

# Environmental mainstreaming in Belgian development co-operation. Brief comparison between KLIMOS and Louvain-Coopération tools

---

JEAN-PAUL LEDANT, 07-06-2018

[ledantjp@outlook.com](mailto:ledantjp@outlook.com)



# Purpose of this presentation

---

To compare the tools proposed by KLIMOS and Louvain-Coopération for environmental integration in development interventions in order to help decide what to do with them.

The purpose is not to assess or evaluate them.

Despite this is not an evaluation some comments and suggestions will nevertheless be made.

# Overview of available Klimos and LC tools

	KLIMOS	Louvain-coopération
Distinct tools (incomparable)	Data base	Tool for producer (beneficiary)
Comparable tools	Screening guides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SG identification</li> <li>- SG formulation</li> <li>- SG implementation</li> <li>- SG evaluation</li> </ul>	Programme level tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Step 1. Diagnostic</li> <li>- Step 2. Check up</li> <li>- Step 3. Monitoring</li> <li>- Step 4. Memory</li> </ul>

**Comment:**

No tool is proposed here for the programming level (unlike in the EU guidelines, which refer to CEP and SEA).

# Overview of available Klimos and LC tools

	KLIMOS	Louvain-coopération
Distinct tools	Data base	Tool for producer (beneficiary)
Semi-comparable tool	Quick scan (QS)	
Comparable tools	Screening guides <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- SG identification</li><li>- SG formulation</li><li>- SG implementation</li><li>- SG evaluation</li></ul>	Programme level tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Step 1. Diagnostic</li><li>- Step 2. Check up</li><li>- Step 3. Monitoring</li><li>- Step 4. Memory</li></ul>

Quick Scan is expected to replace the screening guides when an in-depth assessment is not required (however it has not the same object: QS assesses documents, SG interventions).

# Overview of available Klimos and LC tools

	<b>KLIMOS</b>	<b>Louvain-coopération</b>
Distinct tools	Data base	Tool for producer (beneficiary)
Semi-comparable tool	Quick scan (QS)	
Comparable tools	Screening guides <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- SG identification</li><li>- SG formulation</li><li>- SG implementation</li><li>- SG evaluation</li></ul>	Programme level tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Step 1. Diagnostic</li><li>- Step 2. Check up</li><li>- Step 3. Monitoring</li><li>- Step 4. Memory</li></ul>

Focus of this presentation



# Common characteristics (in comparable tools)

---

- Applicable to a broad range of interventions and sectors (although LC tool is designed for NGO's programme in productive sectors),
- Organized according to the 4 Project Cycle phases,
- Reciprocal links between the environment & the intervention are considered.
- Environmental components are distinguished,
- In addition to bio-physical aspects, reference is made to environmental legislation, sustainable development principles, capacities and vulnerabilities,
- Less complex than other existing tools (for ex. the EC guidelines),
- Several aspects are absent in both tools, which does not mean that they should be added.

## What could be added or changed in both “tools”, in case this would not make the assessments too heavy?

---

- Assessment of availability and reliability of data/information used to answer the questions
- Identification (screening/scoping) in identification of the needs for deeper analysis in formulation
- Reference to other available tools to be used (including other tools of the same toolkit, also EIA)
- Links between diagnostic and objectives, and between steps
- Guiding the selection of environmental aspects to be considered: screen the project for all aspects, then focus on those identified as relevant
- Linking environmental impacts and risks with the result chain (activities, outputs, outcomes, outcome)
- Systematic attention to the impact of the intervention on non-biophysical aspects (vulnerabilities, access to resources, drivers of environmental changes including capacities)
- Consideration of biological resources that are not covered by the definition of biodiversity or forests (ex fish stocks, rangeland)
- Guidance on how to integrate the environment in the main M&E framework (not just adding environmental components)
- More guidance to deal with environmental “risks” or “effects on the programme”(effects on intervention performances, including sustainability and impact)
- Guidance for the use of Quick Scan (not for project proponents?)

# Differences - 1

	KLIMOS – screening guides	LC programme level tool
User of the tool	Mainly external (DGD as funding agency), notably for approval	Internal (implementing NGO)
Object of environmental integration	Interventions (unspecified)	NGO programme in productive sectors (but can be extended)
Sources of information to be used	Intervention documents (?)	Field knowledge, partners
Environmental effects on the intervention	Only negative (risks)	Positive or negative
Distinction between environmental components	At formulation stage only (biophysical impacts)	At all stages (incl. awareness, energy, health)
Guidance in Project Cycle phases	<i>See next slide</i>	




# Differences – 2

## The project cycle phases

PC phase	KLIMOS – screening guides	LC programme level tool
Identification		<b>Detailed analysis</b>
Formulation	<b>Detailed analysis.</b> Does not clearly prepare implementation. Refers to indicators.	Generates explicit inputs for programme document. No reference to indicators.
Implementation	Only up-dating data	Approach similar to environmental management plans (with monitoring)
Evaluation	Refers to lessons learnt <i>regarding</i> EI. Does not guide the evaluation process.	Refers to lessons learnt <i>from</i> EI. Provides questions guiding the evaluation process.

# Opportunities for quite rapid or easy improvement (in both tools)

---

- Risks or effects on the intervention : refer to risks or effects on performances of the intervention (including sustainability & development impact).
  - Impacts resulting from the intervention: also effects on vulnerabilities, on the access to natural resources and on environmental management capacities.
  - Biodiversity and forests: refer to other biological resources as well (fish stock etc.).
- 

# Conclusions and suggestions

---

DGD may approve both tools and users should be free to choose and adapt to their own needs.

Each team (KLIMOS, LC) can freely consider which rapid improvements are possible, taking into account the other toolkit.

Anyway the tools should be kept simple.

Monitor and assess their use, user friendliness, usefulness after incorporating deeper improvements.