



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

LIFE-OF-PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND DESIGN MANAGEMENT: TRAINING FOR USAID/SOUTH SUDAN STAFF & PARTNERS

Juba, South Sudan

25 – 31st January 2013



This document was prepared by The Cadmus Group, Inc. under USAID's Global Environmental Management Support Program, Contract Number GS-10F-0105J. The contents are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

Photo Credit: Charles Hernick, 2013

Photo of workshop attendees during field visit to water tanker filling station.

WORKSHOP TRAINING REPORT

GEMS ACTIVITY REPORT

AF2: LIFE -OF- PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND DESIGN MANAGEMENT: TRAINING FOR USAID/SOUTH SUDAN STAFF & PARTNERS.

JUBA, 25 – 31 JANUARY 2013

Prepared by:

Jane Kahata, Consultant to the Cadmus Group, Inc. (jkahata@yahoo.com)

Prepared under:

The Global Environmental Management Support Project (GEMS), Award Number AID-OAA-M-11-00021. The Cadmus Group, Inc., prime contractor (www.cadmusgroup.com). Sun Mountain International, principal partner (www.smtn.org).



DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

Background and Overview	1
General Workshop Descriptions	1
Overall Goal of the Workshop	1
Summary of Goals, Objectives and Methodology to Training Delivery.....	2
Course Evaluation	4
Follow up Action Plan	16
Attachment 1: Key Contacts	17
Attachment 2: List of participants (with Affiliation)	19
Attachment 3: Agenda for 3-day Workshop	26
Attachment 4: Photos.....	30

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

A 4.5-day training workshop on the “Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management (ESDM)” was held in 2010 in an effort to help bridge some of the environmental compliance gaps identified in an Environmental Best Practices Report (BPR) conducted in 2009. However, staff turnover coupled with the recruitment of new staff for an expanded mission portfolio means that many of the current staff are not familiar with USAID’s environmental compliance requirements.

To help bridge the identified gaps, USAID/South Sudan supported one 3–day training workshop and two 3-hour/brief orientation courses on “Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management” for about 60 USAID/South Sudan staff and implementing partners (IPs) in 2013. This structure helped provide training to as many participants as possible and still allowed attendees (USAID & IPs) to meet work obligations of the staff. The Global Environment Management Support (GEMS) project, a USAID capacity building project provided support to the training in terms of trainers/facilitators and provision of training materials.

GENERAL WORKSHOP DESCRIPTIONS

USAID STAFF AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS WORKSHOP

The **USAID/South Sudan staff and Implementing partners training workshops** were held from the 25th – 31st January 2013 at the MSI compound in Juba, South Sudan. The training comprised of two 3-hour training courses held on the 25th and 31st respectively. On the 25th, eleven USAID staff and seven IPs were trained while on the 31st, a total of 13 (9 USAID & IP) staff received the training. This training was an abridged version of the 3-day training course covering salient issues/topics that are critical for purposes of environmental compliance.

The 3-day training course was attended by a total of 44 staff (9 USAID & 33 IPs). This was an intensive training course which featured a 2 hour virtual field visit on Day 1 and a half-day field visit on Day 2. Each session was designed to reinforce a key environmental compliance/ESDM skills cluster.

OVERALL GOAL OF THE WORKSHOP

The overall goal of the workshop was to strengthen Environmentally Sound Design and Management of USAID-funded activities in South Sudan by assuring that participants have the motivation, knowledge and skills necessary to (i) achieve environmental compliance over life-of-project, and (ii) integrate environmental considerations in activity design and management to improve overall project acceptance and sustainability.

SUMMARY OF GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY TO TRAINING DELIVERY

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	HOW ACHIEVED – REFERENCE TO COURSE AGENDA* SEE ATTACHED AGENDA
<p>1. Motivating LOP environmental compliance. USAID’s mandatory environmental procedures exist to assure environmentally sound design and management (ESDM) of development activities. The workshop begins by defining ESDM and establishing why ESDM must be a necessary and explicit objective for successful development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate the ESDM concept and common causes of failure to achieve ESDM. • Explain why ESDM must be a necessary and explicit objective for successful development. • Articulate key action principles for achieving ESDM 	<p>Sessions 2 (Presentation and Discussion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Environment (the big picture highlighting key global environmental trends) • Why Environmentally Sound Design and Management? • EIA and ESDM
<p>2. Building Core EIA Concepts & Skills. USAID’s environmental procedures are a specific implementation of the general environmental impact assessment (EIA) process. An understanding of the basic EIA process greatly facilitates understanding USAID’s procedures, and basic proficiency in a set of core EIA skills is required for effective compliance over life-of-project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the relationship between ESDM and the EIA process. • Describe the key elements of the EIA process. • Demonstrate basic proficiency in the core EIA skills of identifying significant impacts/issue of concern and design of mitigation and monitoring plans 	<p>Sessions 3, 4 ,7,8, 10 (Presentations, discussions, field visit, exercise and group report out)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline Characterisation/ identifying Issues of concern • Principles of Mitigation
<p>3. Mastering LOP Compliance Requirements. The workshop first surveys</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (All) Describe the basic elements of LOP compliance, and 	<p>Session 5, 6, 11 & 12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Life of Project for USAID Staff and Implementing

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	HOW ACHIEVED – REFERENCE TO COURSE AGENDA* SEE ATTACHED AGENDA
<p>LOP environmental compliance requirements. These requirements—and the compliance process—can be divided into “upstream” and “downstream” elements.</p> <p><i>Upstream</i> compliance consists primarily of the pre-implementation environmental review process defined by 22 CFR 216 (Reg. 216), which culminates in approved Reg. 216 documentation (RCEs, IEEs and EAs).</p> <p><i>Downstream</i> compliance consists primarily of <i>implementing</i> the environmental management conditions specified in approved 22 CFR 216 documentation, and <i>reporting</i> on this implementation. The <i>environmental mitigation and monitoring plan (EMMP)</i> is the key instrument for systematic implementation of these conditions—and thus for achieving ESDM.</p>	<p>attendant roles and responsibilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Upstream Participants) Demonstrate basic proficiency in the pre-implementation environmental review process established by Reg. 216. • (Downstream Participants) Develop and critique environmental mitigation and monitoring plans. Demonstrate basic proficiency in developing environmental mitigation and monitoring plans. Articulate the environmental compliance reporting requirements attendant to EMMP implementation. 	<p>Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reg 216 & Screening under Reg 216 • Effective IEEs • Translating IEE conditions into Specific EMMP Implementation • Field site visit with Down Stream Focus, i.e. preparation of EMMP
<p>4. Understanding Key “Special Topics” in Compliance. Due to limitations of time, only water was covered as a special topic</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the key compliance issues involved in water and articulate recommended best practice. 	<p>Session 9</p>
<p>5. Improving Compliance Processes. Achieving LOP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of 	<p>Session 16 Staff and IPs in 2 groups</p>

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	HOW ACHIEVED – REFERENCE TO COURSE AGENDA* SEE ATTACHED AGENDA
compliance and ESDM requires both that individual USAID staff understand their roles and responsibilities and master key skills <i>and</i> that mission processes support and “mainstream” environmental compliance.	<p>environmental compliance processes in our team/mission against those in the region as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake or propose improvements to these processes 	<p>reviewed the status of compliance in light of training. Identified gaps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed their own Action Plan

COURSE EVALUATION

LEARNING APPROACH

ISSUE	% SCORE FOR EACH ISSUE				
	1	2	3	4	5
Balance of time in classroom to time in field (N=37)	8 (Much more time in field needed)	24 (A bit more time in field needed)	49 (About right)	11 (A bit more time in classroom needed)	8 (Much more time in classroom needed)
In classroom, balance of presentations to exercises, group work and discussions	8 (Much more emphasis on presentation is needed)	13 (A bit more emphasis on presentation is needed)	49 (About right)	27 (A bit more emphasis on exercises & discussions needed)	5 (Much more emphasis on exercises & discussion is needed)
Technical level pace (N=39)	5 (Much too heavy)	31 (A little too heavy)	54 (About right)	8 (A bit too light)	3 (Much too light)
Opportunities for peer exchange &	7 (Needed to)	16 (Needed to)	29 (About)	45 (Some more)	8 (Many more)

learning (N=38)	hear and learn much more directly from facilitators)	hear and learn more directly from facilitators	right)	opportunities for peer learning/ exchange are needed	opportunities for peer learning/ exchange are needed)
-----------------	--	--	--------	--	---

DISCUSSION

The learning approach was considered about right by close to 50% of the learners for two of the issues while the technical level and pace was considered about right by 55% of the participants. 31% of the participants felt that the technical level and pace were a little too heavy. Only 29% of the participants felt that opportunities for peer exchange and learning were about right while 45% felt some more opportunities were needed. This can be explained by the fact that this was a 3 day course and in addition, participants had to source for their own lunch outside of the training venue which reduced time for interactions.

HIGHEST/LOWEST RATED SESSIONS

This section was not properly evaluated with 9 (23%) participants not indicating their two highest rated sessions and 19 (44%) participants did not indicate which sessions they rated lowest. Some of those who rated the sessions lowly felt these had a lower relevance for them (Session 11 & 12) were considered more relevant for USAID staff than for IPs. EMMP development (Session 10) was ranked highest and second highest by a total of 14 (35%) participants.

OVERALL EVALUATIONS

ISSUE	% SCORES (1-5): 1 = VERY POOR; 2 = POOR; 3 = ACCEPTABLE; 4 = GOOD; 5 = EXCELLENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
Technical quality (Program & Content): N=40	2.5	0	7.5	70	20
Facilitation: N=40	5	0	15	65	15
Logistics: N=39	10	3	41	36	10
Venue: N= 40	5	3	10	56	25
Field Visits: N=40	3	8	3	16	70

Most of the participants were happy about the course content, facilitation and venue/organisation with over 80% indicating this was good or excellent. The field visits were rated very highly with 70% indicating they found them excellent. Logistics scored the lowest and this can be attributed to the arrangements that the participants had to make on their own for lunch.

COURSE IMPACT

CHARACTERISATION THAT PARTICIPANT MOST AGREED WITH	% SCORE: N=39		
	1	2	3
Baseline knowledge: In light of what you have learned in this workshop, how would you rate your understanding of ESDM and USAID's environmental procedures	28 (Had poor or limited understanding)	46 (Understood basics, lacked some details)	26 (Had a strong & detailed understanding)
Empowerment: To what extent has this workshop increased your knowledge and capabilities to address environmental compliance requirements in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	0 (Not at all)	46 (Moderately)	54 (Strongly)
Motivation: To what extent has this workshop increased your motivation to proactively address environmental compliance and ESDM in the context of your job function/ professional responsibilities?	0 (Not at all)	33 (Moderately)	67 (Strongly)

Nearly half of the participants had basic understanding of the ESDM and USAID's environmental procedures, while the rest (approximately 25%) had poor or limited understanding of the same. Only approximately 25% of the participants had a strong and detailed understanding before the training. This underscores the importance of offering the training.

After the training, all the participants felt empowered- more than half of them felt that their knowledge and capacity was strongly enhanced. All the participants felt motivated to address environmental compliance and ESDM in their operational areas. Nearly two-thirds of participants were strongly motivated. This is a strong indication that the training had imparted the required knowledge and skills for future job performance.

GENERAL COMMENTS FROM THE 3-DAY TRAINING COURSE

- Instructors have an assumption that all the participants have a scientific knowledge. Simplify terminologies for non-science inclined participants;
- No lunch area for all to interact. Lunch should be provided since going out for lunch delays people;
- Field visits provide excellent opportunities to reinforce classroom learning;
- Facilitators should internalize materials and not read from PowerPoints;
- Quality of presentations should be improved upon, content is alright (I guess we need to have 4 PowerPoint slides per page instead of 6);
- Sessions 11 & 12 not very relevant for non USAID staff;
- More examples related to agricultural activities should be provided;
- IP level monitoring of small scale activities. There is a form that was shown on day 2, to be used by project managers (ERF/ERR??). More of it should have been shared practically;
- Venue was quiet and clean;
- One site visit does not expose us enough to other aspects of the environment;
- Refresher workshops needed;
- Session 5 needed more by USAID staff and not IPs;
- Agricultural land reclamation not covered;
- Practical physical work on the ERF not covered;
- Support needs - more training.

DAILY EVALUATION FOR THE 3-DAY TRAINING COURSE

To better get feedback about the training, each of the participants was required to evaluate all the sessions held during the day. These were evaluated and rated in terms of: (i) presentation content quality; and (ii) usefulness for their organisation on a scale of 1-5. An additional column was provided for any other comments. In addition, other parameters of the training were to be rated on a scale of 1-5 with a score of (1) being the poorest and (5) being excellent.

Also, there were two (2) questions geared towards testing the knowledge and understanding of the participants at the end of each day. The following are the results of these daily evaluations:

DAY I EVALUATIONS

Session Evaluation Scores and Comments

SESSION NO. & NAME	PRESENTATION CONTENT QUALITY (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	USEFULNESS TO YOUR ORGANISATION (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	COMMENTS FROM EACH OF THE SESSIONS
Session 1: Workshop Objectives and Logistics, Participant Introductions	3.6	3.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good work and organization • Poor • Well presented • Very good as we introduce ourselves • Relevant to expectations • Useful for my organization by building/improving capacity • Introductions are long and probably unnecessary • Good • Too repetitive and slow
Session 2: Environmental Compliance as a means to Achieving Environmentally Sound Design and Management (ESDM)	3.8	4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More clarification needed • Clear presentation • Excellent • Good presentation • Good entrance to understanding environment holistically • Useful for my organization to know limitations, codes, requirements • Could be presented a bit faster

SESSION NO. & NAME	PRESENTATION CONTENT QUALITY (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	USEFULNESS TO YOUR ORGANISATION (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	COMMENTS FROM EACH OF THE SESSIONS
Session 3: Fundamental Skills of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	4	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent topic • Give relevant examples from health care • Well presented – backed with clear examples and explanations • Needs to be improved • Very excellent presentation • Useful for my organization by building/improving capacity • Reading off power point does not equal a good presentation
Session 4a& b: Virtual Field Visit & Identification of Key Issues: Practicing Core EIA skills	4.1	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understood EIA more due to this session • We should have gone to the actual location (waste water plant) instead of the virtual visit as it's close • Involved in a training project • Exposure to application and core skills • Excellent case study • Very good presentation • Often key to successful project implementation • Presentation was useful for my organization because updated information, learned about new activities that impact the environment
Session 4c: Virtual Field Visit	4.1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good practice • Nice study to my organization • Very excellent presentation • Often key to successful project

SESSION NO. & NAME	PRESENTATION CONTENT QUALITY (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	USEFULNESS TO YOUR ORGANISATION (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	COMMENTS FROM EACH OF THE SESSIONS
			<p>implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful for my organization by providing low-cost field visit • Great
Session 5: Reg. 216: USAID's Pre-Implementation EIA Process	4.1	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdue training for COR-AOR and partners which will facilitate development of effective IEEs/EIA • More on relevancy to health organizations • Useful to look at "small scale" IEEs (activity level), these are most likely to be more relevant to my day-to-day work • Well explained using relevant examples • Needs to be improved • Well presented • Good to know as its part of USAID's requirements • Useful for my organization by building/improving capacity • Great • Good presentation
Session 6: Effective IEEs	3.9	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to understand more on IEE and get difference from EIA • Well-articulated • Excellent • Very excellent presentation • Useful for my organization by providing quick practice method, precision

SESSION NO. & NAME	PRESENTATION CONTENT QUALITY (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	USEFULNESS TO YOUR ORGANISATION (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	COMMENTS FROM EACH OF THE SESSIONS
Average score for all Day 1 presentations	3.9	4.1	

Discussion

All of the presentations were evaluated positively with regard to presentation content quality, with an overall average of 3.9. The virtual field visit and identification of core issues (session 4 a, b & c) and the session on USAID's pre-implementation EIA process each got the highest score of 4.1. The lowest score was on the introduction (with a score of 3.6), which some participants found less valuable than the primary information sessions. Many participants praised the examples and explanations given, though one commenter asked for more examples relevant to health care.

The overall average score of the ESDM training's usefulness to organizations participating in the workshop is 4.1 of out 5. The session on fundamental skills of EIA was the most highlight rated, with a score of 4.3 out of 5. The only session with less than a 4 was the introductory overview session. Many participants expressed in the comments how the training was useful to their organization, including an increased understanding of EIA and environmental impacts, exposure to application, and as an introduction to thinking of the environment holistically.

Overall Day 1 Evaluation score

ISSUE	AVERAGE SCORE ON A SCALE OF 1-5; 1 BEING POOR AND 5 BEING EXCELLENT
Quality of Methodology used during the day: N=30	3.8
General usefulness of the days theme for your organisation: N=30	4.3
Quality of information presented today: N=30	4.1
Satisfaction with the workshop organisation: N=29	4.0
Overall average score	4.1

General Comments from Day 1 Evaluations

- It's a good workshop and the material (content) presented was helpful. However, lunch should be provided so that participants do not have to travel far to find it;
- Lunch should have been provided by training organization so participants would not have to go far for lunch;
- Overall quality of presentation and organization is very good;
- Fairly understood EIA and IEE presentations although new to the training. I have fairly understood the content, but more *might be* needed to make it more relevant to organizations dealing in health care provision;
- Lunch should be provided so that we don't waste time looking for lunch;
- Lunch should have been served;
- Useful exposition to the powers of EIA and good presentations from the workshop/training facilitators;
- The facilitators need to improve their way of presentation in terms of explanations of topics, and they should be specific in some explanations;
- Use of pictures was excellent;
- This workshop is very useful for me personally and my organization;
- Whole training aspects in relation to project designs and its impacts on our environment is important to my organization;
- Excellent;
- I fully appreciate the utility of this course;
- Since this is the first training that I learned about IEE/EIA, it is outstanding. I liked the stretching/sport/tea breaks. Trainers are friendly;
- Presentation is quite useful. There is great need to adjust the mode – especially where the presenters seem to be reading the whole presentation directly;
- Generally good information;
- The activities and group discussions are very effective. More emphasis on the filling up of IEE. A sample of form used would help;
- Generally a good presentation. Keep it up. Keep the energy high.

Discussion

The average rating of Day 1 was a 4.1, or good. The highest individual rating was in 'general usefulness of the days theme to your organization', with an average rating of 4.3. Over half of the participants (18 out of 33) left comments in the provided section. Generally the comments were positive, those that are critical often request more specific examples (e.g., for health care).

DAY 2 EVALUATIONS

Session Evaluation Scores and Comments

SESSION NO. & NAME	PRESENTATION CONTENT QUALITY (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	USEFULNESS TO YOUR ORGANISATION (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	COMMENTS FROM EACH OF THE SESSIONS
Session 7: Environmental monitoring & Environmental Mitigation & Monitoring plans (Core EIA Skills 2)	3.8	4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned can be an asset to my organization and help me do field work more successfully • Not enough information in addition to slides • More relevant to our organization and well presented • Quality of presentation leaves a lot to be desired; concept is relevant • Good presentation but presentation not pretty exceptional
Session 8; Indicators Exercise	4.1	4.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good message of target setting?? • Well done • I hoped we would have had more time
Session 9: Water: Special Environmental Compliance & ESDM Considerations	4.3	4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not relevant to health care organisations • Good presentation and very practical.
Session 10a & b: Field Based EMMP Development	4.3	4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adults should not be forced to do group work. It is amazingly painful
Session 10c: Field	4.7	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very excellent knowledge on

SESSION NO. & NAME	PRESENTATION CONTENT QUALITY (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	USEFULNESS TO YOUR ORGANISATION (AVG. SCORE ON 1-5 SCALE)	COMMENTS FROM EACH OF THE SESSIONS
Visits			<p>data collection, organisation and data presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good and interesting exercise • Field visits provided an excellent opportunity to reinforce classroom role learning • More practical • Field visits were excellent • Good field trip guidance • Excellent opportunity to reinforce classroom learning
Average score for all Day 2 presentations	4.2	4.4	

Discussion

All the presentations were evaluated positively with regard to presentation quality and content with an overall average score of 4.2. The field visits got the highest score of 4.7. With regard to session's usefulness to participants organisations, it can be deduced almost of the participants felt they were useful and relevant. However one participant drawn from the health sector indicated that water issues were not relevant to their programs, which of course is a misconception. The overall average score of the ESDM training's usefulness to organisations participating in the workshop is 4.4 of out 5 which is pretty good.

Overall Day 2 Evaluation score

ISSUE	AVERAGE SCORE ON A SCALE OF 1-5; 1 BEING POOR AND 5 BEING EXCELLENT
Quality of Methodology used during the day: N=21	4.1
General usefulness of the days theme for your organisation: N=21	4.4

Quality of information presented today: N=20	4.0
Satisfaction with the workshop organisation N=21	3.8
Overall average score	4.1

General Comments from Day 2 Evaluations

- No lunch area for all to interact;
- Slides should be easy to flip through – the full page ones were difficult to follow (I guess this was for the PowerPoint's for which a slide was printed on a single page);
- I wish to see more training even for non-specialized staff to raise awareness on environmental issues and to ensure EIA considerations for future projects;
- Presenters should not read from Power Point presentations to participants but should internalize the materials;
- Contents are good and useful for future programming;
- The training is good for my project.

Discussion

The overall rating of the Day 2 activities was good; the participants gave it an overall average score of 4.1. For the section on comments, only 7 of the 25 participants (28%) that completed evaluation forms at the end of Day 2 provided comments. ;

Nine out of 25 participants (36%) did not attempt to respond to the question of what simple, SMART indicator could be used to monitor erosion and loss of top soil. About 28% of the participants answered the question about the 5 components of the EMMP correctly.

FOLLOW UP ACTION PLAN

The following table describes the way forward to contribute further to the projects objectives.

USAID/ SOUTH SUDAN	IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MEO to arrange for refresher training courses/and or training to cover issues not covered in the training. Such training should be more specific to development objectives. Two of the participants raised the issue of inadequate coverage of agricultural issues such as land reclamation, slash and burn practices common in South Sudan and the extent to which this can be permitted by USAID. USAID and IPs remain compliant with environmental reporting requirements. 2. COR/AOR to play their oversight responsibilities more effectively. 3. Office of Acquisition and Assistance to ensure environmental compliance issues are fully integrated into contracting instruments via ECL. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue with refresher training courses that should be more program objectives inclined. 2. Brief COP on Gaps identified. 3. Review environmental compliance in their programs and make the necessary changes to improve compliance. This will include reviewing IEEs to familiarise with EA conditions for their activities and putting measures in place to implement the conditions such as development and implementation of EMMPs. 4. In-house training for other members of staff. One of the issues to cover is the use of the ERF/ERR form.

ATTACHMENT 1: KEY CONTACTS

ORGANIZATION	NAME AND POSITION	CONTACTS
USAID/AFR/SD	Brian Hirsch, AFR BEO & COR for GEMS	bhirsh@usaid.gov
CADMUS/GEMS	Mark Stoughton	mark.stoughton@cadmusgroup.com
	Charles Hernick	charles.hernick@cadmusgroup.com
	Michael Minkoff	michael.minkoff@cadmusgroup.com
USAID/S. Sudan	Richard Nyarsuk - MEO	rnyarsuk@usaid.gov
	Mary Laku – Alternate MEO, AOR – IFDC, COR FARM	mlaku@usaid.gov
	Selam Kebrom - Program Development Office	skebrom@usaid.gov
MCHIP Central Equatoria State	Edward Eremego Luka - Program Manager	+211955319025;
Republic of South Sudan, Ministry of Housing and Physical Infrastructure	Morris Jeremiah Wani Lomodong, Director General Sanitation, GOSS	m.lomodong@btinternet.com +211913083897

TRAINING/FACILITATION TEAM

LEAD GEMS TRAINER & FACILITATOR	Lead Trainer/Facilitator: Jane Kahata (Consultant to The Cadmus Group)	jkahata@yahoo.com
	Trainer/Facilitator: Charles Hernick (The Cadmus Group, GEMS)	charles.hernick@Cadmusgroup.com
	Trainer/Facilitator: Simon Gatheru (Consultant to The Cadmus Group)	Simongatheru@yahoo.com
LOGISTICS (TRANSPORTATION)	Peterson Chege, SILC INTERNATIONAL	chegep2002@yahoo.com

CONTRACTS, FUNDING AND COST-SHARES

PARTICIPANT SUPPORT	<p>33 Implementing Partner Organizations attended the workshop. IP organizations provided their staff with transport to and from the training venue; accommodation and per diem where needed</p> <p>USAID South Sudan Via GEMS provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pre-planning support (travel, per diem and fees)• Transport to field case study sites;• Training materials• Support to the training/facilitation team (travel, per diems and consultant fees)
---------------------	---

ATTACHMENT 3: AGENDA FOR 3-DAY WORKSHOP

AGENDA:

Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design & Management Workshop

A Training Workshop for USAID/South Sudan Staff and Implementing Partners

Juba, South Sudan – 28 - 30 January 2013

DAY/TIME	MODULE	OBJECTIVE/CONTENT SUMMARY	PRESENTER/FACILITATOR
Day 1	Motivation, Core Skills, Overview of Environmental Compliance over Life of Project		
8:00-8:30	Participant Registration		
8:30-8:50	Welcome and Opening Statements	Highlight the value of workshop content and expected results.	USAID/South Sudan Mission Staff
8:50-9:30	Session 1: Workshop Objectives and Logistics; Participant Introductions	Establish workshop objectives; brief the agenda and learning approach. Review logistics. Participant self-introductions; articulate expectations; establish learning agreement.	Jane Kahata (GEMS)
9:30-10:30	Session 2: Environmental Compliance as a means to Achieving Environmentally Sound Design & Management (ESDM) <i>Presentation (includes brief video "Environmental Considerations: Toward a Sustainable Future") and dialogue</i>	Achieve a common understanding of "environment." Introduce USAID's Environmental Procedures and summarize their legal basis & the life-of-project requirements they establish. With illustrations by example, understand the need to systematically address environmental considerations in design and implementation of development activities – even in activities not primarily focused on infrastructure	Simon Gatheru (GEMS) Charles Hernick (Cadmus/GEMS)
10:30-10:45	Break		
10:45-11:45	Session 3: Fundamental Skills of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (Core Skills Part I) <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Define key terms—baseline, impact, activity—and learn essential classroom theory for baseline characterization, impact identification & mitigation design and how they apply in the EIA framework; the EIA framework is the basis for USAID Environmental Procedures.	Jane Kahata (GEMS)
11:45-12:45	Session 4a& b: Virtual field visit & identification of key issues: practicing Core EIA skills <i>Part A: Briefing and Photo Tour (0:20)</i> <i>Part B: Group work (0:40)</i>	Practice observation skills needed to characterize the baseline situation and identify impacts/issues of concern. Identify possible mitigation approaches for limiting adverse effects on the environment.	Simon Gatheru (GEMS)
12:45-13:45	Lunch		

DAY/TIME	MODULE	OBJECTIVE/CONTENT SUMMARY	PRESENTER/ FACILITATOR
13:45-14:15	Session 4c: Virtual Field Visit <i>Part C: Report-out/Synthesis Discussion</i>		
14:15-15:00	Session 5: Reg. 216: USAID's Pre-Implementation EIA Process <i>Presentation</i>	Understand Reg. 216 as USAID's mandatory pre-obligation EIA process, and further understand that environmental mitigation and monitoring conditions established by this process become required elements of activity design and implementation. Become familiar with the entire Reg. 216 process.	Charles Hernick (Cadmus/GEMS)
15:00-15:15	Break		
15:15-16:45	Session 6: Effective IEEs <i>Orientation (0:10); Group work (1:00) + synthesis discussion (0:20)</i>	Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) are USAID's version of the preliminary assessment and the most common type of Reg. 216 documentation. We learn the characteristics of effective IEEs by critiquing draft IEEs based on the virtual field visits.	Charles Hernick, CADMUS/GEMS
16:45	Close of Day <i>Announcements and feedback</i>		
Day 2 Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plans			
8:30-8:40	Day 1 review & Day 2 program		
8:40-9:30	Session 7: Environmental Monitoring & Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plans (Core Skills Part 2) <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Monitoring is the essential complement to mitigation: its objective is to determine clearly and cost-effectively if mitigation is sufficient and effective. We will understand this objective, brief the two types of environmental monitoring indicators & achieve a common understanding of the principles of environmental monitoring design. EMMPs set out the mitigation and monitoring measures by which a project will respond and comply with IEE or EA conditions. We will understand the basic EMMP concept and formats. Introduce key guidance: <i>EMMP Factsheet</i> .	Simon Gatheru
9:30-10:00	Session 7: cont'd <i>"Conditions to Actions" discussion/exercise</i>	Practice a key EMMP skill: Translating IEE conditions to specific mitigation actions	Charles Hernick CADMUS/GEMS
10:00-10:15	Break		
10:15-11:15	Session 8: Indicators exercise <i>Small group exercise</i>	Build and apply indicator selection skills (a key constituent skill for EMMP development) in a scenario-based small-group exercise centered on the Visual Field Guides.	Jane Kahata
11:15-11:45	Session 9: Water: Special Environmental Compliance & ESDM Considerations <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Covers water quantity (availability) and quality issues important to environmental compliance with a focus on wetlands.	Charles Hernick (Cadmus/GEMS)

DAY/TIME	MODULE	OBJECTIVE/CONTENT SUMMARY	PRESENTER/ FACILITATOR
11:45-12:30	Session 10a& b: Field-based EMMP Development Exercise <i>Part A: Briefing</i> <i>Part B: small-group prep.</i>	Over this extended session, we will work in small groups to develop EMMPs for project scenarios based on the field visits we will undertake at the beginning of Day 2. In Part B, groups discuss potential adverse impacts of the case study sites. Review background and reference materials and discuss approach for EMMP development.	All facilitators Group work
12:30-13:30	Lunch		
13:30-17:00	Session 10c: Field visits: <i>Field visit (in group)</i>		Jane Kahata (GEMS)
Day 3 Complete field visits and develop EMMPs			
8:30-8:40	Day 2 review & orientation to Day 3 program		Simon Gatheru (GEMS)
8:40-10:30	Session 10d: EMMP & group presentation development <i>Small group work</i>	Based on field visits, develop an EMMP & a presentation on this EMMP.	All facilitators
10:30-10:45	Tea		
10:45-11:30	Session 10e: Case Study Conclusions <i>Group presentations in plenary</i>	Working groups present their EMMPs in approx. 15-minute presentations with feedback from facilitators	All facilitators
11:30-12:00	Session 11: Environmental Compliance Reporting <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	IPs must report on environmental compliance for A/CORs for fulfill their responsibilities. This reporting is based on the EMMP. Understand environmental compliance reporting requirements, including integration with broader project M&E and PMP reporting requirements.	Jane Kahata, GEMS
12:00-12:30	Session 12: Roles, Responsibilities & Resources	Synthesize Environmental Compliance Roles & Responsibilities. Introduce the key resources available to support environmental compliance and ESDM.	Charles Hernick (Cadmus/GEMS)
12:30-13:30	Lunch		
13:30-14:45	Session 13: Environmental Compliance/ESDM Knowledge game <i>Small-group competition</i>	Reinforce key “core session” content in a small-group competition.	All facilitators
14:45-15:15	Session 14: Parking lot session <i>Plenary Q&A</i>	Address unresolved questions or issues and summarize information presented throughout the training.	Simon Gatheru (GEMS)
15:15-15:30	Break		

DAY/TIME	MODULE	OBJECTIVE/CONTENT SUMMARY	PRESENTER/ FACILITATOR
15:30-16:30	Session 15: Bringing Curricula to Reality <i>Plenary discussion, staff + IP focus groups, and individual action plans</i>	Identify lessons learned and practical actions that can be operationalized in future planning.	Jane Kahata (GEMS)
16:30 – 16:45	Workshop Final Evaluations	Participants complete evaluation form	Charles Hernick (Cadmus/GEMS)
16:45	Closing Ceremony	Conclude workshop and distribute certificates.	Mission staff

ATTACHMENT 4: PHOTOS



Participants doing Group Work



Charles in one of the Sessions.



Participants in Session



Presentation Session



Participants in one of the Sessions



Training in Session



Participants during Tea Break



Field Visit – Water Group



Field Visit - Water



Field Visit Presentation from one of the Groups