



## **Report for the Inter-Regional Technical Workshop on Tools and Measures to Inform Inclusive Green Economy Policies**

**Nairobi, Kenya - UN Complex, Conference Room 1  
2-4 July 2013**

### **Contents:**

**Overview and Key Messages**

**Session Summaries**

**Annex** Notes from Group Discussions

**Report for the Inter-Regional Technical Workshop on  
Tools and Measures to Inform Inclusive Green Economy Policies  
Nairobi, Kenya - UN Complex, Conference Room 1  
2-4 July 2013**

## **Overview**

UNDP, UNEP, and UNDESA organized an “Inter-regional Technical Workshop on Tools and Measures to Inform Inclusive Green Economy Policies” in Nairobi, Kenya from 2-4 July. This Workshop provided a forum for over 100 officials and experts from 25 countries, a majority from Africa, representing ministries of finance, planning, and environment, and civil society. UN agencies and multi- and bilateral development partners, including the WB, AfDB, GIZ, DANIDA, the Green Growth Best Practices Initiative and Green Economy Coalition also participated.

Participants shared experiences on implementing inclusive, green economy approaches as a means for reducing poverty and ensuring more equitable sustainable development. Break-Out Groups assessed the strengths and weaknesses of different integrated assessment and modeling tools, environmental fiscal reforms, and measurement frameworks. The workshop also helped identify how the UN system and partners can better respond to growing country demand for inclusive green economy approaches.

As follow-up, the UN and partners will integrate workshop recommendations into ongoing inclusive green economy programming. This technical workshop is one of a series of events co-organised through the [UNEP-DESA-UNDP Green Economy Joint Programme](#) with the support of the Netherlands and European Commission. Workshop activities were informed by and feed into the [Green Growth Knowledge Platform](#) ([www.ggkp.org](http://www.ggkp.org)) as well as the work of the [UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative](#).

## **Key Messages**

- Rio+20 debates have helped highlight different perspectives on inclusive Green Economy (iGE) approaches within and across countries and public, private, and civil society institutions, and their links to the MDGs and post-2015 discussions. As the Rio+20 Outcome Document notes, iGE policies can be an **important means to reducing poverty** and supporting more **sustainable development**.
  - While there are trade-offs, iGE approaches do not mean choosing between growth, social progress, or environmental sustainability. With strong cross-sector planning and policy frameworks and a “**whole-of-governance**” approach, inclusive green economies can be designed in ways that limit harm for groups or sectors, and increase access to investments, while increasing equality and social well-being. The **social and inequality dimensions** of iGE approaches in particular require greater focus.
-

- To ensure that the design and implementation of integrated iGE approaches are informed by the most relevant information, **decision-makers** and partners from **civil society** and the **private sector** require access to and understanding of a more advanced yet practical set of policy tools, measures and methodologies that can be adapted and respond to the needs of different country contexts.
  - Country contexts differ widely with respect to development starting points and priorities; political will and stability; institutional capacities; technical, financial, and natural resources; economic structure and position within regional and global markets, etc. Depending on these needs and other factors, there can be many **different sustainable development pathways** and **iGE tools** to support them.
  - The Rio+20 Outcome Document recognizes these needs and encourages UN agencies and partners to help respond to country demand by coordinating information on iGE tools and good practices. These can be divided into closely-linked sets of decision-making tools, policy instruments, measurement frameworks, and broader inclusive stakeholder consultation and capacity development tools:
    - **Integrated decision-making tools** to assess cross-sectoral social, environmental, and economic synergies and trade-offs over the medium and long-term. These include long-term macro-economic models, e.g. Threshold-21, Computable General Equilibrium, Systems Dynamics, Cost Benefit Analysis, as well as integrated diagnostics, e.g. Strategic Environmental Assessments, Poverty Social Impact Analysis, MDG Simulations, and Labour Market and Economic Assessments.
    - **Policy instruments** to encourage a shift to iGE approaches that consider impacts on different sectors and groups, including women, youth, and indigenous peoples. These include environmental fiscal reform, public climate and environmental expenditure reviews, social protection, including public works programmes, micro-credit, adaptive social protection and conditional cash transfers, public-private partnerships, and green employment and trade policies.
    - **Measurement frameworks** to inform, advocate and assess progress towards iGE objectives, with links to the emerging post-2015 framework and SDGs. These include the UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) and the Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) programme, composite indices, such as the Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI), and a range of indicators, statistics and quantitative and qualitative data.
    - **Inclusive Capacity Development approaches** to ensure that policies and inter-ministerial and public-private partnerships are informed by stakeholder knowledge and needs, to address political economy issues, and to strengthen governance and institutional capacities needed to better apply the iGE tools outlined above. These include stakeholder engagement techniques, and capacity assessments and programmes, e.g. Institutional Context Analysis and Collaborative Capacities.
  - For these tools, policy instruments, and measures to be effective, they must be applied and institutionalized across the larger national policy and budgeting cycle. iGE approaches rely on a combination of tools and policy instruments - there is **no one-size-fits-all iGE toolkit**. National decision-makers can select and adapt from the full range of tools and policy instruments available.
  - To help inform the selection of iGE tools, the UN system and partners will continue to facilitate **knowledge platforms, toolkits**, and **South-South learning** events such as this Technical Workshop. UN Country Teams and partners will also support broader country-led iGE initiatives to reduce poverty and maximize social, environmental, and economic benefits over the medium- and longer-term.
-

## Session Summaries

The three-day Technical Workshop comprised a combination of panel presentations, plenary discussions, and break-out working groups.

Day 1 included Opening Remarks, Workshop Objectives, and interactive sessions on: the Global and National iGE Context; an Overview of Inclusive Green Economy Tools and Measures; Long-term Planning Tools; and Environmental Fiscal Reform. Day 2 focused on National Implementation of iGE Approaches; Integrated Social, Economic and Environmental Assessments; Measurement Frameworks; and in-depth Break-out Groups Discussions of all Tools and Measures covered by Day 1 and Day 2. Day 3 focused on implications and next steps for responding to country demand and priorities for iGE programming.

Summaries of each session's key points, plenary discussion, and implications for iGE approaches follow. Session presentations are available online. Break-out group reports are included as annex.

## Day 1 Sessions

### Session 1. Context Setting: from Global to National and Back

Guiding questions for this session included:

- What are the implications of Rio+20 preparations, including National Reports and the Outcome Document on inclusive green economy approaches sustainable development and poverty eradication?
- What links to MDGs, post-2015 and the SDGs?
- What post-Rio global, regional and national follow-up activities are under way?
- How can these support decision-makers to plan green economy initiatives?
- What are the links tools and measures?

#### Key points from presentations

The series of UN Sustainable Development Conferences including Rio+20 have set clear principles for integrating the social, environmental and economic strands of development, including through **inclusive green economy** and **green growth approaches**.

Pushing to achieve the **MDGs** and **transitioning to the post-2015 framework** and **SDGs** requires deeper transitions to more resource-efficient, resilient forms of growth that bring multiple social, economic, and environmental benefits.

The following important design and implementation lessons can be learned from the MDGs:

- engaging all stakeholders from initial stages of goal, target, and indicator setting, as well as diagnostics, planning, financing and implementation;
  - flexibility for countries to customise and define the goals based on needs;
-

- anchoring activities in national development plans, policies, legislation and budgeting;
- putting in place a robust monitoring and evaluation mechanism;
- ensuring periodic reviews at global level and national level;
- maintaining momentum with advocacy, capacity development, and political champions.
- Data and evidence for planning is crucial. Use of proxy indicators is important, but should be used with caution. Measurements cannot be accurate if disparities are not measured.

There is a need for iGE approaches to address the quality of growth and the efficiency with which growth is translated into poverty eradication. This in turn requires addressing trade-offs and adapting and monitoring the use of iGE tools at different national and sub-national levels.

### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

Participants highlighted the importance of using data in the planning process, while being aware of the shortcomings of proxies, and the need to explore more cost effective data collection.

Emphasis was placed on the need for equitable and inclusive GE processes, including integration of gender equality and women's empowerment principles, youth and other groups.

Participants also discussed the importance of addressing trade-offs, and the role of existing programmes which main not be GE-branded but share objectives, e.g. MDGS, and PEI.

## **Session 2. Overview of Inclusive Green Economy Tools, Measures, and Initiatives**

Presentations for this session focused on the following sub-topics:

- Diagnostic and decision-making tools for integrated assessments;
- Policy Instruments for environmental fiscal reform, and related green innovation, industrial, employment policy and social protection instruments;
- Financing tools;
- Inclusive stakeholder engagement and related capacity development tools, including Institutional Context Analysis; and
- Measurement frameworks, data and indices used to inform diagnostics, M&E, advocacy.

### **Key points from the presentations**

iGE approaches reflect a steady **evolution of development thinking** and **experience**, including on iGE tools and related environmental legislation.

For iGE tools, policy instruments, and measures to be effective, they must be applied and institutionalized across the larger national policy and budgeting cycle. iGE tools help ensure **shifts in public and private development investments** in ways that lead to multiple social, environmental, and economic benefits.

---

Decision-makers can select and adapt from a range of iGE tools and policy instruments. At the same time, there is no one-size-fits-all iGE template, and no single tool or model can ensure iGE transitions if used in siloed approaches. Issues of political economy, capacity development, coordination and partnerships with private sector and civil society are just as important as the tools targeted by this workshop.

To ensure a greater impact across the social, environmental and economy strands of sustainable development, policies must be informed by an assessment of impacts across sectors and groups over the medium and longer-term, including synergies and options to address policy trade-offs.

Innovative partnerships were highlighted, including those facilitated by the Green Economy Coalition.

### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

Greater awareness-raising and capacity development is needed to ensure that national experts, government and academic institutions have access to a broader range of iGE tools.

iGE interventions must be flexible so that they can meet the sometimes changing needs and priorities of government and other stakeholders, while at the same time maintaining long-term focus on shifting public and private investments in ways that bring multiple social, environmental, and economic benefits.

Participants also exchanged information on good practices. These included Pakistan's support for an initial set of institutions with a mandate on public capacity building. The use of online learning was also encouraged, including the UNEP/UNITAR course on iGE approaches.

## **Session 3. Integrated Decision-making tools - Long-term planning models: Synergies and trade-offs across social, environmental and economy strands of SD**

Guiding questions and sub-topics for this session included:

- Long-term planning tools and models (Threshold-21, Computable General Equilibrium models (CGE), climate change vulnerability assessments, marginal abatement cost curves, cost-benefit analysis types): how to identify and address synergies and trade-offs across social, environmental and economy strands of SD;
- What do these models produce?
- How are they applied and at what scale, strengths, weaknesses/limitations?
- How do they link to ongoing iGE and poverty-environment mainstreaming initiatives?

### **Key points from the presentations**

Sustainable development challenges do not always have simple solutions. Consequently there is need for a multiplicity of models; policy cannot be reduced to one model due to varying needs.

Modeling tools are useful in identifying synergies and helping address trade-offs resulting from different policies and investments across sectors and population groups over the medium and longer-term.

---

Depending on country context, policy-makers can select from and adapt a range of long-term modeling tools including: Threshold-21, Computable General Equilibrium models (CGE), climate change vulnerability assessments, marginal abatement cost curves, and cost-benefit analysis types.

Threshold 21 and similar tools can help break sector barriers and promote dialogue among stakeholders so all can see and appreciate the outcomes of various development paths. In Kenya, Threshold 21 was customised to focus on climate change impacts, and adaptation and mitigation measures.

Long-term diagnostics, including economy-wide modelling require rigorous data, training on its use and regular application and mapping of poverty and inequality outcomes over the medium term.

Cost benefit analysis can be used to assess the costs of inaction on various natural resource management issues, e.g. the use of pesticides and other chemicals. Such tools also require strong political will to ensure that the results of the analysis are followed up through revised policies and financing.

#### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

Participants recognized that the choice of modeling tools must include practical considerations about the skills, time, and financial resources required especially vis a vis other iGE priorities.

The issue of costs and foreign direct investment was highlighted with examples, including water in the Niger Delta, where investors have raised concerns over some of the costs required by the government.

Three Threshold-21 models are being adapted to different country contexts used through ECOWAS each taking about six months to conduct the initial training and analysis.

The need for continued UN-wide collaboration and support for iGE diagnostic tools and approaches across institutions, countries and regions was also highlighted by participants.

### **Session 4. Policy Instruments – Environmental fiscal reform: Removing barriers, creating incentives, addressing social trade-offs**

Guiding questions for this session included:

- How can fiscal policies influence the planning and implementation of inclusive green economy approaches?
  - What are the implications of different fiscal reform options for subsidies and taxes; cost recovery through fees and charges; and pollution charges?
  - Which successful experiences exist with reforms of economically distorting, environmentally harmful or socially ineffective subsidies?
  - How to address the trade-offs of fiscal reforms for different groups and sectors?
  - What is the role of Public Climate, Environmental and related Expenditure Reviews?
-

### **Key points from the presentations**

iGE approaches should consider the incentives for public and private development investments in ways that increase multiple social, environmental and economic benefits over the medium and longer-term.

Fiscal reform represents a key aspect of addressing incentives systems, and tools such as Public Climate and Environmental Expenditure and Institutional Reviews can support such reforms.

This work should be linked to broader poverty reduction and sustainable growth strategies that prioritize pro-poor budget initiatives, improve cross-sector linkages, use a standard way of measuring environmental expenditures and focuses on reducing internal expenditure on environment.

Dependency on external resources needs to be reduced, while iGE expenditures need to be better internalized through more efficient use of resources. For example, combating deforestation could be supported by showing how much revenue and livelihoods can be saved with proper forest management and can be funded through the collection of user and polluter fees and royalties.

The removal of fuel and other subsidies could bring about unexpected social, environmental and economic consequences brings about both positive and negative consequences. The impact of such interventions should be assessed beforehand as was done through the LEAP programme in Ghana.

Expenditure reviews can help identify current levels of annual public investment on environment-linked areas across public policy and assess the degree to which they sufficient, targeted, and efficient.

Review findings can be used to strengthen linkages between cross-sector iGE policies and their financing, as well as clarify national and sub-national budgeting processes. They can also provide evidence to justify additional investments, including for the use of various iGE tools and measurement systems. Many countries need to adapt a standard way of measuring environmental expenditure.

### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

Ghana shared how it balanced interventions in the energy sector to phase out subsidies in fuel by shifting its focus to other sectors and adopting policies to make up for fuel usage, e.g. feed-in-tariffs.

Countries commented on the need for a holistic SD vision for the next twenty or thirty years and the adoption of gradual reforms as much as possible, rather than reliance on “big bang” reforms. Within this context, public resource priorities should focus on people’s well-being while reducing externalities.

Participants also highlighted the need to involve the informal sector and civil society in fiscal and related iGE reform activities, as well as political champions to extend reforms beyond each electoral cycles.

This work can also be strengthened through a focus on issues of political economy and stakeholder coordination including through tools such as Institutional Context Analysis and Collaborative Capacities.

---



## Day 2 Sessions

### Session 5. Inclusive Green Economy Approaches: National Implementation

iGE country experiences and case studies were presented by Bangladesh, Mauritius, and Ethiopia.

Guiding questions for this session included:

- What are the opportunities for inclusive green economy approaches, including links to poverty reduction strategies and issues of social equity?
- What has been the experience of different countries in formulating strategies, plans and policies for socially inclusive, low carbon, natural resource efficient economy?
- What are the capacities critical to support inclusive green economy initiatives?
- Where can market mechanisms support equitable, inclusive, sustainable development, and where do they not have a role?

The full country presentations are available online with other Workshop resources.

National frameworks such as the National Social Development Strategy in Bangladesh incorporate iGE approaches as a means of achieving sustainable development and eradicating poverty. These frameworks can shift public and private investment in such areas as renewable energy and sustainable agriculture, while halting degradation of urban environments, and strengthening social security and protection.

Some Small Island Developing States and other countries face a variety of iGE implementation challenges including climate change and natural disasters, low resource bases, and externally-driven tourism trends.

National iGE strategies need to align with Constitutions and relevant environmental and development policy, as Ethiopia's CGRE strategy does, which also aims to reduce net GHG emissions to zero.

#### Questions/Comments/Observations

Participants and presenters highlighted the need to engage with ministries of finance as part of broader efforts to cost, prioritize and finance iGE policy options, while address tradeoffs and synergies.

In addition to addressing social impacts of iGE approaches, participants highlighted the need to consider also the impact of different investment scenarios on growth and trade.

The need to strengthen public-private partnerships was highlighted, including through policy debates.

Participants also recognized the need to engage other stakeholder groups including women, youth and indigenous groups as part of iGE policy design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

---

## **Session 6. Integrated social, economic and environmental assessments**

This session focused on the following integrated assessments: Strategic Environmental Assessments, Poverty Social Impact Analysis, MDG Simulations, and Labour Market and Economic Assessments.

Guiding questions for this session included:

- What do these assessments produce?
- How are they applied and at what scale, strengths, weaknesses/limitations?
- How do they link to ongoing iGE and poverty-environment mainstreaming initiatives?

### **Key points from the presentations**

The session presentations highlighted how a combination of integrated social, economic and environmental assessments can strengthen and inform iGE approaches across different country contexts.

Integrated assessments can help to identify synergies and trade-offs across sectors and population groups depending on different policy and investment scenarios over the short-, medium and longer term.

They are particularly important for ensuring that iGE approaches are pro-poor and respond to the needs and knowledge of women, youth, indigenous peoples and marginalized groups.

These assessments can be used at macro, intersectoral, sectoral, community and household levels to identify the links between drivers of poverty, inequality, environmental degradation, growth and the iGE policy options that directly and indirectly influence countries' SD trajectories.

Some of these policy options include benefit-sharing, strengthened social protection and public services, and a retargeting and more efficient use of public resources, both domestic and ODA, as well as shifting of fiscal and related incentives to shift private investments in ways more conducive to iGE objectives.

### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

Session discussions highlighted the need to institutionalize the use of such assessments as part of national policy and budget processes to ensure their more consistent application.

Several countries in the region and beyond already are using a variety of integrated assessments. Participants recognized the need to share these experiences more widely.

---

## **Session 7. Measurement frameworks:**

### **Going beyond GDP to include Social and Environmental Dimensions**

Guiding questions and sub-topics for this session included:

- What measurement frameworks are needed to inform, track, and assess inclusive green economy approaches?
- What are their strengths, weaknesses/limitations, and links to GE/PE work.
- What is the role of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) to support iGE policymaking in a country? How can the WB-led WAVES programme support these efforts?
- What examples are there of “going beyond GNP” to capture the social, environmental, and economy aspects of inclusive green economy, including UNEP Green Economy Indicators, Multi-dimensional poverty indicators, and the PEI Results-Framework?

#### **Key points from the presentations**

Data, statistics, natural accounts, indices and composite indices are key to raising awareness, advocating, incentivizing, monitoring and evaluating more transparent and accountable iGE policies over the short, medium and longer-term. They are essential to diagnostics to help identify and respond to trade-offs in iGE transitions, including for vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Institutional capacities and resources to establish these iGE measurement systems require strengthening. SEEA represents an established framework and foundation for standardized accounts directly relevant to the iGE tools and policy instruments addressed by this Workshop. Greater advocacy and capacity development is needed in every country to adapt and implement SEEA.

Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) aims to support SEEA implementation and promote sustainable development by ensuring that national accounts used to measure and plan for growth include the value of natural resources.

iGE transitions rely on a comprehensive system of measure that consider: 1) the state of iGE approaches (2) its integration in policymaking processes. The UNEP manual on GE indicators provides a step-by-step approach on how to delimit, classify and measure a green economy transformation.

iGE indicators can support decision makers to: 1) identify and prioritize problems and set the agenda for policy interventions; 2) identify possible intervention options; 3) estimate policies impacts across sectors before implementation, with a more marked focus on indicators for socio-economic impacts and well-being; and 4) monitor the performance of the interventions implemented.

---

The activities of PEI in Mauritius has shown the need to: improve M&E systems with strong PE indicators, regularly monitor the implementation of national strategies and track development progress, and take more timely action to revised development agenda and the policies needed to bring change.

### **Questions/Comments/Observations**

Participants recognized the opportunity to learn from MDG experiences and apply them to iGE measurement efforts, including through implementation of SEEA and WAVES support.

In some instances, there are discrepancies between what is reported at the national and sub-national levels. For this reason better tools and accountability systems are needed to ensure correct reporting.

Participants recognized the challenges of data unavailability, use of outdated data, and lack of resources

The role of civil society groups in complementing government reporting was noted. This can encourage greater transparency. There is a need to build civil society capacities for such engagement.

Participants recognized the need to use multiple indicators and select the ones relevant to country context. They also noted the need for governance systems to strengthen iGE data collection and use.

## **Session 8. Break-Out Working Group Discussions**

At the end of Day 2 and beginning of Day 3, break-out group discussions were held on each set of tools presented on the first two days, with each group presenting their discussions on Day 3. These discussions were designed to: increase participants' understanding of the tools; share experiences; assess the strengths and weaknesses of different tools, policy instruments, and measurement frameworks; and identify opportunities for adapting tools and measures to support iGE approaches in each country context, including through the ongoing support of the UN system and multilateral and bilateral partners.

These working group break-out discussions have informed this report's key messages, as well as follow-up programming at the regional and country level including through the UNDP-DESA-UNEP Joint Programme on Green Economy, and the UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative.

Partial informal notes from these working group break-out discussions are included as Annex.

Among the working group recommendations was a call to the UN and partners to continue to develop capacities and help inform the selection of iGE tools and measures through the facilitation of knowledge platforms, toolkits, and South-South learning events similar to this Technical Workshop.

---

## **ANNEX – INFORMAL NOTES FROM GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

### **Long-term Diagnostics Tools/Modeling**

#### **What is modeling?**

##### **Definitions:**

-Giving a coherent narrative to a specific scenario in order to understand a specific reality.

-A model is a representation of a system that allows for investigation of the properties of the system.

They are used to simplify a complex situation, by analyzing data to reach a certain conclusion. A model is therefore a tool for policy discussions. Negotiations are built on a background of the information received from such models.

#### **What are the common models being used to assess G.E?**

- CGE Model (Computable General Equilibrium)
- Input-output analysis
- Cost-benefit analysis
- T-21 Model

##### Two types of models:

-Existing models can be used to study the impacts of G.E policy in the different sectors.

-Existing models can be modified to analyze Green Economy, e.g. T-21 is a long existing model, but it has been modified to be able to analyze inclusive Green Economy policy options.

A G.E. model goes further than older models. For example, while the older models would stop at an increment to the GDP as result of a certain policy, a G.E model goes further to assess how this earning can be reinvested and what this would result in.

There is need to understand G.E. in a specific country context in order to know which model to apply G.E focuses on the interactions of all the sectors, energy, education, transport, employment. If you assess a specific sector only, it might appear as a cost, but further analysis of its long-term effect on the other sectors and GDP could show a benefit.

##### Complementarity of the models:

There is, however, complementarity between the models since each of them needs the others. There is not one that is complete all by itself. Each model has its own strengths and weaknesses but working together they can complement each other.

---

The choice of model really depends on the green economy sectors that you want to assess. It could be T-21, CGE or Input–Output model. There is therefore no one champion model. It all depends on what you want to test.

There is need for an integrated assessment model that gives a cross-sector analysis by using different factors. In Costa Rica, 90% of energy comes from hydro-electricity; however, climate change and frequent droughts affect the rivers and then the power, hence energy sector. There is a cycle, in which different sectors affect each other.

### **Difference between T-21 AND CGE**

T-21 is mostly macro. It takes a macro approach in data analysis. CGE takes a micro approach on a macro level, sought of bridging the gap between macro and micro.

Different models have different methodologies which brings strengths and weaknesses in the model.

### **Data availability**

The data to be used depends on the model that is being used. It is context specific. Certain methodologies require more data than others. For example, T-21 requires data from many sectors, and this is mostly macro data, which may require a complex understanding.

When interpreting the model make you have to keep in mind which data was used to arrive to that conclusion.

### **At what stage of planning process or policy making should we start using models?**

At every single step of the process. You need to use different models at different stages depending on the conclusion that you want to reach.

A practical application of this model would be to identify stakeholders in the particular field of interest, find a house in which to run this model, do the analysis, and acquire the results which you can then use in policymaking, or give it to the policy makers to use in planning. The overall interaction of the model must be economic social and environmental.

### **Weaknesses of Models**

**Uncertainty** - Policy makers require numbers, which they use as evidence to base their policies on. However the models present a level of uncertainty that they may not be comfortable with. To counter this, you must have transparency in the numbers and the data used in the model.

**Relationship between models and politicians** - The problem encountered here is to get the politicians on board and to have them use the information derived from them to make policies.

---

Countering this is to strengthen institutional and individual capacities to use and work with the models. Make them own it and run it and work alongside them. Also separating the political seats with civil servant/technical posts based on expertise is important, e.g. currently in Kenya.

Capacity building is key as part of the introduction and use of new iGE tools and policies.

### What key elements should you consider when choosing a model?

- Sector in which it is to be applied
- Type of analysis
- Key indicators
- Information you want to gather
- The data available
- The time it takes to implement the results of the model
- The ability of the software to continue in use long after the results have been achieved.

### Integrated Assessments Group

#### MEMBERS

	NAME	COUNTRY/ ORGANISATION
1	PAUL MANDE	BURKINA FASO
2	NAAYIKE LAWIIIY	BURUNDI
3	SANDRA AMANKWA	GHANA
4	AHMED GISHARIP	SUDAN
5	MOUSTAPHA KAMAL GUEYE	ILO
6	ISSIFI BOUREINA	NIGER
7	USMAN IFTIKHAR	UNDP
8	HAKIM AULAIAH	YEMEN
9	CHARLES AVIS	PEI
10	FAIZUL ISLAM	BANGLADESH
11	SARWAT CHOWDHURY	BANGLADESH
12	CHRISTINE OKAE ASARE	GHANA

Moderator: Moustapha Kamal Gueye; ILO

Rapporteur: Christine Okae Asare; Ghana

#### 1) Clarifications about the tools, policy instruments and measures

- A presentation was made on four tools, i.e. the SEA, MAMs, Economic instruments, and creation of Green Jobs. However, there are a vast number of other tools i.e. integrated tools and integrated assessment that have not been presented at this workshop, e.g. TWEB
- It should be acknowledged that there are different scales of tools and there are different tools for different levels for. E.g. macro versus micro level tools.

- Tools also depend on the questions that they are to address

2) What are the strengths and weaknesses of each tool?

- Strengths (S) and Weakness (W)
  - ◆ Integrated assessments are cross-sectoral (S)
  - ◆ Ease of use of tools can be a strength or a weakness. (S, W)
  - ◆ Timing of the results of the tool is important. The results of the tool should feed into the planning cycle. For example, it shouldn't come after the time it is needed for decision making. (S, W)
  - ◆ The length of assessment of the tool is very important because the results are time bound for a particular political decision to be made (S, W)

3) How are/would you use these tools instruments in your country? What tools/instruments would suit your country best?

- The answer would depend on what policy question the country would want to address;
  - There is no one tool, i.e. no one size fits all. There is a mixed bag of tools which countries can pick from to suit their context. There needs to be a complimentary of tools;
  - The tools should enhance participation by a wide range of stakeholders;
  - The tools have a capacity building element and this should be for a wide range of stakeholders and not only a particular sector. This enhances ownership;
  - The tools should be adaptable and should be internalized;
  - There is also a need to use existing country systems, i.e. the appropriate institutional systems in place to ensure country ownership and sustainability.
-