

Group exercise - TEEB Country Study learned lessons					
TEEB Country Study International Workshop, Cancun, Mexico					
	Bhutan	Ecuador	Liberia	Philippines	Tanzania
<b>Policy linkages</b>	<p><b>1. What were the challenges that you faced in defining scope?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty in understanding the concept of TEEB</li> <li>• Conflicting policies (SHP, 2008 &amp; PFA 2007)</li> <li>• Defined and identified the TEEB Bhutan scope through multi-stakeholders consultation meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Landing" was difficult: Coordination / relation could have been stronger between implementors and public sector; Other important stakeholders were/are still missing in the process</li> <li>• Having more specific policies to be informed/changed/evaluated or complemented with other policy instruments would've been helpful</li> <li>• Challenges for Ministry of Environment: i) Pioneer work on integrating ecosystem services in other sector's policies, ii) How to "implement" the constitutional and delivering strategic and legal framework when other sectors are "not interested"</li> <li>• ESPOL (agriculture): i) "not too hard" to define scope - current dynamic of the watershed already pointed to the right/relevant direction and stakeholders were aware of these, ii) From a "value chain" perspective, market demands/needs are very helpful in defining subjects to be investigated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mayor challenge in terms of policy consideration given that mangrove is one of the critical ecosystems that every stakeholder agrees that there was urgent need for actions in term of policy consideration;</li> <li>• The process of scope definition was not difficult given the economic, cultural values of the ecosystem itself;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intend on covering more areas but the funds were limited</li> <li>• The scope was initially scaled down to LPPCHEA, but critical ecosystem services were not just confined to the site, e.g. mangroves were spread, fish biomass dynamics is baywide</li> </ul>	no
	<p><b>2. Would you revise the scope if you had the chance? (eg. Broadening, narrowing, strategic, policy links, spatial) How?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, hydropower sector is major contributor of country's GDP</li> <li>• Water availability / watershed management</li> <li>• Climate change</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We could have also assessed other policy issues apart from land reclamation i.e. cultural services of biodiversity areas in ancestral domains</li> <li>• There were opportunities of revising the scope but the constraint to complete the project in one year limited that option.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadening the scope of the study, including issues of conversion of grasslands to forest plantation in the highlands, pollution from agro inputs to the water system in the basin and its trends from the higher to lower Rufiji.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>3. Would you redefine the policy scenarios? How?</b></p> <p>No, from the result from the current scenarios would suffice the concerned raised during scoping workshop</p>		<p>Include customary ordinances and codes in policies and legal instruments governance and management regime</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initially only three scenarios were considered for assessment, but PRA in fact includes "green-gray" (integrating conservation with engineering solutions – the soft and hard options)" reclamation technology that includes conservation areas of reclamation</li> </ul>	<p>The policy scenarios will remain the same for the new ventures of the study (BAU and SAGCOT scenarios). The study redesigned to provide a balanced resolutions for the best policy option through mitigations of the externalities observed in the two extreme policy scenarios used in the study)</p>
<b>Process</b>	<p><b>1. What are the issues learned in the coordination between focal ministry, research host institution and UNEP TEEB Office? What worked and what did not? How should they have been involved, and at what stage?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclearly on the scope of the TEEB between institutions and ministry</li> <li>• Familiarization of the scope of TEEB to focal agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Didn't: changes in public administration teams at MoE and other instances - A public intersectoral committee could have been a very useful instance</li> <li>• Administrative aspects with TEEB-PNUMA could have worked better (cashflow, deadlines not met)</li> <li>• In the case of Ecuador, practically 2 different studies that began at different time points - "lost synergies"</li> <li>• Implementation of more systematic coordination instruments and most of all at different levels (more often on technical level, e.g. Skype meetings but also on strategic/political level with participation of TEEB PNUMA to gain relevance at national level and motivate other sectors</li> </ul>	<p>Initially, there was not clear understanding of the TEEB implementation process by the Project Team; The project implementation continued base on clear understanding of the Project Team and UNEP of the importance of the project itself</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gov't proposed direct contracting with the service provider but under UNEP system the contract should go through the regular procurement process of the government. The result was that the contracting process was extended to eight months.</li> <li>• Stakeholders were invited but a few did not want to participate in view of their priorities e.g. LGUs. In the case of PRA there was reluctance to involve because of the false notion that the assessment covers the preferences of PRA their participant became frequent</li> <li>• TEEB Philippines did not have significant issues of involvement of stakeholders since all were already engaged including WAVES, Cabinet Cluster on Integrity of Environment and Climate Change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been communication breakdown between the implementing agency and the ministry and stakeholders. Limited information on the progress of project activities and finance has been between TEEB UNEP and implementing agency (The government has been out of the loop of communication on both progress and finance)</li> <li>• The ministry requests to be copied to all information (progress and finance) of the project, at least to understand on what is happening on the ground</li> </ul>
	<p><b>2. Which actors have been involved and left out? How should they have been involved, and at what stage?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coca Codo Sinclair, CELEC (Energy Matrix) was hard because of lack of interest</li> <li>• High sensitivity from government related to strategic projects =&gt; priority has been "finishing up" the construction of infrastructure!</li> </ul>	<p>It was a challenge to involve all of the actors from the community to national level</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a need to have a multisectoral review group from the onset of the project to provide clear indications and sort of real needs of the policy issues in relevant sectors. This would make deliverables of the project more relevant and useful to address real needs of sectors and decision making.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>3. What could have you done to engage these actors? And how could have UNEP TEEB Office assisted?</b></p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance and technical backstopping to the review group on the focus of the study vs sectoral policy issues</li> <li>• To bring them onboard in the project, UNEP TEEP to assist in providing logistical arrangement for such a forum</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology</b>	<p><b>1. Did you understand from the beginning the methodological implications (BAU, spatially explicit modeling, ESS, scenario analyses, valuation, etc.) of the project? What components of the work were you not comfortable with? What were capacity constraints? What could the TEEB Office done better? What could the country team have done better?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no clear-cut ideas on the TEEB processes</li> <li>• Not comfortable with Scenario generation and biophysical modeling</li> <li>• TEEB office could have prioritized organized technical capacity building training</li> <li>• Calibrations of Biophysical modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESPOL (Agriculture): Generic TEEB Approach was not too easy to understand: i) TEEB Agri-food helped a lot in understanding, ii) in this case there was "freedom" when defining the investigation methodology (soil tests, interviews and mathematic model to inter-relate both)</li> <li>• EPM (Energy): "Learning by doing"</li> <li>• Integrating the "Biophysical" analysis with the "S Valuation" to enhance each other was a challenge itself (many different -valuation- methods); Thinking about specific shareholders/policies could have helped here to make the case for biodiversity with key actors</li> <li>• Biophysical" analysis must be robust (base ground for everything else) but at the same time it is very useful if the models can be easily adapted to "make the case" for Biodiversity when integrating the S valuation and aiming at different stakeholders and therefore policy impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues associated with the scenario development was not clear and that in country available experts were not available to help make informed decision process easy;</li> <li>• We were not comfortable with valuation aspect given that the Ebola pandemic could not allow to get either regional and international expert to carry out the task;</li> <li>• The TEEB in Geneva as agreed could have seconded the promised expert due largely to the pandemic;</li> <li>• Capacity constraints was pronounced due to unavailability of in-country experts for the scenarios development and near lack of appropriate data collection tools/equipment;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The service provider fully grasped the implications and process and came with innovations given limited data availability to scale down the outputs, provided that the expected outcome meets the UNEP objectives. For example, limited the project to Manila Bay because of time and budget constraints</li> <li>• The service provider team needed a systems modeler but most local provider are not available because of others engagements</li> </ul>	<p>The study was well designed with all components focusing on the real issues on the ground and the need for policy interventions</p>
	<p><b>2. If your budget was doubled - what would you have added - if your budget was halved - what would you have removed?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADDED: Comprehensive capacity building on biophysical and socio-economic valuation.</li> <li>• REMOVED: Reduced both Valuation Ecosystem Services and No of Areas/Sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing quality and scope of primary information generated to overcome information challenges in data bases</li> <li>• Half-Budget? Study could not have been conducted!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If budget was double the Project Team would have done more work or widened the scope of consultations in field &amp; increase experts;</li> <li>• Little work could have been done if budget was reduced/halved;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If budget were doubled, we could have conducted primary data collection, hired a modeler with appropriate compensation, and acquired remote sensing data and developed or purchase systems modeling software that can be used in future ES assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If budget was doubled- issues and impact of the scenarios on biodiversity in the basin would be added</li> <li>• If budget was halved issues of mangroves would be removed</li> <li>• How would you define success for your country study?</li> </ul>
<b>Using the results</b>	<p><b>1. How would you define success for your country study?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generate the baseline information of ESS</li> <li>• Disseminate the information generated to the wider audience</li> <li>• Endorsement of the TEEB Study as Policy Instrument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informing and "persuading" policy (makers) to make informed decisions based on studies.</li> <li>• If you could create and build capacities (HCD) in the concepts and methodologies</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased demand for integration of ES analysis in local land use planning</li> <li>• Integration of ES Assessment Indicators and sub-strategies in the Philippine Development Plan for 2017-2040</li> <li>• Signed policy instrument implementing TEEB processes and protocols in land reclamation projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Useful to inform the government and the local communities, NGOs, private sector and other interested parties on the best path of development in the basin and trade-offs between conflicting and competing development policies for undiminishing future of the basin</li> </ul>
	<p><b>2. What challenges and opportunities do you see in mainstreaming results?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PES institutionalization for upstream community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson learnt: being too specific about a policy that should've been informed, could be dangerous =&gt; policy prioritization/relevancy could change with time</li> <li>• How to make the process "bullet-proof" to changes at political level? =&gt; Anchoring concepts and investigated subject to other stakeholders (e.g., Universities)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable not ambitious as anticipated;</li> <li>• There is no big disagreement on mainstreaming results if the key issue to such which is public awareness and dissemination of information to end users in time;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In mainstreaming, the challenge is creating a core team in the DENR to spearhead undertaking the ES assessment processes</li> </ul>	<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflicting interests among different actors within and out of the public sectors</li> </ul> <p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country choice of area of study and issues to be studied in the basin</li> <li>• Sensitivity of the study area (food and water security, Energy and other ecological/ecosystem services) for agricultural important zone of the country</li> <li>• Alternatives path provided by the project which are pro conservation e.g. PES</li> </ul>