA	93
3.3.13 SEA in other industrialised countries	96
Japan	96
Korea	97
Portugal	97

	Spain	99
	<i>Cases</i>	
3.1	SEA of Parliamentary Bills in Denmark	101
3.2	SEA of the Netherlands National Waste Management Plan 2002	104
3.3	Proposed SEA of Point of Immigration Entry Enhancements, USA	110
4	SEA experience in development cooperation	113
4.1	SEA in multi-lateral development agencies	113
4.1.1	The World Bank	113
4.1.2	African Development Bank	120
4.1.3	Asian Development Bank	122
4.1.4	Inter-American Development Bank	125
4.1.5	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	126
4.1.6	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	130
4.1.7	A proposed comprehensive approach for multilateral development banks	133
4.2	SEA in bilateral aid agencies	134
4.2.1	Canadian International Development Agency	134
4.2.2	Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom	135
4.2.3	The Netherlands	138
4.2.4	OECD Development Assistance Committee	140
4.2.5	Swedish International Development Agency (Sida)	141
4.2.6	United States Agency for International Development (USAID)	143
	<i>Cases</i>	
4.1	Application of the Strategic Environmental ANalysis (SEAN) Methodology in Cameroon, and in Honduras and Nicaragua	154
5	SEA experience in countries in transition	157
5.1	Newly Independent States	159
5.1.1	Main features of SER/OVOS systems	159
5.1.2	Regional trends and variations	160
5.1.3	Implementation of SER provision and procedure	161
5.1.4	SEA practice in NIS	164
5.1.5	Recent developments and issues in the Russian Federation	165
5.2	Central and Eastern Europe	168
5.2.1	Origins of SEA in CEE	170
5.2.2	Recent developments in SEA arrangements and implementation	170
5.2.3	SEA practice in land use planning	173
5.2.4	SEA of sector plans and programmes	178
5.2.5	SEA of programming documents for EU structural funds in all EU accession countries	181
5.2.6	SEA of policy	184
5.3	Future development of SEA in the NIS and CEE regions	186

<i>Cases</i>		
5.1	SEA of Slovak Energy Policy (EP 2000)	190
5.2	Framework SEA of the Polish National Development Plan 2004-2006	194
5.3	SEA of Energy Policy of the Czech Republic (EP-CR)	199
6	SEA experience in developing countries	205
6.1	SEA in southern Africa	205
6.1.1	South Africa	208
6.1.2	Botswana	214
6.1.3	Lesotho	216
6.1.4	Malawi	217
6.1.5	Mozambique	217
6.1.6	Namibia	218
6.1.7	Swaziland	222
6.1.8	Tanzania	223
6.1.9	Zambia	226
6.1.10	Zimbabwe	227
6.2	SEA in Francophone Africa	228
6.2.1	Benin	231
6.2.2	Burkina Faso	231
6.2.3	Cote d'Ivoire	232
6.2.4	Madagascar	232
6.2.5	Morocco	233
6.2.6	Senegal	234
6.2.7	Other countries	235
6.3	SEA in the rest of sub-Saharan Africa	236
6.3.1	Nile basin	236
6.3.2	Cape Verde	236
6.3.3	Ghana	236
6.3.4	Uganda	237
6.4	SEA in Latin America and the Caribbean	239
6.4.1	Bolivia	240
6.4.2	Brazil	241
6.4.3	Chile	242
6.4.4	Dominican Republic	243
6.4.5	Guatemala	244
6.5	SEA in Asia	244
6.5.1	China	245
6.5.2	Hong Kong	247
6.5.3	Indonesia	248
6.5.4	Nepal	248
6.5.5	Pakistan	250
6.5.6	Thailand	253
6.6	SEA elsewhere	253
6.6.1	Lebanon	253
6.6.2	Pacific islands	255
<i>Cases</i>		
6.1	SEA for the Proposed East London Industrial Development Zone,	

	South Africa	259
6.2	SEA of Tofo, Barra, Tofinho and Rocha (TBT) beaches area, Mozambique	263
6.3	SEA of the Great Western Development Strategy, China	268
6.4	SEA for Second National Development Plan, Namibia	271
6.5	SEA for Water Use, South Africa	276
6.6	Transboundary SEA of the Nile Basin	281
6.7	SEA in the South African National Ports System	284
6.8	Land use Plan for the Sperrgebiet, Namibia	291
6.9	Sectoral SEA: Generic Environmental Management Programme for Marine Diamond Mining off the West Coast of South Africa	296
7	Advances and conclusions	299
7.1	Points of departure	299
7.2	Conclusions and recommendations	299
	7.2.1 SEA revisited and reconsidered	300
	7.2.2 Key trends in SEA process development	301
	7.2.3 Status of SEA and experience in different parts of the world	302
7.3	Future directions and ways forward	307
	7.3.1 Improving SEA quality and effectiveness	307
	7.3.2 Towards a sustainability approach	308
	7.3.3 Promoting integrated assessment and planning	309
7.4	Challenges to real progress?	310
	References	313
	Appendices	343
1	SEA legal and policy benchmarks	345
2	Some examples of SEA training initiatives	347
3	The situation regarding SEA in countries in transition prior to 1997	350
4	Millennium ecosystem assessment	353
5	Recommendations for SEA of regional development plans in CEE countries	358
6.	Principles, their implications for CIDA and key factors for SEA	359
7.	Sub-national economic and environment planning (E-c-E)	361
8.	Legal requirements for SEA in selected Spanish regions	364
9.	Sustainability impact assessment of WTO multilateral trade negotiations	366
10.	Examples of integration mechanisms and role of environmental assessment from selected EU member states	368
11	Step-by-step guidance on application and use of procedures and methods in SEA good practice	375
12.	Considerations for UNDP quality programming	378
13.	Analytical strategic environmental assessment, ANSEA	381
14.	Steps for starting, managing and improving a sustainable development strategy	383

Boxes

1.1	References to EIA and integrated assessment in the WSSD Plan of Implementation	3
2.1	Some Definitions of SEA	11
2.2	Trends in the evolution of SEA conceptions	11
2.3	Examples of commonly used acronyms for SEA-type approaches	12
2.4	Some Principles for SEA	15
2.5	Performance Criteria for SEA	16
2.6	A Pre-Screening Procedure for Determining SEA Requirements	18
2.7	Rationale, benefits, capacity requirements and preconditions for SEA	23
2.8	Some initiatives towards SEA in development cooperation	28
2.9	The Global Environment Outlook project	30
2.10	State of the environment reporting	31
3.1	Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to the UNECE Convention on EIA in a Transboundary Context	40
3.2	The EU Environment Action Programme and Strategy for Sustainable Development	43
3.3	Integration of the environment in European Commission policy-making	44
3.4	Impact assessment in EC policy-making	45
3.5	Information to be provided in an Environment Report (as specified in Annex 1 of the EU SEA Directive)	47
3.6	The Central Highlands RFA/CRA Process, Australia	50
3.7	Forest and Timber Inquiry, Australia	51
3.8	Pilot SEAs in Austria	54
3.9	Pilot SEA for Vienna's waste management plan	54
3.10	Use of the SEA round table approach in Austria	55
3.11	Aims, principles and roles for implementing SEA in Canada	56
3.12	Generic framework for ex ante SEA for trade negotiations, Canada	58
3.13	Danish guidance on SEA of bills and other proposals: examples and experience	61
3.14	Pilot SEA in North Jutland, Denmark	63
3.15	Finnish experience in assessment of Bills compared with the assessment of policies, plans and programmes	65
3.16	French guidance on SEA of transport plans and programmes	69
3.17	Netherlands environmental test of draft legislation	75
3.18	The challenge of implementing the European SEA Directive in the Netherlands: A personal reflection	77
3.19	SEA dimensions of the New Zealand Resource Management Act (RMA)	80
3.20	Auckland's Regional Growth Strategy 2050 as a SEA application	83
3.21	Environmental assessment for hydroelectric power plans in Norway	85
3.22	SEA in land use planning: experiences from five pilot projects	86
3.23	UK guidance on SEA for national policies	87
3.24	UK guidance on SEA of development plans	88
3.25	Bonneville Power Administration Business Plan EIS	95
3.26	Preliminary Environmental Scan (PES) in Korea: A SEA-like system	98
C3.2.1	Weighting sets used in the LCA	106
4.1	SEA of Gujarat State Highways Programme, India	114
4.2	Regional environmental assessment of Argentina flood protection	115
4.3	The World Bank's Environmental Strategy	116
4.4	Draft strategic impact assessment guidelines for the African Development Bank	121

4.5	The proposed six-step SEA methodology for the IADB	127
4.6	Trialing the Environmental Overview approach	128
4.7	UNEP manual on integrated assessment of trade-related policies	131
4.8	Steps in Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management	132
4.9	Proposed comprehensive SEA system for multi-lateral development banks	133
4.10	CIDA process for SEA	135
4.11	DFID's screening guide	136
4.12	Andhra Pradesh: Operationalizing Vision 2020 Environmental Management	137
4.13	SEA development in Mozambique	138
4.14	Strategic Environmental Analysis (SEAN): The main steps	139
4.15	SEA in Development Cooperation	141
4.16	Sida's strategic questions on economic policy and the environment	142
4.17	USAID's regional environmental threats and opportunities assessment for Africa	144
4.18	Elements in Strategic Environmental Planning: Proposed to USAID	145
4.19	Progress with PRSPs: key points of the comprehensive review by World Bank and IMF	146
4.20	Variance in PRSP environmental performance	150
5.1	Sofia Initiative on Strategic Environmental Asses	158
5.2	State environmental review (SER) in NIS Countries	163
5.3	Status of SEA practice in Belarus	165
5.4	SEA application in the Russia Federation	166
5.5	SEA of the Moscow City Master Plan for the Period to Year 2020	167
5.6	Examples of legal provision for SEA in CEE countries prior to transposition of Directive 2001/42/EC	168
5.7	Second generation of SEA arrangements in the Czech Republic	172
5.8	SEA of the Jurmala Territorial Development Plan, Latvia	174
5.9	SEA of the Varna Municipality Development Plan, Bulgaria	175
5.10	SEA of Bratislava land use plan	177
5.11	Methodology and approach to SEA of major transport routes in Slovenia	178
5.12	SEA of Waste Management Plan of the Czech Republic	180
5.13	SEA of National (Regional) Development Plans in CEE	181
5.14	SEA of development plans from the perspective of decision-makers	183
5.15	Use of environmental objectives in SEA of plans and programmes	184
5.16	SEA of energy policy in Czech and Slovak Republics	185
5.17	Recommended principles for SEA Application in the CEE region	187
5.18	Priorities for the development of national SEA systems in the CEE region	187
C5.2.1	Sustainability criteria for assessing the Polish National Development Plan, 2004-2006	196
6.1	Examples of legal entry points for SEA in southern Africa	206
6.2	Socio-economic and political context for planning and SEA in southern Africa	206
6.3	EIA ³ in the Southern African Development Community (SADC)	207
6.4	Preliminary SEA for the KwaZulu-Natal Trade and Industry Policy, South Africa	210
6.5	Provisions for SEA in South Africa's policies, legislation and programmes	211
6.6	Okavango delta management plan	215
6.7	SEA of Caprivi Sugar Project, Namibia	219
6.8	Rössing uranium mine Sustainability Assessment	221
6.9	Some SEA-like processes in Swaziland	222
6.10	Management Zone Planning/EIA in Tanzanian National Parks	224
6.11	SEA of road development in national parks, Tanzania	225
6.12	SEA of Development Around Victoria Falls, 1996	228
6.13	Proposed procedure for an SEA of the coastal management programme (Côte	

	d'Ivoire)	232
6.14	Sectoral environmental assessment of Moroccan agriculture	233
6.15	Environmental assessment of the Second Transport Sector Programme (PST II), Senegal	234
6.16	SEA of Ghana's Poverty Reduction Strategy	236
6.17	Use of SEA-type approaches to inform the development of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan, Uganda	237
6.18	Examples of SEAs in Latin America and the Caribbean led by the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank	239
6.19	SEA of Santa Cruz – Suarez Road, Bolivia	241
6.20	SEA of Programme for the Rehabilitation of Downtown Sao Paulo, Brazil	242
6.21	Challenges to introducing SEA in Chile	242
6.22	The new EIA Law in China	246
6.23	SEA of Territorial Development Strategy, Medium-Term Options, Hong Kong	247
6.24	Bara Forest Management Plan, Nepal	248
6.25	Assessing the potential to introduce SEA in Nepal	249
6.26	SEA of Thermal Power Generation Policy, Pakistan	252
6.27	SEA and land use Planning project in Lebanon	254
6.28	Promoting SEA in Pacific Island Countries	256
6.29	Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Fiji Islands National Tourism Plan	256
C6.2.1	Steps in SEA in (Tofo, Barra, Tofinho and Rocha Beaches) area, Mozambique	264
C6.7.1	Vision for the sustainable development of the Port of Cape Town	288
C6.7.2	Strategic issues for detailed investigation during the SEA	288
7.1	Work programme of the OECD DAC Task Team on SEA	303
7.2	The leverage of donors: A personal reflection	306
A4.1	Aims of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	353
A4.2	Integrated ecosystem assessment	354
A7.1	Refined sub-national E-c-E planning model used by the Asian Development Bank	361

Tables

2.1	SEA: constraints and opportunities to overcome them	25
3.1	SEA institutional frameworks and their scope of application in selected countries	34
3.2	SEA models and approaches	42
3.3	Stages of Stages, decisions and outputs of SEA and sustainability appraisal	91
3.4	Types of actions addressed in NEPA programme analyses	94
4.1	A summary matrix for Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of policy change	119
4.2	Environmental review of Vietnam PRSP	149
4.3	SAIEA proposed framework for PRSP assessment	151
5.1	SER/OVOS systems in NIS	161
5.2	OVOS/SER application to strategic proposals	162
5.3	Overview of the status of SEA provision in CEE countries	171
5.4	Proposed options for incorporating SEA into strategic planning processes in the CEE region	188

C5.1.1	Relationship of SEA to policy development	192
C5.1.2	Evaluation of major components of SEA of Energy Policy 2000	193
C5.3.1	Indicators for analysing the Energy Policy	201
6.1	The conceptual differences in understanding and emphasis between EIA and SEA in South Africa	209
6.2	Examples of SEAs in Mozambique	218
6.3	SEA in developing francophone countries	229
6.4	EAs carried out in Madagascar	233
6.5	Possible roles for the development and use of SEA in Nepal	251
6.6	Summary of process for SEA of Fiji's Tourism Development Plan	258
C6.2.1	TBT SEA: Specific alternatives	266
C6.4.1	Phases in NDP2 support project, Namibia	272
C6.5.1	Key elements of the SEA process for SFRAs	277
7.1	Elements of SEA capacity and their development	305
7.2	Elements of review of SEA quality and effectiveness	308
A10.1	SEA Examples in Central Europe	351

Figures

1.1	Typology of sea approaches	2
2.1	The menagerie of SEA terminology	14
2.2	EA practice within the tiered transport planning system in Germany	18
3.1	Stages in the environmental assessment process proposed for evaluating State – Regions planning contracts (CPEs) in France	68
3.2	Five-stage approach to SEA/SA	90
4.1	A 'continuous improvement' approach to sustainable development	153
6.1	Key requirements for implementing decision-focused SEA in southern Africa	208
6.2	SEAs in South Africa: 1996-2003	211
6.3	Example of how SEA elements can be integrated and used to support the municipal development planning process	213
6.4	Framework for Environmental Audit of District development Plans, Botswana	215
C6.1.1	Process for SEA of East London IDZ	260
C6.5.1	Usutu to Mhlathuze WMA: Location	280
C6.7.1	Policy process and CSIR's interaction with the process	284
C6.7.2	SEA Process for the Port of Cape Town	287
C6.8.1	Sperrgebiet. Location	292
C6.8.2	Process for planning the sustainable development of the Sperrgebiet	293
A13.1	Procedural steps for the ANSEA framework	382