

# **SARHAD PROVINCE CONSERVATION STRATEGY**

## **INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

### **SECTION 1**

### ***REPORT***

#### **PREPARED BY**

**DR. PETER HARDI  
SENIOR FELLOW AND DIRECTOR**

**MEASUREMENT AND INDICATORS PROGRAM  
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

**PESHAWAR (PAKISTAN) – WINNIPEG (CANADA)**

**JUNE 25, 1998**



## ***BACKGROUND***

IUCN-P (the World Conservation Union-Pakistan), the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI), Islamabad and the Government of the North West Frontier Province under the auspices of the Pakistan Environment Programme (PEP) requested technical assistance (TA) from a “Sustainable Development Monitoring Advisor” through the Canadian partner organization. IISD was contracted to provide the services. The main purpose was to assist in the design of a system of monitoring sustainable development, initially within the context of the Sarhad Province Conservation Strategy (SPCS). On behalf of IISD, Dr. Peter Hardi, Senior Fellow and Director of the Measurement and Indicators Program, and Mr. Laszlo Pinter, Program Officer of the Program, have been assigned as consultants to perform the work.

The principal tasks included the following:

- A review of the work undertaken in this field by Canadian agencies and institutions and a compilation of a set of reference materials;
- A review of documentation and data sources available in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP);
- Meeting with key government officials, NGOs and other stakeholders; and
- Designing an appropriate measurement system and indicator set, and the provision of assistance to establish them.

The assignment was undertaken in two phases. In Phase 1, Dr. Hardi, after a preparatory period in Canada, travelled to Pakistan for the first field trip for consultations, capacity assessment meetings and reviews. The results were processed at IISD, where an integrated assessment system was designed and a data availability matrix prepared. In Phase 2, Dr. Hardi helped prepare a multi-stakeholder workshop in Pakistan to determine priority issues for a phased implementation of the SPCS and solicit recommendations for indicators from the participants. Discussions were held to determine the most useful institutional arrangement for carrying out the assessment. After returning to IISD, a refined version of the integrated assessment system and measurement tools, including a set of indicators, was prepared, providing measurement and analysis techniques for direct application.

The TA has been considered as a part of the overall assessment process described in detail in Section 2 - Integrated Assessment System. During Phase 1 the TA focused on capacity and data assessment. In Phase 2 it focussed on public participation and multi-stakeholder input in the assessment process as well as on institutional arrangements for the assessment process.

## CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

### Objective

The objective of capacity assessment was to collect information and review data in order to make recommendations for measurement strategies, appropriate indicators and analytical tools that are feasible for assessing progress toward sustainable development in the NWFP in particular, and Pakistan in general.

### Methods

#### *Review of key documents*

During a four-week intensive preparation period prior to the field trip, over 50 publications were reviewed, including the National and Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy (NCS and SPCS, respectively), the NWFP Environmental Profile, the provincial Bureau of Statistics yearbooks, SDPI publications, reports from international development agencies, IUCN publications, and so on. In addition, while in Pakistan, more than 30 documents, including NGO and government reports, ministerial statistics, rural development profiles, and international aid agencies materials were reviewed.

#### *Personal interviews and consultations*

During the two field trips, the consultant participated in *close to 50 consultations, meeting with more than 70 persons* (some of them more than once), including IUCN staff, other NGO representatives, government officials, experts, aid workers, representatives of donor agencies, journalists and grassroots activists (Attachment 1). The average duration of the meetings was between one and two hours. Most of the meetings took place in Peshawar, NWFP, while several meetings were held in Abbottabad, NWFP (including a two-day workshop), Islamabad and Karachi.

#### *Data availability assessment*

Particular effort was made to systematically survey data-related issues, including:

- data collecting capacities (agencies and organizations, institutional arrangements and human resources);
- data collection and processing methods (including statistical and econometric apparatus, instrumental monitoring systems and visual observation); and
- data verification methods and data reliability.

#### *Multi-stakeholder workshop*

A two-day workshop was held to secure the input of different stakeholders in the province into the design and implementation of the measurement process.

## Main Findings

### 1. Shifting priorities in the interpretation of the conservation strategy

More than two-thirds of the meetings were held in the NWFP. These meetings revealed that the public interest in *policy priorities are shifting* to issues that are differently outlined or not prioritized in the NCS, SPCS and other documents related mostly to environmental problems. While these documents do define the most important non-environmental objectives as well, such as the “treatment of the fundamental social problems that are the underlying cause of environmental degradation,” they preserve a strong environmental focus as it is stated among the strategic tasks for the period of 1995-98 of the SPCS (page 47).

In the field it becomes clear that the most compelling task is to address the fundamental social problems, irrespective of their impact on the environment. Actually, environmental issues rarely appear now among the priority issues of policy-makers. The main *focus is on social and development issues*. Everybody seems to agree on the three closely related and most pressing issues that need immediate political and social actions:

- Poverty and poverty alleviation
- Food (in)security
- Population pressure – growth control (family planning)

Three additional issues of high importance are identified:

- Societal peace (law and order; good governance)
- Education (particularly to increase literacy)
- Health

Environment seems to be a priority issue only when it directly affects food security (such as the problems related to waterlogging, salinity, soil erosion in general, or the impacts of irrigation) or when it is linked to visible catastrophic consequences (like the impacts of deforestation in watersheds during the 1992 flood). Even in the context of health, the most pressing issues are infant and child vaccination, while environmentally relevant topics such as treatment of sewage and solid waste, or urban air pollution, are not on the top of the policy agenda. Some of the environmental issues, emphasized by international agencies and global environmental politics, such as global warming, are not priority issues in the field (neither for the government nor the population).

These findings *do not question the objectives as outlined in the SPCS or the NCS* of Pakistan. They simply *reflect the reality* of very scarce resources and the time constraints that define the limits of policy implementation. This reality provides the context for the implementation of both the NCS and the SPCS. Between 1991 and 1996, the SPCS seemed to receive the highest political and bureaucratic support, and the allocation of public funds for its implementation were consistently increasing. The subsequent political changes and economic problems gradually diverted attention from some of the issues highlighted in the SPCS. The detected shift in public perception reflects the

fact that the consultant's assessment was conducted at a difficult time of the country's history, when fluctuation and instability in political and bureaucratic structures would admittedly inhibit a reliable forecast of the government's commitment to environmental work. At the same time nobody has questioned the rationale and the legitimacy of the objectives of the NCS or SPCS. As a matter of fact, the consultant is deeply impressed by the dedication of his Pakistani partners to promote sustainable development and conservation issues amidst the difficulties they have to face.

## **2. From conservation strategy to sustainable development strategy: the need for gradual and phased implementation**

The strategies, particularly the provincial one, can very well be viewed as *sustainable development strategies* rather than environmentally focused conservation strategies. Social, welfare and governance issues are well emphasized in the strategy documents; in fact, the merit of the strategies is that they are holistic and define conservation broadly enough to include issues of population and human resources as well as social and institutional development. Rephrasing them in the context of sustainable development would help emphasize their linkages and long-term, intergenerational implications. Unfortunately, there is no capacity for a comprehensive implementation of all aspects of the strategic plan; a decision is necessary to determine what to do in the first stage of implementation and what is to follow in consequent periods. Implementation of the strategies should continue to be *a gradual and prioritized process*, as it is spelled out in the action plan for implementation of the conservation strategy and in Part III of the SPCS, with adequate focus on the most relevant issues. This is the only way to maximize scarce resources.

Consequently, the evaluation system and the planned measurement tools to assess progress in implementation must *be adjusted to the focus and available resources of implementation*.

## **3. Urgency of action: measurement cannot substitute implementation but it can help focus and prioritize local activities**

All interested parties, including government officials, NGO activists, representatives of donor and aid agencies as well as the affected grassroots activists have emphasized that they are already tired of preparing and discussing plans and strategies. They all want to convert words into deeds and they need to implement the plans and strategies. Delay in implementation of crucial parts of the strategy might jeopardize the credibility of the SPCS. These feelings are so strong that they seem to mask the fact that implementation of various parts of the strategy is, indeed, happening, though not necessarily within the framework of the SPCS. The underlying problem is that this implementation has not been documented and articulated.

While comprehensive implementation of the strategy does not seem to be realistic at this time, a phased and carefully focused approach, as described in the previous point, might be the best way to start. The expectation for an evaluation system is based on the recognition that *if* implementation started, there would be tools to determine whether the actions taken were in the right direction.

Measurement tools should be designed to help such a process and should reflect local needs. Specifically, the following comments can be made:

- There seems to be a need for *simple and action-oriented indicators* to help improve decisions and recognize the need for corrections.
- *Carefully selected and specific indicators* will be necessary to follow the phased approach.
- *Local problems and special pockets of underdevelopment* shall be clearly identified by the indicators.
- *Aggregation is not perceived as a priority problem*. While aggregation is important to help assess business and government performance in developed countries, in Pakistan the need for indicators representing individual issues has been repeatedly emphasized. In the application of indicators on the provincial or the national level, however, some sort of aggregation will be necessary. Without presenting an overall picture (and the accompanying alarm), politicians might not buy into the implementation process.
- Indicators based on *averages* (like most of the human resources indicators) might *not be useful* when applied in a highly stratified society.

At the same time the consultant tried to make it very clear during the consultations that even the best designed evaluation systems and indicator sets are only tools for better implementation, but they are *no substitutes for action*. Implementation first needs *political will and the allocation of at least a minimal amount of resources*. Measurement will help *keep implementation on track*; indicators can function as *drivers for action* and facilitate further decision-making.

#### **4. Limited amount of data is available to measure progress toward sustainable development**

*Existing institutions and methods of data collection and processing have not been designed to measure progress toward the goals of the conservation strategy, not to speak about sustainable development*. While this observation is also valid in an international context, it has immediate relevance in the NWFP.

The most obvious *limitations* due to the above-mentioned fact are the following:

- Very few measures exist specifically for environmental issues, and no significant physical-instrumental monitoring systems are functioning. Pakistani statistical services do not measure such important issues as surface and groundwater quality (e.g. the consultant was unable to detect any sign of a government-run, systematic water quality monitoring network), air quality, soil contamination, or waste disposal; no systematic or reliable data are available.
- There are some surprising constraints and limitations even in more conventional data services. Most important, it is impossible to accurately measure the macroeconomic performance of the province. Data are not available for provincial GNP and related issues; no independent reporting exists for provincial trade, general and financial services, and so on. Data services and measures in these areas are monopolized by the federal government, which discourages provincial breakdown because of political considerations.



- Data related to military expenditures and activities (e.g., resource consumption, site pollution, and so on.) are completely unavailable. The exclusion of these data in a country where the proportion of the military expenditure in the national budget is extremely high creates the possibility of serious errors in any efforts to measure progress toward sustainable development on a macro scale (e.g., nationally).
- In- and out-migration is not measured as part of the demographic data. But it is an issue of high importance in the NWFP, where the pressure created by the Afghani refugees significantly alters the landscape of small- and medium-sized business, employment opportunities and food supply. The number of refugees, and of those who permanently stay in Peshawar and in the Province, is only estimated (anywhere between 10 and 15% of the total population of the province); even the method of estimation is unknown. Census surveys do not cover Afghani families, as they have no citizen status in Pakistan. Serious planning and realistic assessment of progress toward sustainable development is impossible without a reliable measure.

The most comprehensive source of environmental data in the NWFP is the *Environmental Profile of NWFP Pakistan*, prepared by DHV Consultants (The Netherlands) and EDC Limited (Islamabad, Pakistan) in 1994. The Profile's environmental quality data are derived mostly from one-time surveys and studies that have not been repeated since, and in some cases they are simply estimates.

## 5. Part of the available data are not reliable

The government's reporting service covers primarily social, demographic, economic, agricultural, educational and health-related data (see details in attached database). The most detailed reporting is on agriculture, while reporting on education seems to fit best to the requirements of sustainability reporting.

The Bureau of Statistics within the Planning and Development Department of the Government of the NWFP (GoNWFP) reports the vast majority of data. The Bureau has *a good conventional statistical apparatus and well-trained staff*. Line departments (having responsibilities by sectors), most importantly the Education Department, and the Industry, Commerce, Mineral Development, Labour & Transport Department, as well as specialized bureaus like the Agricultural Statistics Wing in the Agricultural (Extension) Department, all report to the Bureau. Problems arising from data collection methods, lack of financial resources, and consequently, lack of adequate supervision, are well known by the leaders and members of the Statistical Bureau. They seem to *know best how reliable or unreliable the data they publish are* and they *know the reasons* as well. It is another matter that *those who use the statistics outside the Bureau usually are not aware of all the factors that explain the shortcomings*.

The findings on *limited data reliability* and their causes can be best illustrated with a few examples:

- *Population growth*: The latest development statistics for the NWFP (1995–96) identifies a few pockets of the province where the population growth shows a significant anomaly (above 10% and –9.5% growth rates, versus a 3.3% provincial average). Explanation: the results of the

previous census that were used for comparison were based on guesses in several cases; the last census, based on actual surveys, corrected those data. If the guess was wrong, the change became significant. No special policy consequences could be drawn based on the published growth rates.

- *Afforestation*: Published data cannot be verified because there has been no supervision and control of the reports of field enumerators. In other words, nobody has checked the actual size of reforested areas (very recently some control activity has been started).
- *Television sets*: The reported number for some areas is extremely low while the overall provincial numbers are also quite low. In one case the number of sets shows an 80% decline over three years! The explanation is that the data represent only officially registered sets, and people simply do not report non-registered ones, afraid of being charged for the usage.

In other cases, such as *literacy data*, differences in definitions and the fact that some definitions are not tested by measurement make the published data less reliable. (For example, at least three definitions for literacy are applied: being able to write, able to understand what is written, and being able to read and understand a newspaper.)

## 6. The system, not the personnel is responsible for the limitations

The conclusion drawn from the previous analysis is that the *system* of data collection established in the NWFP *does not provide an adequate base for assessing and reporting progress toward sustainable development*. While the issues covered in statistical reporting are well related to relevant parts of the SPCS, the missing areas are far too important, and their inclusion warrants structural changes in the measurement system. At the same time, the professional skills of the staff that processes and reports data are good and any proposed evaluation system can build on their experience. For example, the Rural Development Statistics, a series of district level publications based on the Bureau of Statistics own surveys, are very impressive (even with the limitations in data availability and reliability that the staff is well aware of). These, however, are extremely time consuming to prepare, and are difficult to repeat.

The *main impediments to adequate assessment* are the following:

- *Centralization* is still the primary characteristic of government decision-making systems, while sustainable development and the SPCS specifically call for decentralization. Compartmentalization and departmentalization of the tasks does not substitute for decentralization. A more decentralized system, paired with behavioural changes, should be put in place; otherwise the measurement tools will not make a difference.
- *Community involvement* and its impact on decision-making cannot be evaluated within the present system, even if major efforts have been made to increase community involvement in the preparation and implementation of the SPCS, particularly through the Social Action Program (SAP). The time allocated to increase public awareness and participation in the program is too short.

- *Limited resources* have resulted in the use of inadequately qualified personnel for field evaluation (this is particularly a big problem in the agricultural statistical service where the field enumerators are usually the least qualified and worst paid workers), the lack of effective supervision to check the reliability of reported data, and the inability to conduct detailed surveys periodically.

## 7. Make the strategy and the results accessible: language, terminology and awareness

Openness and transparency of the evaluation system and easy access to data and indicators are crucial factors for a successful implementation of the conservation strategies. One factor that helps achieve these goals is the use of everyday language. The most significant impediment in this respect is the use of English as the professional *lingua franca*. While the widespread use of English is completely justifiable among experts and representatives of foreign governments, agencies and international organizations (the consultant also had to communicate in English), it still creates significant problems in the implementation of the SPCS, not to mention the mobilization of the public in support of the strategy.

Some of the major problems related to language are the following:

- The full text of the SPCS is *not translated* into Urdu or the local languages; it is *inaccessible* for those whose English is poor or non-existent. Though the SPCS Summary and several sector-specific brochures are translated to Urdu, even those who work on the strategy know only the chapters that are relevant to their task. It would be desirable to *develop a capacity to comprehend the linkages among the tasks* and *continue efforts* to repackaging the information for wider audience.
- The *terminology* of sustainable development, environmental protection and resource conservation is *not indigenous* in the local culture and it is difficult to translate these terms (e.g., there is no nation-wide agreement on the usage of the Urdu translation of the term *sustainable development*). Contextual explanation and expressive examples are needed to bring the issues close to the population and administration, and make their implementation workable. These efforts should build on local knowledge and indigenous perception of the issues of sustainable development.
- Several NGOs and grassroots organizations prefer to *use a phraseology* (again, in English) that is clearly *driven by donor expectations* and preferences, and is distant from grassroots, lower level bureaucrats or field workers. It creates a *measurement problem* because in some cases indicators designed to reflect issues without adequate or precise social content might be useless. A characteristic example is given here as it is directly related to measurement issues:

Speaking about community programs, the phrase “*poorest of the poor*” has been most frequently used. The consultant raised questions about the definition of who is the “poorest of the poor,” whether there is any quantitative or objective threshold by which this social category can be identified. If we wish to establish an indicator to measure the success of

community programs (to reduce the number or raise the living standard of the “poorest of the poor”), we need such a definition. An interesting answer was given:

Local people never use any Urdu or Pukhtoon equivalent of this phrase for two reasons. No members of the communities want to be identified (and humiliated) as the “poorest of the poor”; and nobody in a community (or outside it) wishes to insult (and humiliate) anybody by naming him the “poorest of the poor.” It does not mean that they cannot differentiate between different strata of the community. When it comes to the task of, say, distributing aid within the community, community members collectively decide who are in the greatest need at that particular time without permanently stigmatizing anybody. As a consequence, it would be irrelevant and even counterproductive to design an indicator related to the “poorest of the poor.”

The context of the above remarks is the *language* and how to make the strategies and their ideas more *accessible*, not their relevance. The language problem, transparency of the assessment process, and accessibility of the results have a direct bearing on the measurement work. Their impacts are discussed in the section dealing with indicators.

## **8. Existing institutional arrangement: advantages and disadvantages**

Government departments, particularly the Planning, Environment and Development Department (PE&DD) in the NWFP, deal with the Conservation Strategy *ex officio*. PE&DD oversees the Bureau of Statistics, the main source of data, and it has the responsibility to supervise the implementation of the SPCS in the line departments. Agencies like the police also collect data on certain issues related to the strategy. At the same time, government departments or agencies, directly dependent on decision-makers whose performance also has to be evaluated, might present biased information; and they cannot necessarily enjoy the trust of NGOs and the general public. They might also have limited budgetary resources to conduct measurement activities.

Several research institutions and university departments are also interested in collecting data and evaluating different aspects of social, economic or environmental issues. Some of them, like the SDPI, have a more theory-oriented interest. The research conducted on indicators of sustainable development at the SDPI, though of high academic level, is not directly applicable in practice.

Some NGOs can provide the necessary independence for an evaluation team; they might be technically even better equipped than government offices, and they enjoy the public’s trust. One such NGO, whose mandate is directly linked to evaluation and data collection, is the Frontier Resource Center; this organization has just been established and has no working experience yet. Another group developed its own methodology for assessing the socio-economic profile of families in districts; the work of the Sentinel Community Survey is supported by UNDP and UNICEF, funds coming through the GoNWFP. Government departments, however, might be skeptical about the competence of such organizations; cooperation with government agencies and access to

government controlled data might be quite difficult. NGOs have no indigenous financial resources to conduct assessment activities; they depend mostly on donor funding.

International organizations, such as UNDP or IUCN, have a strong interest in conservation and sustainability issues; they command significant resources and have good expertise available. They also have adequate to good relationships with government departments and data access might not be a problem; in certain cases they can initiate independent measures and surveys. At the same time, unintentionally or inadvertently, some of them are perceived as representing external values and influence. IUCN is clearly an exception as local people staff its offices and over the years clearly proved that it is deeply rooted in local society. International organizations have an important role to support the assessment process, but they cannot substitute local capacities for the long run. That is why they should not be the host institution for assessment.

Over time and during practical application, the recommendations based on these findings should be modified by the experience of local experts who would be in charge of the implementation of the SPCS. As a matter of fact, reviews and capacity assessments similar to the one completed during Phase 1 of the TA should be periodically held and the previous findings need to be tested against changes revealed through the later reviews.

## *PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT*

Phase 2 of the TA focused on public participation and multi-stakeholder input in the assessment process. In Phase 2 the consultants initiated a multi-stakeholder review and ranking of priority issues related to a phased implementation of the SPCS. The multi-stakeholder review also helped identify potential indicators to measure progress in the implementation of priority issues. The multi-stakeholder review was conducted in the form of a two-day workshop retreat by 28 invited representatives of public and private organizations, government, NGOs, business, academia and community groups.

### **Multi-stakeholder workshop**

The workshop was held in Abbottabad (NWFP) and organized by IUCN-Peshawar office and the SPCS team. The workshop started and ended with plenary sessions while most of the stakeholders input was generated in two parallel working groups. The agenda of the workshop is attached (Attachment 2).

During the first part of the workshop, Dr. Hardi provided the participants with a detailed presentation on the need and importance of measurements, the internationally most influential conceptual frameworks of assessment and some of the underlying methodological problems. He presented illustrations of leading indicator works internationally. At the end of the presentation Dr. Hardi outlined the findings of Phase 1 capacity and data assessment, presented a proposed process for assessment in the NWFP, and explained in detail the tasks of the participants.

In the second part of the workshop, the participants formed two parallel working groups and using a template created by the consultants, selected issues of major concerns for the first phase of implementation of the SPCS. The selection of issues was followed by a ranking process in which every member of the respective groups cast his or her vote to establish the priority order of issues. The process helped the participants understand the variety of frequently conflicting interests and build consensus around shared goals.

In the third part of the workshop, the groups started to identify indicators that might be used for measuring progress for the selected priority issues.

The last part of the workshop was devoted to synthesis of the results of the two working groups and a preliminary evaluation of the outcomes.

The workshop proved to be an invaluable exercise in several ways:

1. Convening representatives of different and conflicting interests and building consensus around implementation
2. Helping understand the complexity of measurement

3. Making expectation of and planning for assessment more realistic
4. Identifying need for capacity building

The full list of the workshop participants and the members of the individual working groups are attached (Attachment 3).

### **Facilitator feedback on the indicators workshop**

The observations of the two facilitators, Gul Najam Jamy and Dr. Imtiaz Alvi, provide valuable feedback and show the depth of the involvement of the different stakeholders in the assessment process. Their observations included the following:

- A very good mix of participants was available. One key group not represented was media;
- Almost all participants took keen interest in the topic and contributed whole-heartedly during the group work;
- The participants had good knowledge of issues facing the province. However, one working group had problems in classifying/grouping the issues under specific themes;
- At the start of the workshop, most of the participants did not have much idea about monitoring progress towards sustainability and indicators. Most of them had never used any indicators. The workshop clarified the concept of monitoring, assessment and indicators. The participants appreciated the relevance and importance monitoring and indicators carry in policy formulation and informed decision making;
- Once the concept and terms were understood, most participants took much interest and started looking at their own work and the ways in which they could use the available information to monitor progress and make informed decisions;
- It was evident that while in the public (government) sector a lot of information (data) is collected to demonstrate “progress” being made; in reality this data does not provide a real picture. For example, information is available on the number of schools built, but hardly any data are available to show the type and number of teachers and the quality of teaching and the graduates;
- A number of participants felt that if a paradigm shift is made to assess and monitor the progress of public sector organizations and the impacts on the ground, most of them would find it extremely hard to justify their existence;

- Any paradigm shift along the above-mentioned lines would entail collection of primary data, as the currently available data may not be very useful to assess the impact and contribution of public sector organizations;
- Most of the NGO sector participants dealt with local-level issues and indicators and were not very forthcoming in visualizing macro-level issues and concerns the province was facing. Their contribution was, thus, a bit limited;
- The workshop made it clear that the task ahead, potentially very useful, is not simple and requires joint efforts of several dedicated partners under a strong leadership; and
- The workshop ended on a very positive note with numerous calls by some participants seeking information on any follow-up activities.

The outcomes and lessons of the workshop as well as further work and activity were discussed in several technical meetings with the SPCS team and the respective representatives of the NCS and the IUCN country office. Non-technical debriefings were held for several PEP partners (including the federal P&DD, the SDPI and IUCN-Pakistan) with the participation of a UNDP representative in Islamabad; and from the country office team and IUCN's regional representative in Karachi.



## *OUTPUTS OF THE ASSISTANCE*

### *PHASE I*

- A. A review study of relevant measurement work already undertaken in sustainable development outside Pakistan, *Measuring Sustainable Development: Review of Current Practice* and a *Summary Report* on indicators, has been delivered to the IUCN-SPCS Unit in Peshawar as a power-point *slide presentation* and as IISD's *Compendium of Sustainable Development Indicator Initiatives and Publications* (hard copy and on IISDnet <http://iisd.ca/measure/compindex.asp>).
- B. Four sets of key reference materials of IISD and Canadian publications on assessment and indicator projects (Attachment 4) have been handed over upon arrival to:
- SPCS/IUCN Support Team in Peshawar
  - Bureau of Statistics, Planning and Development Department of the Government of the NWFP in Peshawar
  - Library of the SDPI in Islamabad; and
  - Planning and Development Department of the Federal Government of Pakistan in Islamabad.
- Three additional sets were provided during or after Phase 2 to:
- IUCN-P Islamabad Office
  - IUCN-P Karachi Office; and
  - UNDP's Islamabad Office.
- C. Report assessing local capacities and an outline of an evaluation framework and monitoring matrix with a preliminary set of indicators.
- D. Terms of Reference for Phase 2 of the TA (Attachment 5).

### *PHASE II*

- A. Final report of the TA, including a multi-stakeholder workshop report from Phase 2
- B. Integrated Assessment System document, specifying the process and the institutional arrangements for measuring performance during the implementation of the SPCS.
- C. Measurement Tools document, including a set of indicators, ready-to-use indicator sheets with calculation methodology, and attached data source specification, and data source codebook.



**ATTACHMENTS TO SECTION 1 – REPORT**

**LIST OF MEETINGS, WORKSHOP PROGRAM AND WORKSHOP  
PARTICIPANTS**



## ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF MEETINGS<sup>1</sup>

## Phase 1 (March-April 1998)

DATE	NAME	INSTITUTION	POSITION
03/24/98 Karachi	1. Mohammad Rafiq 2. Dr. Imtiaz Alvi	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Head of Programme Head of Planning and Evaluation Section
03/24/98 Islamabad	3. Dr. Asif Ali Zaidi 4. Gul Najam Jami	IUCN Islamabad Programme Office IUCN SPCS Unit	Manager, PEP Director
03/25/98 Islamabad	5. Dr. S. Sajidin Hussain	IUCN Environmental Rehabilitation Project	Coordinator, Natural Resources Group
03/25/98 Islamabad	6. Dr. Chaudry Inayatullah	UNDP Pakistan	SD Advisor
03/25/98 Islamabad	7. Masood Anjum Khan	Ministry of Planning & Development, Environmental Section	Environmental Assessment Specialist
03/25/98 Islamabad	8. Mozaffar Ali Khan Qizilbash 9. Dr. Shahrukh Rafi Khan	SDPI	Senior Researcher Senior Researcher
03/25/98 Islamabad	10. Dr. Javed Ahmad 11. Kent Jingfors	IUCN Islamabad Programme Office	
03/26/98 Peshawar	12. M. Khattak	IUCN Sarhad Programme Office	Head of Sarhad Programmes
03/26/98 Peshawar	13. Sarmad Khan	Sarhad Rural Support Corporation	
03/26/98 Peshawar	14. Berry van Gelder 15. Joop Heinen	Forestry Sector Project Peshawar	Chief Technical Assistant, Team Leader Project Officer
03/26/98 Peshawar	16. Intikhab Ameer 17. Nadeem Yaqub	Frontier Forum of Environmental Journalists The News International	General Secretary Staff Correspondent
03/27/98 Peshawar	18. Javed Iqbal 19. Irshad Khan	Planning, Environment & Development Department, GoNWFP	Director, Environment Wing Senior Planning Officer
03/27/98 Peshawar	20. Arjen M. Vroegrop 21. Zarmina Nasir	Strengthening of Planning and Development in NWFP Project	Associate Expert WID Coordinator
03/27/98 Peshawar	22. Asif Hameed Khan	IUCN Sarhad Programme Office	Training Coordinator
03/27/98 Peshawar	23. Hamid Raza Afridi	IUCN-Office of the Secretary to GoNWFP	Coordinator, Cultural Heritage, Sports and SD Tourism
03/28/98 Peshawar	24. Altaf Ahmed	Local Government & Physical Planning and Housing Department, GoNWFP	Director, Project Development Unit

<sup>1</sup> In 31 meetings I met 45 persons (some of them more than once), including IUCN officers and coordinators, other NGO representatives, government officials, experts, aid workers, representatives of donor agencies, journalists and grassroots activists. The average duration of the meetings was between one and two hours. Most of the meetings took place in Peshawar, NWFP; several meetings were held in Abbottabad, NWFP; in Islamabad and Karachi.

DATE	NAME	INSTITUTION	POSITION
03/28/98 Peshawar	25. Sayed Mansoor Islam 26. Shabqadar Khan 27. Arbab Jehangir Khan	Bureau of Statistics, GoNWFP	Director Assistant Director Assistant Director
03/30/98 Peshawar	28. Haji Matiullah Khan	Agriculture Statistics, GoNWFP	Director
03/30/98 Peshawar	29. Mustafa Aziz	Frontier Resource Center	Executive Director
03/30/98 Peshawar	30. Fazal-i Manan 31. Fide Mohammed	Directorate of Primary Education	Deputy Director Assistant Director
03/30/98 Peshawar	32. Omer Rasool	Social Action Programme	Provincial Coordinator
03/31/98 Peshawar	33. Teepu Mohabat Khan	Department of Industries, GoNWFP	Director
04/01/98 Abbottabad	34. Jaffar Ali Shah  35. Mohammad Alam 36. Dr. Asgar Ali Shah 37. Niaz Mohammad  38. Munnawar Zaman Khan	Sarhad Rural Support Corporation Regional Programme Office   Nagribata village	Regional Programme Officer District Engineer Senior Social Organizer Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer Activist, grass-roots
04/01/98 Abbottabad	39. Fawad Saleh	Community Social Welfare Council	President
04/01/98 Abbottabad	40. Mrs. Farhat Miraj	Urban Community Development Project Field Office, GoNWFP	Social Welfare Officer
04/01/98 Abbottabad	41. Amanullah Khan	IUCN SPCS Unit Abbottabad Project Office	Project Manager
04/01/98 Peshawar	Gul Najam Jamy (second time) 42. Iftikhar Malik	IUCN SPCS Programme	Director Industry Coordinator
04/02/98 Karachi	43. Mrs. Aban M. Kabraji Mohammad Rafiq (second time) Dr. Imtiaz Alvi (second time)	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Country Representative Head of Programme Head of Planning and Evaluation Section
04/02/98 Karachi	44. Abdul Latif Rao 45. Julian T. Inglis	IUCN Balochistan Programme Office, Quetta	Head of Programme Technical Advisor

## Phase 2 (May 1998)

DATE	NAME	INSTITUTION	POSITION
05/06/98 Peshawar	1. Asif Hameed Khan	IUCN Sarhad Programme Office	Training Coordinator
05/08/98 Islamabad	2. Imtiaz Alvi	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Head of Planning and Evaluation Section
	3. Gul Najam Jamy	IUCN SPCS Unit	Director
05/09/98 Islamabad	4. Dr. Asif Ali Zaidi	IUCN Islamabad Programme Office	Manager, PEP
	5. Gul Najam Jamy		
05/11/98 Peshawar	6. Adnan Bashir Khan	GoNWFP, Office of the Chief Economist	Chief Economist
	7. Dr. Murtaza Malik		Deputy Director
	8. Dr. Bashir Khan		Deputy Director
05/12-13/98 Abbottabad	9. See separate list of Indicator Workshop participants	Round Tables, NGOs, IUCN	
	10. Obaidullah Baig	IUCN Islamabad Programme Office	Director, Documentaries
05/14/98 Islamabad	11. Imtiaz Alvi		
	12. Gul Najam Jamy		
	13. Dr. Asif A. Zaidi		
05/14/98 Islamabad	14. Aziz Qureshi	Environment Section, Planning, Commission, GoPakistan	Chief
	15. Mohammad Farooq	Environment Section, Planning & Development Ministry	Assistant Chief
	16. Masood Anjum Khan		Assessment Specialist
05/14/98 Islamabad	17. Dr. Shahrukh Rafi Khan	SDPI	Executive Director
05/14/98 Islamabad PEP Partners Debriefing Meeting	18. Mozaffar Ali Khan Qizilbash	SDPI	Senior Researcher
	19. Yorrick Da Silva	SDPI	Research Assistant
	20. Dr. Chaudhary Inayatullah	UNDP	Senior Advisor
	21. Mohammad Farooq	P&D Ministry	
	22. Maheen Zehra	IUCN Islamabad Programme Office	
	23. A.S. Bokhari		
	24. Dr. Asif A. Zaidi		
25. Imtiaz Alvi			
26. Gul Najam Jamy			
05/15/98 Karachi	27. Manik Wijeyeratne	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Director, Finance and Operations
05/15/98 Karachi	28. Nargis Alavi	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Director, Education Program
05/15/98 Karachi	29. Mrs. Aban M. Kabraji	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Country Representative
	30. Nikhat Sattar		Director, Program Development & Coordination





**ATTACHMENT 2****INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP**  
**Abbottabad: May 12-13, 1998****PROGRAM****Day 1**

- 8:30-10:30 Introduction to the workshop's purpose and agenda  
The context of the assessment initiative  
Introduction to measurement of sustainability and brief review of various measurement systems  
The physical reality of measurement
- 10:30-10:50 Tea break
- 10:50-13:00 Indicators, indices and their role in decision-making  
Briefing on the preliminary findings of Phase 1 of the assessment project  
The proposed process and institutions of measurement in the NWFP
- 13:00-14:00 Lunch
- 14:00-16:00 Defining indicators for the SPCS: tasks and challenges
- 16:00-16:20 Tea break
- 16:20-17:30 Small group discussions on priority issues to be measured
- 19:30 Dinner

**Day 2**

- 8:30-10:30 Small group discussions continued
- 10:30-10:50 Tea break
- 10:50-13:30 Presentation of group findings to the plenary  
Comments, additions and discussion of the findings  
Expected outcomes and actions to be taken  
Closing remarks
- 13:30 Lunch
- 14:30- Departure of participants



## ATTACHMENT 3

*INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP*  
*Abbottabad: May 12-13, 1998*

## LIST OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

S#	Name	Name of Organization/Address	Telephone/Fax
1	Mr. Hayat Ali Shah	Manager, Sarahd Tourism, (Tourism Department, GoNWFP), 13/A, Khyber, Road, Peshawar	Tel.: 921 1091 Fax: 921 0871
2	Mr. Niaz Ahmad	Environmental Protection Society (EPS), Mingora - Saidu Sharif, Swat	Tel.: 0936-712282 Fax: 0936-720397
3	Mr. Shabqadar Khan	Office of the Director of Bureau of Statistics, PE&DD, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar	
4	Mr. Abdul Haq Safi	Agriculture Research System, NWFP Agriculture University, Peshawar	Tel.: 45369
5	Mr. Ihsan Ali	Chairman, Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar	Tel.: Off: 43204 Res:843857 Fax: 41979, 841698
6	Mr. Irshad Khan	Senior Planning Officer, Environment Section, PE&DD, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210494 Fax: 9210495
7	Mr. Iftikhar Malik	Coordinator Sustainable Industrial Dev, IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210550 Fax: 9210399
8	Mr. Nasir Azam Sahibzada	Senior Education Officer, WWF, UPO Box 733, University of Peshawar, Peshawar	Tel.: 841593, 842096 Fax: 841594
9	Dr. Murtaza Malik	Deputy Director, NWFP Environmental Protection Agency, GoNWFP, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210148 or 9210263 Fax: 9210280
10	Mrs. Zubaida Khaled	Coordinator Environmental Education, IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210550 Fax: 9210399
11	Mrs. Alia N. Khan	Frontier Urban & Rural Women Association, 66 3rd -Pak Battalion Road, Abbottabad	Tel.: 0992-382666 Fax: 0992-31550
12	Mr. Mustafa Aziz	33/2 Khushall Khan Khattak Road, University Town, Peshawar	Tel./Fax: 44888
13	Mr. Taskeen Ahmad	SUNGI Development Foundation, 1748-C, Civil Lines, Abbottabad	Tel.: 0992-34750 or 33414 Fax: 0992-5818

S #	Name	Name of Organization/Address	Telephone/Fax
14	Mr. Sultan Mahmud Tiwana	The Bank of Khyber, 27-The Mall, Peshawar Cantt., Peshawar	Tel.: 285263
15	Mr. S. Iqmail H. Shah	Divisional Forest Officer, Wildlife Department, Hazara, Abbottabad.	Tel.: 0992-31960
16	Mr. Arshad Samad Khan	Coordinator Urban Environment, IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210550 Fax: 9210399
17	Mr. Abdur Rehman	Sheep Development Officer, Directorate of LD&D, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210285 or 9210309
18	Mr. Rizwan Ahmed	Agriculture Officer (E&M), Directorate General, GoNWFP Agriculture (Extension) Deptt., Jamrud Road, Peshawar	Tel.: 42058, 41080 Fax: 842597
19	Mr. Sheraz Ahmed	Progress Officer, Office of Assistant Director LG&RDD, Mardan	Tel.: 4029 Fax: 67038
20	Mr. Muhammad Zahoor	Assistant Director (Admn), Directorate General, Local Govt & Rural Dev Department, GoNWFP, Peshawar	Tel.: 275809
21	Mr. Nobat Khan	Deputy Managing Director, SIDB, SIE, Kohat Road, Peshawar	Tel.: 231061 Fax: 230747
22	Dr. Jehangir Durrani	Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, NWFP Engineering University, Peshawar	Tel.: 41554
23	Mr. Fayyaz Ahmed Khan	Communication Officer, IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 271728 Fax: 275093
24	Mr. Hamid Raza Afridi	Coordinator Cultural Heritage & Sustainable Tourism, IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 9211135 Fax: 9210399
25	Mr. Asif Hameed Khan	Coordinator Training, IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210550 Fax: 9210399
26	Dr. Imtiaz Alvi	IUCN Country Office, Karachi	Tel.: 021-5861540 Fax: 021-5870287
27	Mr. Gul Najam Jamy	Director IUCN-SPCS Unit, Peshawar	Tel.: 9210550 Fax: 9210399
28	Mr. Amanullah Khan	Coordinator A/Abad Conservation Strategy, IUCN-SPCS Unit	Tel.: 0992-32449 Fax: 0992-32449

*INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP*  
*Abbottabad: May 12-13, 1998***PARTICIPANTS**  
**GROUP - I**

S. #	NAME
1	Dr. Imtiaz Alvi (Facilitator)
2	Dr. M.A.Q Jahangir Durrain
3	Mr. Rizwan Ahmad
4	Mr. Muhammad Zahoor
5	Mr. Muhammad Iftikhar Malik
6	Mr. Amanullah Khan
7	Mr. Fayyaz Ahmad Khan
8	Mr. Taskeen Ahmad
9	Dr. Murtaza Malik
10	Mr. Shabqadar Khan
11	Mr. Hayat Ali Khan
12	Ms. Alia Noureen Khan
13	Mr. Ihsan Ali
14	Mr. Hamid Raza Afridi

*INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP*  
*Abbottabad: May 12-13, 1998*

**PARTICIPANTS**  
**GROUP - II**

S. #	NAME
1	Mr. Gul Najam Jamy (Facilitator)
2	Mr. Abdul Haq Safi
3	Mr. Abdur Rehman
4	Mr. Irshad Khan
5	Mr. Sheraz Ahmad
6	Mr. Niaz Ahmad
7	Mr. Nasir Azam Shahibzada
8	Mr. Mustafa Aziz
9	Mr. S. Iqmail H. Shah
10	Mr. Mr. Nobat Khan
11	Mr. Arshad Samad Khan
12	Ms. Zubaida Khaled

---

**ATTACHMENT 4*****LIST OF DOCUMENTS***

(Handed over to the PEP partners)

1. IISD Annual Report
2. IISD Products Catalogue
3. Bellagio Case Studies: *Assessing Sustainable Development: Principles in Practice*
4. Bellagio Case Studies: *Assessing Sustainable Development: Principles in Practice* (diskette)
5. CEC Final Report: *Communities for Environmentally Sustainable Development*
6. *Developing Ideas*, Issue 13
7. Environmental Business in Canada (Information material)
8. *Measuring Sustainable Development: A Review* - Report to Industry Canada
9. *Moving Business Ahead* - IISD "Knowledge Communications" Project
10. *Moving Towards Sustainable Development Reporting: State of the Environment Report, 1997* for the Province of Manitoba
11. National Round Table on Environment and Economy - Update
12. Overhead presentation "*SD Indicators: International Review*"
13. Performance Measurement for Sustainable Development: *Compendium of Experts, Initiatives and Publications*
14. *Quality of Life Indicators*: Report for the City of Winnipeg
15. Winnipeg Data Availability Table (Attachment to the City of Winnipeg Report)





**ATTACHMENT 5*****TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR SECOND PHASE***

1. Prepare draft proposal for
  - an evaluation system and process to assess the implementation of the Conservation Strategy
  - a set of potential indicators to measure progress toward implementing the Conservation Strategy
  - necessary institutional arrangements for assessment
2. Send draft for comments to IUCN country office in Karachi, and its local offices in Islamabad and Peshawar
3. Incorporate comments to draft
4. Present and discuss draft with SPCS Support Team and Provincial Round Table representatives in the NWFP
5. Check applicability of proposed assessment framework and institutional arrangements with decision-makers, line departments, NGOs and program recipients
6. Inform major donor agencies about the findings
7. Finalize proposal with preliminary implementation plan
8. Write final report