Group 1

Members:

- 1. Patrick Mbomba F., Cameroon (Moderator)
- 2. Aboud Jumbe, Tanzania
- 3. Jean Daniel A. Ngoula, Gabon
- 4. François Sekamondo B., Rwanda
- 5. Rigobert Ntep, Cameroon
- 6. Gislin Mbye N., Gabon
- 7. Romauld SIGMARE, ECA
- 8. Anthony Taylor, ECA
- 9. Dodou Trawally, The Gambia (Rapporteur)

Focus Areas: pages 6 to 23 of the report

- Introduction
- Inclusive green economy methods, tools and methodologies: description of methodological frameworks

Procedure:

- 1. Chairperson and Rapporteur were unanimously chosen
- 2. Review of the terms of reference of the break-out session
- 3. Review of the *terms of reference* of the *consultancy*

Output:

1. Comments on the assigned area (sections 1 & 2)

- The group appreciates the work of the consultant and registers its satisfaction that it was done according to the terms of reference
- ii. The group notes the importance of bringing out *governance* & integrated assessment as components of the methodological frameworks

2. Specific comments on pages 6 – 14 (Introduction)

- i. Enrich the introductory chapter with major historical events such as the 1972 Conference on the Human Environment, Brundtland report, Rio 1992 and Rio+20 events and their relationship with IGE; also provide a vivid relationship of IGE's with SD and MDGs
- ii. Provide a clear definition for the term 'inclusiveness'
- iii. The introduction should be explicit that IGE is beyond climate change mitigation that a comprehensive IGE also considers adaptation to CC
- iv. In addition to narrowing the **technological & productivity gaps (pg7)**, the **policy gap**, looking at issues of financing, emissions etc., need to be addressed as well
- v. In addition to the cited key policy priority areas for IGE (pg8), the participation of the of the *marginalized* should be equally addressed to deal with the issue of *non-inclusiveness*
- vi. Include as an example, 'regulations on efficient and sustainable management of natural resources' as part of 'policy measures complementing market-based instruments...' (pg8)
- vii. The policy priority area of 'International & Regional Cooperation' (pg9), should rather address the strengthening of existing international institutional frameworks by providing necessary resources (financial, human etc.) for their enforcement and implementation instead of establishing new ones.

3. Specific comments on pages 15 to 23 (Section II)

i. The *environmental assessment* component should as well include a tool on environmental *audit* of existing projects

- ii. The *EIA* tool under *environment assessment* should be redefined as *Environmental & Social Impact Assessment* because the latter is the tool now widely used for the assessment of development projects by the World Bank, the AfDB,
- iii. The scope of 'governance assessment' as an assessment framework should be broadened to include issues of ownership, beneficiation & human rights etc.
- iv. The use of GIS as a tool needs to come out clearly in the 'integrated assessment' as a DSS that is already widely used in Africa
- v. In addition to the stated *weakness of feasibility studies* (pg16), it's weakness in making general assumptions about the future should also be highlighted
- vi. The importance of PRAs as an effective tool in poverty and social impact analysis should be recognized in the report
- vii. The group notes that SEA could be applied, at the same time, to policies and programs of different sectors; it therefore suggests that SEA is considered as 'integrated' and not sectoral (pg 19)

4. Policy recommendations

 Sub-regional African bodies (Regional Economic Communities) should align their current policies and development agenda with IGE:

5. Additional suggestions

i. Include indicators to track ecological footprints impacted by sectoral development activities;

- ii. Capacities of governments should be developed on the collection of data linked to above-mentioned *ecological* footprints indicators. This is necessary because ecological footprints also include pressures exerted by various initiatives (e.g. energy, agriculture, livestock, fisheries, forest, mining, infrastructure etc.) on the environment
- iii. The link among the tools should not be overlooked; for example, the additional ESIA tool proposed for environmental assessment is still valuable for social assessment

6. Way forward

- The report should be finalized and made available to National Governments for adoption, sensitization and implementation
- ii. National governments should be supported to build technical Capacities in IGE related areas (remote sensing, GIS, data collection identified as critical gap)