Dear ESEE members and others!

The financial crisis has opened the landscape for engaging in a discussion over more basic questions concerning how our economy is organized. Certainly, the main response has been a kind of reversion to Keynes – to increased public spending to get the wheels going quickly again. It has, however, also made many economists become more careful concerning praising the virtues of ‘unregulated’ markets. Some of the ‘creativity’ behind all kinds of financial derivatives will for the future hopefully be directed more towards productive activity than to spread risks upon unsuspecting investors.

Even more interesting is maybe the quest for the ‘greening’ of the economy and for ‘green investments’. I just witnessed a competition in the newspapers here in Norway about which financial packages were the greenest – those of China, EU, Japan Korea, Norway or the US. This was at least a novel game! At the same time UNDP has launched a program for a ‘Green New Deal’. The aim is to “Mobilizing and re-focusing the global economy towards investments in clean technologies and ‘natural’ infrastructure such as forests and soils is the best bet for real growth, combating climate change and triggering employment boom in the 21st century.” Pavan Sukdev, who some of us met at ISEE 2006 in Nairobi, is a core person in this initiative. He has emphasized that “Investments will soon be pouring back into the global economy - the question is whether they go into the old, extractive, short-term economy of yesterday or a new green economy that will deal with multiple challenges while generating multiple economic opportunities for the poor and the well-off alike.”

These are all positive signals. Nevertheless, I am somewhat worried. Is greening the growth path really solving urgent problems concerning getting our economy on a sustainable track? If not, do we have alternative ideas concerning economic organization available that are able to go beyond both the shallow – i.e., standard Keynesian – or deeper – i.e., Green New Deal – corrections. Well, we have fragments of such an alternative, but we should engage much more consistently in further developments. We seem to agree that ‘the trickling down’ mechanism of the present form of economic growth does not really reach the poorest in our world. We also agree that to the extent that it has an effect, the economy will have to grow far beyond the ecological limits to eradicate absolute poverty. Hence, we agree that redistribution of access to resources is a must. Then, however, we approach the difficult questions: What would an economy that is fair and do not need to grow beyond ecological limits look like?

I see some answers from ecological economists. From the very beginning Herman Daly emphasized that there was a need to regulate inputs of resources into the economy. In some sense this was the first postulate of ecological economics. As such it was radical, and we all know Herman’s experiences with his colleagues when he started to work for the World Bank in the early 1980s. These kinds of constraints were unimaginable to them.

Being an important element of a ‘solution’, this kind of regulation can, however, not do the trick alone. An economy whose basic fuel is expectations about future high level paybacks on investments cannot withstand such a restriction. Actually, the financial crisis has in a sense showed this as it was really the increased uncertainty about future paybacks that expanded the crash in the US housing market to become a world-wide one. Investors simply stopped to invest. Even a ‘steady state’ economy needs investments. Hence, we need to do something more fundamentally with the motivation of firms and of making investments.

There are already firms that are run on the basis of other motivations than maximizing profits. These attract investment capital from people who support the cause of these firms. Certainly, there are many who, while not being the largest capital holders, see that other types of businesses and other types of goals for economic activity are needed. This offers room for learning about how alternative firm structures could function. As such they are important to study and we must discuss to what extent these experiences can be scaled up. My challenge to both myself and to the rest of us is to participate in the debate about these issues and to start crafting research projects that can help deliver new solutions at this level.

Closing, I will turn to another important matter: I wish the organizers of the 6th ESEE conference in Ljubljana June 29 - July 2 good luck with the event. Those of you coming there will maybe read this editorial while participating in the conference. The rest of you will get the Newsletter afterwards by mail. I am quite confident that the Ljubljana conference will be a success. Following the preparations – from some distance though – I observe that Andrej and his local organizing committee have everything very well under control. Actually, it is up to the rest of us now to fill the various ‘slots’ with good content and fresh debates.
ESEE BOARD ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN AUTUMN

The terms of office of the ESEE President, Vice Presidents and a number of other Board members are ending this year. The society will hold elections to fill the positions in the Board in the autumn. We hope that many of the Board members whose terms are expiring will be standing again, but this is also a chance for anybody interested to stand an election for ESEE Board.

A formal call for nominations will be emailed to members later in the year. If you are interested in standing for election to the ESEE board, please contact any other member of the ESEE Board and we will provide further information. Being on the ESEE board provides an opportunity to influence the direction of the Society and Ecological Economics in Europe, with the added bonus of getting to know and working with a great bunch of people!

Jouni Paavola


Felix Rauschmayer
ESEE - Editor of Environmental Policy and Governance
NUCLEAR HEAVEN – PART 2

Two years ago I wondered in this same space why Finland played such an eager role in the global nuclear renaissance. Construction of the country’s fifth nuclear reactor in Olkiluoto has since run into troubled waters. It is time to revisit the topic. The recent trouble raises the spectre of what may yet turn out to be the worst obstacle to nuclear revival: its cost.

The Olkiluoto construction project is seriously delayed. The two contractors, the French Areva and the German Siemens, and the Finnish company TVO that ordered the plant, are in court. TVO says the contractors have not kept the original timetable. The two contractors say TVO and Finland’s nuclear security agency are responsible for the delays. TVO says it’s only doing what the agency tells them to do and the agency says it’s only doing its job. Areva and Siemens have also broken their mutual partnership earlier this year. The Economist speculates that Areva’s CEO Anne Lauvergeon may have to go.

The Finnish media has followed closely the alleged security lapses at the construction site. Recently The Economist and Financial Times have taken up the topic. The bad publicity worldwide is a burden for the industry. Whatever the outcome of the debacle, one thing is sure: what was sold as a quick, low-cost energy fix for the country has turned out to be a slow and costly mess. The new Olkiluoto reactor was originally scheduled to be on line in the summer of 2009. Even the most optimistic projections today put that date around 2012.

Four issues in particular are likely to erode the economic credibility of nuclear power in Finland in the near future. First, as Finland’s paper industry is rapidly moving its operations toward the Equator, the nuclear industry is losing one of its most ardent supporters and trusted clients. This, of course, does not mean there won’t be clients for Finnish nuclear electricity. The problem is that those clients are likely to be outside of Finland’s borders. That is likely to be a problem for many Finns to whom the additional nuclear power was sold as a means to secure the nation’s energy independence – not as a means for the TVO to make a huge profit in the European electricity market. Second, should Olkiluoto electricity become an export item, the presumably resolved issue of permanent storage of high level nuclear waste raises its ugly head. Finland is the only country in the world that has made a political decision on the matter. The Parliament’s decision was made with the clear understanding that Finland would not begin importing high level nuclear waste from other countries. Many are likely to ask this: If electricity generated in the Olkiluoto plant is exported and the resulting high level nuclear waste is stored in Finland’s bedrock, how does that differ from importing nuclear waste? Third, nuclear power is cheap in Finland because the cost estimates of nuclear research and decommissioning are low in international comparison. Furthermore, the required liability insurance against nuclear accidents is an order of magnitude lower in Finland than in Germany and the U.S., for example. Given the two earlier cost issues, how long will Finns accept this giveaway? Fourth, the nuclear renaissance has also brought on line a number of proposals to begin uranium mining in Finland. The country’s minister of trade and industry has made the impeccably logical argument in favour of the proposals: As an environmentally responsible nation, Finland should “close the loop” in the nuclear life cycle and therefore seriously consider uranium mining. Many Finns, particularly those living near the proposed sites, do not share the minister’s view of environmental responsibility.

Janne Hukkinen

HOT TOPIC

Ioan Manuel Ciumasu

The Romanian group of ESEE has been constituted in January 2009 (country contact Ioan Manuel Ciumasu: ciumioan@yahoo.com) and is absolutely open to any ISEE/ESEE member interested in getting involved in a Romanian-EU focus. The first issue of a bilingual English-Romanian Bulletin of the group has been issued as a work instrument on 15 March 2009, and future issues are anticipated for each 15th of March, June, September and December of the coming years. The group is seeking support to expand the publication as a practical review of sustainability news and perspectives in Romania, and to allow a print version.
Ecological Economics in Slovenia

As this year’s ESEE conference is organized in Slovenia, this is an opportunity for a short overview of the ecological economics situation in the county. As one of the transition countries, Slovenia has no formal association of ecological economists, so the organization of the conference is in hands of a group of people, who are coming from different institutions, predominately those, where social sciences were traditionally already integral part of the scientific and professional activities (i.e. agriculture, nature protection, land use planning, forestry, ecology, rural development...). In this specific multidisciplinary environment the sustainable solutions very often didn’t fit into the classical established theories, what showed the need for economic, social and natural science analyses to be brought together in new perspectives, and that brought us to the ideas of ecological economics. In this context the local organizers of the conference are hoping that this event will, both with the selection of conference topics and keynote speakers, bring together the social and natural scientists and experts from more monodisciplinary oriented institutions start developing more sustainable approaches and solutions within the country and the region. And we as organizer are very happy to see that the interest for participation at the conference is exceeding the expectation both as regards Slovenian participants as well as from the other transition countries. More about achieving these wishes we will be able to write in the post conference report.

Policy analysis on crop genetic resource regime in Hungary

Environmental Social Science Research Group (ESSRG), based at the Department of Environmental Economics, Institute of Environmental and Landscape Management, St. István University, Gödöllő, Hungary, in collaboration with Protect the Future (Védegyetel), an eco-political civil society organization has conducted a policy oriented research on genetic resource conservation in Hungary in order to promote an extensive stakeholder dialogue. Two stakeholder-roundtables (February 26 and April 18, 2009), a decision-makers forum (February 27, 2009) and a Parliamentary Open Day (May 22, 2009) were organized. The roundtables were designed to be a stakeholder dialogue on European and Hungarian regulatory environment affecting the use of crop genetic resources. These multi-party dialogues enable stakeholders to share their views, responsibilities and interests. Representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, the Ministry of Environment and Water and politicians participated in the decision-making forum. The aim was to increase cohesiveness amongst and between participants, and their capacity to negotiate in the field of genetic resource conservation.

The Parliamentary Open Day (POD) entitled Landscape Management, Local Varieties and Genetic Conservation on May 22, 2009, held in the Senate of the Hungarian Parliament, provided a meeting point for diverse stakeholders, including researchers, decision makers, politicians, and the general public. The general public in Hungary detains limited information about agro-diversity issues and decision-makers themselves might be unaware of their importance in sufficient depth. The POD was aiming at raising awareness and putting agro-diversity issues higher on the public agenda. It was divided into three sessions: a “plenary” session on what is the state of Hungarian crop/livestock genetic resources and an overview of the current institutional system of genetic conservation and its development opportunities; an “invited contribution” session with representatives from research institutions, NGOs, farmers associations; and an “open discussion” where participants expressed opinions on how the legal and institutional framework of the conservation of local varieties, national crop and livestock genetic resources could be renewed.

Further information: www.essrg.hu/tajfajta, www.essrg.hu/parlament
Professor Stepan Gensiruk is a devoted scholar who all through his career has made an exceptional contribution to the development of ecological economics and forestry science. Being the Head of the Department of the National Academy of Sciences, with committed dedication and great personal efforts, he rose about four decades ago, to the defence of Ukrainian forests that remained over-exploited until the mid 1970s. Since then until now, he has put forward implications for the reconsideration of our views on forest from seeing it as source of timber towards the recognition of environmental role of forest and its multiple ecosystem services. The major theme through his papers (total list exceeds 500 items) is that of sustainable development, with his articles deliberating the principles of ecological economics and the role of forests for economy, people and the environment. Recently, his work resulted in publication of the books “Sustainable Use of Natural Resources” and “Forests of Ukraine” and of two volumes of the “Ukrainian Encyclopaedia of Forestry”. The major significance of his inputs in ecological economics is in the reconsideration of the forest policy, particularly as it is considered through the impacts on political, economic and social life of Ukraine. His work is highly important for this country’s transition to a new society, with its new democratic, economic and cultural values.

Professor Gensiruk is a holder of the Ukraine’s Scientific Awards and of the Ukraine’s Award in Science and Technology. Recently, he received the International Union of Forest Research Organisations Golden Medal (IUFRO, 2000). Today, when the scientific community in Ukraine celebrates his 86th birthday, Professor Gensiruk is a consultant to the Ukrainian National Forestry University, and the National Academy of Sciences. For his distinguished contribution to research and knowledge transfer, he has just been awarded the National Honour of Ukraine and the Silver Medal of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences. The colleagues and students of Stepan Gensiruk both from Ukraine and beyond, are sending their congratulations to his birthday and his new splendid achievements.

**TEEB**

**SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE ESEE PARTICIPATE IN THE ELABORATION OF THE ECONOMICS OF ECOSYSTEMS AND BIODIVERSITY REPORT (TEEB)**

TEEB is intended to provide an economic spin to the causes and implications of loss in ecosystem services and biodiversity. Designed to provide a clear understanding of the trade off between costs of inaction (in terms of loss of ecosystem services) and costs of action, it is an initiative where a large number of ecological economists from Europe including many members of ESEE and elsewhere are actively engaged. The genesis of TEEB goes back to the meeting of the G8+5 Environment Ministers in Potsdam, Germany in March 2007, where it was proposed that a global study on “the economic significance of the global loss of biological diversity” should be undertaken as part of a “Potsdam Initiative” for biodiversity. The proposal was subsequently endorsed by the G8+5 leaders at the Heiligendamm Summit in June 2007.

This global study, which was entitled, “The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity” (TEEB), was initiated by the European Commission (EC) and BMU, Germany in 2007 and was led by Pavan Sukhdev, a senior economist with Deutsche Bank. An interim report of the study was presented at the 9th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP-9) in Bonn, Germany in May 2008. The interim findings concluded that significant global and local economic costs and human welfare impacts were attributable to the ongoing losses of biodiversity and degradation of ecosystems.
TEEB I was successful in providing a broad foundation where evidence and examples were collated, elements of a biodiversity/ecosystem valuation framework identified, and long-standing issues such as ethics in making economic choices re-emphasised. The second phase of TEEB (TEEB II), which has commenced and shall continue in 2009 and 2010, will build on the results of TEEB I with the overarching aim of addressing the continued and rapid decline of biodiversity and degradation of ecosystems at the global level, as documented in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. In particular, TEEB II will focus on improving our understanding of the economic costs of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation and to communicate this understanding to key stakeholders. In so doing, TEEB II envisages a complex suite of five deliverables (D0-D4), which have been jointly agreed to by the EC and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, including:

1. A global economic and valuation study that will provide the conceptual background for the guidance documents (D0)
2. A report providing guidance for international and national policymakers (D1)
3. A report providing guidance for regional and local administrators (D2)
4. A report providing guidance for business and industry (D3)
5. A report providing guidance for consumers and citizens (D4)

The reports aim to enable end-users of biodiversity and ecosystem services to apply and incorporate ecosystem and biodiversity valuations in their decision-making processes by using methodologies developed in D0. Given this, TEEB II will include a strong communication and stakeholder engagement process throughout the project cycle.

Pushpam Kumar
Scientific Coordinator, TEEB

---

THE CENTER FOR TRANS-DISCIPLINARY STUDY OF INSTITUTIONS, EVOLUTION AND POLICIES

The Center for Trans-disciplinary Study of Institutions, Evolution and Policies is a new virtual research centre dedicated to introduce ideas from institutional, evolutionary and ecological economics into the European research, public debate and policy making. CETIP is associated with the Institute for Forecasting, Slovak Academy of Sciences www.progeko.savba.sk/pu. CETIP concentrates on trans-disciplinary research and training in Europe, primarily in the region of Central and Eastern Europe, presently undergoing the transition from socialism to free market and democracy. Main concern is to continue in existing inter and trans-disciplinary cooperation on international research projects.

Providing adequate opportunities for intergenerational cooperation, such conditions for trans-disciplinary career development of early stage and experience researchers in European research Area, supporting flexible research teams and interdisciplinary cooperation across natural and social sciences. CETIP ambition is also to provide a platform for science and policy interface through public seminars or discussion forums at regional, national or international level. CETIP cooperate with similar research centres such as Center for the Study of Institutional Diversity, Arizona State University, Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University (http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop), Stockholm Resilience centrum (www.stockholmsresilience.su.se) and The Institute for Economic and Environmental Policy, IEEP (www.ieep.cz) at the Economic University in Prague. CETIP is in close cooperation with other open research and policy centres such as Center for Institutional Analysis, Development and Policy (CADI) in Romania (www.cadi.ro) or IREAS in Czech Republic (www.ireas.cz) and with related international academic programmes such as International Human Dimension Programme of Global Environmental Change (IHDP) (www.ihdp.org) or academic societies as European Society for Ecological Economics (ESEE) (www.ecolecon.org). The academic advisory board includes: Professor Carl Folke, Stockholm Resilience Centre, Professor Konrad Hagedorn, Humboldt University Berlin, Professor Jiřina Jílková, IEEP, University of Economics Prague, Professor Mária Kozová, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Comenius University Bratislava, Professor Elinor Ostrom, Arizona State University, Professor Peter Söderbaum, Mälardalen University, Sweden, Professor Arild Vatn, Norwegian University of Life Sciences. Contact: Tatiana: Kluvánková-Oravská, Veronika Chobotová: cetip@savba.sk
The Conference is targeted at researchers, environmental professionals, international organizations and policy makers who are interested in working in the management and conservation of biodiversity. The Conference is focused on identifying the most effective and efficient instruments for biodiversity conservation, such as auctions of biodiversity conservation contracts, payment-for-services contracts, taxes, tradable permits, voluntary mechanisms and straightforward command and control. Special emphasis will be given to policy reforms aimed at increasing the commercial rewards for conserving biodiversity, increasing the penalties for biodiversity loss and circulating information on the biodiversity performance requirements of firms. An increasing number of businesses, which were responsible for biodiversity loss in the past, are now supporters of biodiversity conservation. Markets for organic agriculture and sustainably-harvested timber are developing at double-digit rates, while rapid growth is observed in the demand for climate mitigation services, such as the protection of forests and wetlands to absorb carbon dioxide. Bio-prospecting, the search for new compounds, genes and organisms in the wild, is another biodiversity business on the rise.

The path breaking intellectual themes of the environmental movement of the 1960s and 1970s have made a vigorous comeback during the first decade of the 21st century. Once again, natural resources, the economy, and consumption are relevant issues for environmental social science, but from a different perspective. Rather than dwelling primarily on the quantitative limits of natural resources, today’s discussion revolves around the integrity of the services that ecosystems provide for humanity. Instead of focusing on a generic critique of the market economy, today’s challenge is widely seen as the design of social institutions with which to harness or facilitate markets for sustainable development. And earlier concerns over conspicuous consumption are today being met with efforts to manage a transition toward more sustainable patterns of consumption and production.

The 2009 YHYS Colloquium takes these shifts in intellectual perspective as its starting point and asks the following guiding questions: What challenges does the future focus of environmental policy on ecosystem services pose for environmental social science? What implications does the change in policy focus have for the design of environmental governance? Are cultures of consumption changing and if so, how are the changes linked to changes in governance? The organizers believe there are important issues for environmental social science to uncover in the management of natural resources and ecosystem services, novel governance arrangements to be explored in crafting a more sustainable global economy, and unexplored cultural and power issues that need to be understood as prerequisites for successful transition to more responsible consumption. The three key note speakers of the colloquium reflect its themes: Marina Fischer-Kowalski, Arild Vatn and Inge Repke.

The organizers are also inviting proposals for workshops to be held during the YHYS Colloquium 2009 in Helsinki. Those interested in organizing a workshop should contact Mikko Jalas (mikko.jalas@hse.fi) by September 15th 2009. The workshop themes can be related to the Colloquium themes but also other topics are warmly welcome.
CONFERENCES & WORKSHOPS

IV IBEROAMERICAN CONFERENCE ON DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT
7 - 9 October 2009, Bogota, Colombia

This event is jointly organized by the Javeriana University, Universidad del Valle del Cauca, the National University of Colombia and the Iberoamerican Network for Ecological Economics (www.redibec.org).

More information at: http://www.cisdaiv.unal.edu.co/

4th ANNUAL GREEN ECONOMICS CONFERENCE
Mansfield College, Oxford University, Friday 31 July to Saturday 1 August 2009

This Conference will follow the tradition of the Annual Green Economics Conferences which are the world’s leading Conference series in Green Economics. Internationally renowned composite, multidisciplinary, scientists, economists, campaigners, Policy makers and Directors, Professors Social scientists and Researchers from all over the globe continue to attend the very popular Green Economics Series, and to present their frontier research findings and to keep up to date with latest achievements and developments in this very fast moving and leading and topical field.

More information at: http://www.greeneconomics.org.uk/key79.html

CONFERENCE on GOVERNANCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
in a Multi-Level Context
Leipzig, Germany, 19 - 22 January 2010

GoverNat invites the research community, administrators and NGO representatives to present own approaches and experiences and to discuss the project’s results in natural resource governance in an attempt to bridge the present distance between abstract theoretical formulations and specific but isolated case descriptions.

Conference Topics
- Information flows and formats in decision making
- Differing legitimacy across levels and sectors
- Relationship between experts, public and institutional decision-makers
- Distribution of costs in decision making
- Evaluation of policy instruments and participatory processes
- Participatory methods in multi-level conflict management
- Drawing lessons from successful and failed participation cases
- Multi-level participatory methods in practice

The Conference welcomes contributions that answer such questions with a mix of theoretical developments and empirical evidence.

Scientific Board
- Prof. Mikael Skou Andersen
- Prof. Paula Antunes
- Prof. Susan Baker
- Prof. Frank Fischer
- Prof. David Gibbs
- Prof. Geoffrey Gooch
- Prof. Yrjö Haila
- Prof. Hubert Heinelt
- Prof. Andrew Jordan
- Prof. Ortwin Renn
- Dr. Doug Wilson
- Dr. Heidi Wittmer
- Dr. Tatiana Kluváňková-Oravská
- Dr. Louis Lebel
- Dr. Ines Omann
- Prof. Jouni Paavola
- Prof. György Pataki
- Dr. Felix Rauschmayer
- Prof. Ortwin Renn
- Dr. Doug Wilson
- Dr. Heidi Wittmer
I. Organised in three permanent commissions

(i) For meta-evaluation: its tasks are to evaluate results of evaluation processes from the aspect of codex and standards;
(ii) For ethical codex and evaluation standards: its tasks are to work on evaluation standards and ethical codex of evaluators;
(iii) For evaluation studies: its tasks is to locate fundamental sources and new knowledge in the area; the latest: Sankey (on incommensurability), Leopold (1971), Ekins, Medhurst, 2003, Sankey (political issues). Bar-Yam (thematic analysis), Tukker, Leontief (input-output matrix).

II. Vision

Society operates as a platform (or incubator) of the civil society aimed at improving evaluation system and at promotion of independent evaluation of public policies in Slovenia and in European Union. We want evaluation practice to be able to make use of conflicts in the assessed public issues instead of trying to ignore or eliminate them

Affirm neutral evaluation of social phenomena, observed as complex - what one sees and evaluates is always predefined in scope and scale of his/her observation.

III. Activity

(i) Newsletter: bi-weekly in Slovene, quarterly in English
(ii) Working papers (6 issues).
(iii) An initiative to the Government for a systemic approach to the evaluation issues in Slovenia (April 2009). It has been signed by 170 individuals and ten collectives, including the largest trade union in the country and several scientific institutes, by approx. 30 academic professors and 30 government officials that are active in some 30 different professional areas in which evaluation takes place. As a result of the initiative, SDE visited ten ministries in the period of April-June 2009, and developed cooperation with ministries for finance, for public administration, for environment, for development, and for culture.

IV. Meso-matrical Impact Assessment (MIA) methodology

Many of those currently involved in the assessment of large-scale and multi-scope government policy impacts to the social welfare have had significant difficulties in summarising fragmented evaluation results. There are incommensurable viewpoints with regard to social reality in scale and in scope, so they provide us with views that are not reducible to a common denominator. Linked to this is a disagreement over assumptions about the aggregation of the assessed policy impacts (micro) into summary conclusions (macro) that inform decision-makers operating at the meso level. A meso-matrical impact assessment (MIA) is proposed to cope with social incommensurability in scale (micro-meso-macro) and scope (economic-social-natural). MIA is derived from Leontief's input-output matrix that presents assessment results as overlaps between incommensurable scopes, where secondary impacts play a central role.

The case is illustrated with the comparative assessment of sustainability of regional development programme for Pomurje region (Slovenia) with Leontief's input-output matrix that presents assessment results as overlaps between incommensurable scopes, where secondary impacts play a central role. Connected to MIA is an approach to impact assessment that is micro-meso-macro and takes into account the effects of impacts on the meso level. MIA is derived from Leontief's input-output matrix that presents assessment results as overlaps between incommensurable scopes, where secondary impacts play a central role.

For all important dates, abstract submission procedure and any further information, please refer to the Call for Papers available at: www.governat.eu/conference
SUMMER COURSE

“IS IT POSSIBLE ANOTHER INTERPRETATION OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS?
THE VISION FROM THE ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS”

University Pablo de Olavide in Carmona, Seville
September 14-18, 2009

The Spanish Network of Ecological Economics (www.EcoEcoEs.es) will celebrate at the University Pablo de Olavide in Carmona, from September 14-18, 2009, the summer course: “Is it possible another interpretation of the economic crisis? The vision from the ecological economics”. This is a 30 hours course mainly directed to last year college students and, in general, to all people interested in Ecological Economics.

EcoEcoEs thinks that there is an important lack of diffusion of Ecological Economics (EE) ideas in Spain. This is specially worrisome among college students, because official programs in Economics and Environmental economics are basically based on neoclassical tenets and do not incorporate other frameworks. In this regard, and in the framework of economic crisis that we have seen, it is interesting to ask if it can interpret the economy from another perspective. Thus, the summer course aims to contribute to answer the following questions: Is possible another interpretation of the economic crisis?, What are the conceptual and methodological that allow such other interpretation? What could be, for example, some approaches to this other economic reality?

More information: olavideencarmona@admon.upo.es

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS

FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI
Research Programme on Sustainable Development
Research fellow position

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), an Italian research institute that carries out research on sustainable development, encourages to submit applications for a Research Fellow position. The successful candidate will join one of the two modelling teams at FEEM that are engaged in frontier research on the connections between the economy, energy and climate.

An outline of the modelling done so far is available at http://www.feem-web.it/witch/ and http://www.feem-web.it/ices/. Duties will be carried out at the FEEM offices in Milan or Venice, Italy.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT | UNIVERSITY OF YORK
Lectureship in Environmental Economics
Ref: UoY00389

This post offers an exciting opportunity to be involved in a significant expansion of the Environment Department and will be available from 1st October 2009. You will contribute to the development of our undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses, and you will be research active in fields that are complementary to the existing research strengths of the Department.

Information enquiries for the Economics post should be made to Professor Mike Ashmore (Tel: 01904 434070, email: ma512@york.ac.uk). Further information about the Department is available at: www.york.ac.uk/depts/eeem.
CIFOR is looking for dynamic and qualified candidates for the following positions

Deputy Director General

The DDG will work closely with the Director General in the management and operations of CIFOR. The DDG will coordinate and monitor the implementation of CIFOR’s new strategy, oversee partnerships and host country relations, manage the impact assessment unit, and oversee the functioning of the regional and project offices.

Director, Forests and Governance Programme

The Director will report to the Director General and lead research on how society can make more informed and democratic decisions that support sustainable forests and livelihoods. The multidisciplinary programme currently includes research on decentralization of forest management, impacts of globalized trade and investment on forests and forest communities, forest finance and law enforcement, collaborative forest management, and climate change and forests.

Scientist, Impact Assessment

The Scientist will report to the Deputy Director General and will contribute to strategic planning and prioritization of research investments. The Scientist will conduct ex ante and ex post impact assessments, and work closely with other Scientists in designing research projects and clarifying impact pathways.

For full details of the positions and how to apply, please go to http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/careers
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