

Contents

.....

| | |
|---|------|
| List of illustrations | xi |
| Preface | xiii |
| <i>The structure of the book</i> | |
| <i>Part 1 Introduction</i> | |
| <i>Part 2 Sustainability assessment: pluralism</i> | |
| <i>Part 3 Sustainability assessment: practice</i> | |
| <i>Part 4 Solutions?</i> | |
| About the editors | xx |
| | |
| PART 1 | |
| Introduction | 1 |
| | |
| 1 Why sustainability assessment? | 3 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | |
| <i>Trends and implications</i> | |
| <i>Transitions and institutions</i> | |
| <i>The evident lessons</i> | |
| <i>Six imperatives for sustainability assessment</i> | |
| <i>References</i> | |
| <i>Environmental assessment and sustainability timeline</i> | |
| | |
| 2 The changing theory of impact assessment | 18 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | |
| <i>Defining scientific theory</i> | |
| <i>Theoretical underpinnings in the early years</i> | |
| <i>The changing nature of IA theory</i> | |
| <i>The changing normative basis for IA theory</i> | |
| <i>Developments in theories of decision making</i> | |
| <i>Causal theory</i> | |
| <i>Theory and pluralism</i> | |
| <i>Conclusions</i> | |
| <i>References</i> | |

| | |
|---|----|
| PART 2 | |
| Sustainability assessment: pluralism | 35 |
| 3 Challenges in determining the effectiveness of sustainability assessment | 37 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | |
| <i>Critical debates</i> | |
| Contested meanings of sustainable development | |
| Sustainability and context | |
| Contested time horizons and spatial boundaries | |
| Holism versus reductionism | |
| Process versus outcomes | |
| <i>Measuring effectiveness</i> | |
| <i>Pluralism and effectiveness</i> | |
| <i>Conclusions</i> | |
| <i>Notes</i> | |
| <i>References</i> | |
| 4 Contested time horizons | 51 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | |
| <i>Time horizon issues</i> | |
| Length of time horizons | |
| Cultural value of resource | |
| Resilience of resource | |
| Who absorbs costs or profits from project impacts? | |
| <i>Cases</i> | |
| Case #1: Solar Calendar in southern Utah | |
| Case #2: Reefs, marine fishermen lifeways in St Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands | |
| Case #3: Hallandsås railway tunnel in Sweden | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | |
| <i>References</i> | |
| 5 Contested spatiality: geographical scale in sustainability assessment | 68 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | |
| <i>Sustainability across geographical, social and ecological scales</i> | |
| <i>Sustainability in practice: cases studies of scale issues in sustainability assessment</i> | |
| Scoping and scale – assessment processes in Quebec (Canada) | |
| Mining – bioaccumulation of radio nuclides Kakadu (Australia) | |
| Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Australia) | |
| <i>Key ideas for sustainability assessment practice</i> | |
| <i>References</i> | |
| 6 Legal pluralism: notions of standing and legal process constraining assessment | 85 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | |

Context of sustainability assessment
Sustainability assessment as part of improved governance:
international initiatives
Standing and access to justice in Australia
Challenging Australian environmental decisions
Australian federal approaches to judicial review
New South Wales: state approaches to judicial review
Potential for legal review of sustainability assessment in Australia
Learning from international and national approaches to improving
environmental governance
Concluding comments
References

| | | |
|--------|---|-----|
| 7 | Pluralism in practice | 100 |
| | <i>Introduction</i> | |
| | <i>Context</i> | |
| | <i>Conceptualisations of sustainability</i> | |
| | <i>Values and interests</i> | |
| | Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) for sustainability assessment | |
| | What's your bottom line? | |
| | <i>Process expectations</i> | |
| | <i>Embracing pluralism in sustainability assessment</i> | |
| | Strategic approaches to sustainability assessment | |
| | Deliberation in sustainability assessment | |
| | Sustainability assessment as a learning process | |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | |
| | <i>References</i> | |
| PART 3 | | |
| | Sustainability assessment: practice | 115 |
| 8 | Framework for comparing and evaluating sustainability assessment practice | 117 |
| | <i>Introduction</i> | |
| | <i>Procedural effectiveness</i> | |
| | <i>Substantive effectiveness</i> | |
| | <i>Transactive effectiveness</i> | |
| | <i>Normative effectiveness</i> | |
| | <i>Pluralism</i> | |
| | <i>Knowledge and learning</i> | |
| | <i>Conclusions</i> | |
| | <i>Notes</i> | |
| | <i>References</i> | |
| 9 | Sustainability assessment in England | 132 |
| | <i>Introduction</i> | |
| | <i>Procedural effectiveness</i> | |

Substantive effectiveness
Transactive effectiveness
Normative effectiveness
Pluralism
Knowledge and learning
Conclusions
Notes
References

- 10 Learning by doing: sustainability assessment in Western Australia 149
- Introduction*
The evolution of sustainability assessment in Western Australia
The practice of sustainability assessment in Western Australia
External regulator-led sustainability assessment
Internal proponent-led sustainability assessment
Procedural effectiveness
Substantive effectiveness
Transactive effectiveness
Normative effectiveness
Pluralism
Knowledge and learning
Concluding remarks
References
- 11 Sustainability assessment in Canada 167
- Introduction*
Sustainability assessment as public practice
Evaluating formal sustainability assessments in Canada
Seven sustainability assessments
The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (1974–1977)
Ontario's class environmental assessment of timber management on crown lands (1987–1994)
Development of an urban growth management strategy for British Columbia's Capital Regional District (1996–2003)
The Voisey's Bay mine and mill environmental assessment (1997–2002)
Whites Point quarry and marine terminal environmental assessment (2004–2007)
Kemess North copper-gold mine environmental assessment (2005–2007)
Mackenzie Gas Project environmental assessment (2004–2009)
Lessons and prospects
References
- 12 Sustainability assessment in South Africa 184
- Introduction*
Procedural effectiveness

Substantive effectiveness
Normative effectiveness
Transactive effectiveness
Pluralism
Knowledge and learning
Summary and conclusions
Notes
References

PART 4
Solutions?

197

13 Better engagement

Introduction
Letting many voices be heard: methods for better engagement
Influencing decisions
Making engagement work: embedding solutions in sustainable structures
Conclusions
References

14 Better learning

216

Introduction
Theory and types of learning
Examples of learning from sustainability assessment practice
Learning in proponents
Learning in consultants
Learning in regulators
Learning in the public
Learning in researchers
Better learning
Critical reflection in sustainability assessment
Critical and reflective engagement in sustainability assessment
Facilitating emancipator learning
Conclusions
References

15 Designing an effective sustainability assessment process

231

Introduction
Summary of practice
Procedural effectiveness
Substantive effectiveness
Transactive effectiveness
Normative effectiveness
Pluralism
Knowledge and learning
Some reflections on the theory of effectiveness
Connecting criteria and imperatives

Better process?

References

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 16 | Integrating sustainability assessment into planning: benefits and challenges | 245 |
| | <i>Introduction</i> | |
| | <i>Sustainability in planning</i> | |
| | <i>Integrating planning and sustainability assessment contents</i> | |
| | <i>Integrating planning and sustainability assessment processes</i> | |
| | <i>Methodological challenges</i> | |
| | <i>Conclusions</i> | |
| | <i>Acknowledgements</i> | |
| | <i>References</i> | |
| 17 | Conclusions | 263 |
| | <i>Introduction</i> | |
| | <i>The focus on pluralism</i> | |
| | <i>A robust evaluation framework</i> | |
| | <i>Representing sustainability assessment practice</i> | |
| | <i>What key challenges face sustainability assessment?</i> | |
| | <i>Are the recommendations made in Part 4 realistic?</i> | |
| | <i>References</i> | |
| | Index | 271 |