

GEMS Training Delivery Report:

## **Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management Trainings Workshops for USAID Staff & Implementing Partners**

Held 12 March–16 March and 19 March – 23 March at  
Busua Beach Resort, Takoradi, Ghana



**6 April 2012**

**Cover photo:**

Loading and Processing Operations Area, Norpalm Oil Palm Plantation, Takoradi Ghana

**GEMS Training Delivery Report:**

**Environmental Compliance and  
Environmentally Sound Design and Management**

*Training Workshops for USAID Staff and Implementing Partners*

**Held 12–16 March and 23 March 2012 at  
Busua Beach Resort, Takoradi, Ghana**

**Prepared by:**

Mark Stoughton, Ph.D., The Cadmus Group, Inc.  
Kristin Taddei, The Cadmus Group, Inc.

**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](http://www.cadmusgroup.com)). Sun Mountain International, principal partner ([www.smtn.org](http://www.smtn.org)).  
GEMS Activities AF3 & AF4



**DISCLAIMER**

The authors' 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

1.	Overview	2
2.	Agenda & learning approach	2
3.	Evaluations	5
4.	Issues for follow-up & lessons learned	7
5.	Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements	9

### Attachments

Final Agendas  
Participant Lists  
Evaluation Form

## Acronyms

AFR	USAID Bureau for Africa	GB	gigabyte
AFR/SD	USAID Bureau for Africa, Office of Sustainable Development	GEMS	Global Environmental Management Support Project
ATR	Agreement Officer's Representative	GH	USAID Bureau for Global Health
BEO	Bureau Environmental Officer	IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
CFR	Code of (US) Federal Regulations	IP	Implementing Partner
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative	SMTN	Sun Mountain International
DCHA	USAID Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance	LMS	USAID Learning Management System
EA	Environmental Assessment or East Africa	LOP	Life-of-Project
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
EMMP	Environmental Mitigation & Monitoring Plan	MEO	Mission Environmental Officer
EMCB	Environmental Management Capacity-Building (Program)	RCE	Request for Categorical Exclusion
ENCAP	Environmentally Sound Design and Management Capacity-Building Support for Africa	REA	Regional Environmental Advisor
ERF	Environmental Review Form	Reg. 216	22 CFR 216 (Title 22, Code of US Federal Regulations)
ERR	Environmental Review Report	US	United States
ESDM	Environmentally Sound Design & Management	USG	United States Government
		USAID	United States Agency for International Development
		WA	West Africa

## 1. Overview

Over 12–23 March 2012, GEMS conducted two five-day, back-to-back training on “Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management” in Takoradi, Ghana. Participants for the first workshop (12-16 March) were USAID Staff in Africa Region. Participants in the second (19-23 March) were staff of Implementing Partner (IP) organizations of USAID/Ghana and USAID/West Africa.

The workshops were funded by AFR/SD, USAID/Ghana and USAID/West Africa via GEMS. USAID/West Africa provided key organizational and planning assistance.

Six site visits were conducted during each workshop. These visits focused on agriculture, infrastructure, health/sanitation, and waste management environmental activities.

Excluding the training team, 38 participants attended the first workshop, of whom 2 were USAID/Ghana staff. The remaining participants represented 25 missions, including those in Liberia, Mali, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Rwanda, Uganda, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. Again excluding the training team, 43 participants attended this workshop, from 26 different organizations.

The workshops were the latest in a series of trainings for staff and partners of USAID missions in Africa. initiated under the ENCAP project.<sup>1</sup> ENCAP was a predecessor project to GEMS serving the Africa-region. The **overall goal of workshops** in this series is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in the host country by assuring that participants have the motivation, knowledge and skills necessary to (1) achieve environmental compliance during the implementation phase of their project; and (2) otherwise integrate environmental considerations in activity design and management to improve overall project acceptance and sustainability.

The training materials and workshop agenda were developed by GEMS in consultation with the USAID core planning team. An in-country logistics provider, Sunlife Travels and Tours, was assisted with local procurement, case site transport, hotel bookings, and transfers to and from the training venue.

This report is not a proceedings document, but is intended to document the workshops<sup>2</sup>:

- Learning approach and structure, as reflected in agenda, materials & facilitation;
- Outcomes (including evaluations and issues for follow-up); and
- Key attributes and implementation arrangements.

## 2. Learning approach & agendas

Each workshop was 4.5 days in length, featuring 2 half-day field visits, each designed to reinforce a key environmental compliance/ESDM skill cluster.

**Approach to Learning.** The workshop is intended to be highly participatory and field-based:

---

<sup>1</sup> The most recent such workshops were held in Naivasha, Kenya for USAID Regional Staff and for USAID/Kenya staff and partners in January and February 2011. For a list of past trainings under ENCAP, see [www.encapafrika.org/encapCalendar.htm](http://www.encapafrika.org/encapCalendar.htm). For a list of GEMS trainings, see <http://www.usaidgems.org/overviewCalendar.htm>

1. Skills and processes briefed in the presentations will be built and practiced in hands-on exercises conducted in small working groups.
2. The key, integrative exercises in Core EIA skills and LOP compliance are built around field visits.
3. *Even presentation-centered sessions are intended to be interactive.* Participants are expected and encouraged to ask questions and, as importantly, to share and discuss their own experiences and perspectives relevant to the topic at hand.

**Overall Goal.** As noted, the overall goal of both workshops was to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in sub-Saharan Africa by assuring that participants have the *motivation, knowledge and skills necessary to* (1) achieve environmental compliance over life-of-project, and (2) otherwise integrate environmental considerations in activity design and management to improve overall project acceptance and sustainability.

**Africa Regional USAID Staff Workshop---Agenda Structure & Objectives.** Towards this goal, the agenda of the first, Africa Regional, workshop agenda had five main components, each corresponding to key workshop objectives.

Agenda component	Corresponding objectives: By the end of the workshop, participants will be able to:
<p>1. <b>Motivating LOP environmental compliance.</b> 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"> <li>• Articulate the ESDM concept and common causes of failure to achieve ESDM.</li> <li>• Explain why ESDM must be a necessary and explicit objective for successful development.</li> <li>• Articulate key action principles for achieving ESDM</li> </ul>
<p>2. <b>Building Core EIA Concepts &amp; Skills.</b> 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"> <li>• Explain the relationship between ESDM and the EIA process.</li> <li>• Describe the key elements of the EIA process.</li> <li>• Demonstrate basic proficiency in the core EIA skills of identifying significant impacts/issue of concern and design of mitigation and monitoring.</li> </ul>

<p><b>3. Mastering LOP Compliance Requirements.</b> The workshop first surveys LOP environmental compliance requirements. These requirements—and the compliance process—can be divided into “upstream” and “downstream” elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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).</li> <li>• <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.</li> <li>• After surveying LOP environmental compliance and building needed core skills, we will split into two “streams” for a portion of the workshop: one focused on upstream compliance, and one on downstream compliance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>(All)</b> Describe the basic elements of LOP compliance, and attendant roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>• <b>(Upstream Participants)</b> Demonstrate basic proficiency in the pre-implementation environmental review process established by Reg. 216.</li> <li>• <b>(Downstream Participants)</b> Develop and critique environmental mitigation and monitoring plans.</li> </ul> <p>Demonstrate basic proficiency in developing environmental mitigation and monitoring plans.</p> <p>Articulate the environmental compliance reporting requirements attendant to EMMP implementation.</p>
<p><b>4. Understanding Key “Special Topics” in Compliance.</b> Focused “special topic” sessions address the environmental compliance and management aspects of selected current, complex and emerging issues in the USAID portfolio and operating environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain the key compliance issues involved in each special topic, and articulate recommended best practice.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Improving Compliance Processes.</b> Achieving LOP 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of environmental compliance processes in our team/mission against those in the region as a whole.</li> <li>• Undertake or propose improvements to these processes following the workshop.</li> </ul>

Components 1 and 2 were sequential and occupied most of the first 1.5 days of the workshop. The remainder of day 2 and day 3 addressed the third component. Day 4 focused on “special topics” (component 4). Day 5 (a half-day) focused on improving compliance processes (component 5).

This agenda structure was piloted at the 2011 Africa Regional workshop in Naivasha, Kenya and replicated for this workshop with minor updates.

The final agenda for the Africa Regional USAID staff workshop is annexed to this report.

**West Africa and Ghana IP Workshop---Agenda Structure & Objectives.** The IP workshop goals, agenda structure, and objective were very similar to the USAID Staff Workshop.

The primary difference was that rather than covering life-of-project compliance, the workshop focused intensively on *downstream compliance*: that is, implementing the environmental management

conditions specified in approved 22 CFR 216 documentation, and reporting on this implementation. The environmental mitigation and monitoring plan (EMMP) is the key instrument for systematic implementation of these conditions—and thus for achieving ESDM.

The final agenda for the IP workshop is annexed to this report.

**Materials Archive.** The materials and agenda for these workshops are archived on the AFR/SD sharepoint server at <http://afr-sd.sharepoint.afr-sd.org/gems/Ghana2012/default.aspx>. They will be accessible under the “training” section of [www.usaidgems.org](http://www.usaidgems.org).

Materials for the May 2012 workshop for USAID/Zambia staff and partners, which are essentially identical to those used for this workshop are available at <http://www.usaidgems.org/Workshops/Zambia2012.htm>.

### 3. Evaluations

Three different formal methods were used to evaluate the success of each workshops in meeting its objectives. All indicate that both workshops strongly achieved these objectives:

**1. Expectations tracking.** In the first session of each workshop, participants were asked to record their expectations for the workshop, which were then posted. As the workshop progressed, participants were periodically asked to review their expectations and put a check mark on those that had been met. By the end of each workshop, all expectations save a few that pertained to particular sectoral best practice questions (which were outside the scope of the workshop) had been addressed.

**2. Environmental Compliance/ESDM Knowledge “Game.”** Following the conclusion of core LOP compliance theory and practice sessions on Day 4, a test and review of this content was conducted in the form of a small-teams competition. The Environmental Compliance/ESDM knowledge game consisted of 3 rounds of multiple-choice/fill-in-the-blank questions designed as a technically challenging review of substantive content conducted under time pressure. Each round of the game corresponded to a particular workshop objective. All teams recorded correct answers at least 75% of the time, indicating strong comprehension and uptake of core workshop content.

**3. Individual workshop evaluation & feedback instrument.** At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were asked to complete an individual GEMS workshop evaluation form (attached). It is designed to both solicit evaluations of learning approach and to differentiate evaluations according to the level of prior knowledge of participants. The latter is intended to evaluate workshop performance against and inform future workshop design with respect to a consistent challenge in this training series: simultaneously meeting the needs of both “old hands” and “novices” in the areas of ESDM and USAID environmental procedures.

(Due to miscommunication, disaggregation of results by self-assessed prior knowledge level was not possible for the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop, however.)

The tables below summarize the responses received.

**A. Overall evaluation results:**

Scoring scheme: (1=very poor; 2=poor; 3= acceptable; 4=good; 5=excellent)

Evaluation Element	Workshop 1—AFR Regional				Workshop 2—Ghana & West Africa IP			
	Average scores by type of participant				Average scores by type of participant			
	All (27)	Among self-described . *			All (37)	Among self-described:.		
Advanced (1)		Mid-level (12)	Novice (13)	Advanced (6)		Mid-level (14)	Novice (17)	
Tech. Program	4.069	4.300	4.625	4.222	4.58	n/a	n/a	n/a
Facilitation	3.724	3.900	4.000	4.192	4.29	n/a	n/a	n/a
Logistics	3.517	3.700	4.125	3.556	4.47	n/a	n/a	n/a
Venue	3.828	3.900	4.375	4.111	4.30	n/a	n/a	n/a
Field Work	4.000	4.500	4.375	4.000	4.76	n/a	n/a	n/a

\*Not all participants indicated their level of "baseline knowledge" regarding env. compliance and ESDM.

**Comments:** In all overall substantive evaluation categories (technical program, facilitation and field work), the scores lie between "acceptable" and "excellent."

The overall higher scores for the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop are consistent with those observed in other trainings – similar or identical programs delivered to USAID staff and IPs will tend to receive higher evaluation scores from IP participants, both in technical and logistical areas.

The relatively lower logistics scores for the first workshop appear to reflect the 4 hour bus ride from the airport in Accra to the training venue, Busua Beach Resort.

**B. Learning Approach:**

(3=ideal score in all cases)

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Average Scores*		Interpretation
		Workshop 1	Workshop 2	
Field vs. Class time balance	1=much more field time needed 3=right balance 5=much more classroom time needed	2.78	2.54	On balance, the results indicate a well-balanced pedagogical approach across the categories of interest.  For both workshops, slightly more field time, and slightly more opportunities for peer learning were desired.
Presentations vs. Exercises balance	1=much more emphasis on presentations needed 3=right balance; 5=much more exercise/discussion time needed	2.96	3.00	
Technical Level & Pace	1=too heavy; 3=about right 5=too light	2.96	2.81	
Learning from training team vs learning from peers	1=need to hear much more from facilitators 3=right balance; 5=need much more peer learning	3.56	3.22	

\*average across all participants

### C. Impact

(3= ideal score in all cases)

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Average Scores		Interpretation
		Workshop 1	Workshop 2	
Empowerment (Knowledge & Capabilities)	1=not at all increased 2=moderately increased	2.77		All participants who commented on the Impact section of the evaluation reported that their motivation and empowerment were either moderately or strongly increased, with the latter predominating.
Motivation	3=strongly increased	2.85		

*\*average across all participants*

### D. High rated/low-rated sessions.

*Participants were asked to identify the 1 or 2 sessions they rated most highly and least highly, for content, usefulness, approach or other reasons. Participants in many cases did not use formal session names or numbers, so a number of responses are difficult to interpret. However:*

- *Response patterns were similar across the two workshops*
- *Total citations to high-rated sessions exceeded total citations to low-rated sessions by a factor of about 3:2, with many participants identifying no low-rated sessions.*
- *The highest-rated sessions were the focused bloc of sessions on EMMP development (or the sequence of IEE-focused sessions for upstream bloc participants). After this were the core EIA skills sessions. These sessions correspond directly to the critical core content of the workshop.*

*The global climate change mitigation session was the most consistently low-rated session, primarily because participants found it to be too technical within the time allotted, or because it was not relevant to their work. Beyond this, no consistent trend emerges from the low-rated sessions.*

*The most frequent-cited reasons for assigning a session a low rating were insufficient time to cover the material in sufficient depth, too much depth or detail on the topic, unclear instructions (exercises), or dissatisfaction with the presenter/facilitator.*

A scanned version of the evaluations for the Africa Regional workshop has been archived on the GEMS sharepoint site at <http://afr-sd.sharepoint.afr-sd.org/gems/Ghana2012/default.aspx>. Individual comments on the evaluations offer a number of insights for strengthening future workshops in the series. The USAID/West Africa mission holds the original evaluations for the IP workshop.

## 4. Issues for follow-up & lessons learned

**USAID Staff Workshop.** The highest-priority follow-up steps identified by participants during the “way forward” session were (depending on their function):

- For CORs/AORs, assure that their partners have copies of their IEEs, confirm a schedule for EMMP submission, and agree on reporting requirements.
- Work to incorporate environmental compliance review into field visits
- Organizing a short-format environmental compliance training within their mission
- Arranging an environmental procedures Best Practices Review (BPR) for the mission

Issues identified included (1) lack of contract mandates for EMMPs and environmental compliance actions, leading to problems requiring these actions of IPs; (2) delays in clearance of 22 CFR 216 documentation; (3) inadequate funding/staffing of the environmental function within the mission; and (4) poor awareness within missions of environmental compliance roles and responsibilities.

Generally, these identified follow-up measures and gaps/constraints agree strongly with the overall results of the BPRs conducted across Africa Region to date.

A need was identified for guidance on the conduct of EAs and the relationship between USAID and host country environmental procedures.

**IP Workshop.** The highest-priority follow-up steps identified by participants during the “way forward” session were to (1) contact A/CORs to requests the IEEs governing their project, and (2) then to develop EMMPs responsive to the set conditions.

It should be noted that by show of hands, 3 IPs had copies of their IEEs, 5 had EMMPs submitted but yet to be approved. 2 Had EMMPs appended to the IEEs that they received from USAID. The rest, almost 66% neither had the IEEs nor the EMMPs. Some participants confessed to hearing of USAID’s environmental compliance procedures for the first time at this workshop.

There was a strong belief in the value of developing a web based professional network of the Ips coming out of this workshop. This has been taken up in an ad hoc way under GEMS. E.g. for its GEMS trainings, Sun Mountain International sets up a collaboration space for each workshop on the Basecamp platform, but there is not a consistent approach across GEMS, nor specific funding. GEMS BEOs may wish to consider a more consistent approach.

Some IPs expressed concern that their contracts—and thus workplans and budgets—did not provide for development of EMMPs. This is a strong argument for increased emphasis on uniform use of best-practice environmental compliance language in solicitations and awards. Participants from the Africa Regional workshop will help carry this message back to their missions, but the issue needs consistent communication from the REAs as well – and ideally communication to COs in their own trainings.

**Follow-up with participants: 6-month post-workshop survey.** Subject to availability of AFR/SD funds in the GEMS core budget, participants will receive a 6-month follow-up survey to evaluate training effectiveness and utility. Results from this survey will provide input to the GEMS final report.

#### **Facilitator lessons learned.**

- **Distance to training venue and bus transfer.** Takoradi was chosen for the training due to the proximity of USAID and other case sites. Busua Beach Resort, somewhat West of Takoradi town, was chosen as the hotel offering the best value while providing acceptable training facilities. Reaching Takoradi by vehicle from Accra requires approx. 4 hours by bus along the often-congested coast road. Many USAID participants, especially, felt this was too long, and that the planning decision should have been made for participants to fly from Accra (cost approx. \$70/person). The facilitation team is generally in agreement, and this option should be strongly considered in analogous situations in future trainings.
- **Conference Package Pricing.** Conference package pricing is the norm in sub-Saharan Africa, but is not always easy to reconcile with USG travel cost claims/travel cost accounting. The nature of the conference package price was announced in pre-workshops logistics communications, but explicit decisions should have been taken and announced in advance regarding how exactly the charge should be itemized for the purposes of travel expense submissions.

## 5. Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements

### Place, Dates and Participants

Dates	12–16 March & 19–23 March 2012
Venue	Busua Beach Resort, Takoradi, Ghana ( <a href="http://www.gbghana.net/busua">http://www.gbghana.net/busua</a> ) provided training and accommodation facilities for the workshop.
Participants (full participant lists are attached)	<p><b>Workshop 1: Africa Regional USAID Staff Workshop</b> “Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and ESDM”</p> <p>38 participants (of whom 9 were USAID/Ghana or USAID/WA staff and the remainder MEOs, C/AOTRs, Activity Managers, Team Leaders, M&amp;E Officers, FFP Officers, and PDOs, representing 24 other missions/operating units).</p> <p><b>Workshop 2: USAID/Ghana and USAID/WA IP Workshop</b> “Environmental Compliance-ESDM in Project Implementation”</p> <p>43 participants (implementing partner staff from 26 different organizations)</p> <p><b>Training team:</b> USAID: 4 facilitators at the first workshop, 2 at the second (see “USAID facilitators,” below) GEMS: 3 GEMS facilitators at the first workshop, 2 at the second (see “GEMS training team,” below.)</p>
Working language	English

### Staffing and Logistics

<b>Planning leads and coordination</b>	<p>Field Preplanning (venue and site identification): Rosie Chekenya (GEMS) and Benjamin Opoku (USAID/WA) conducted</p> <p>GEMS Home Office Supervision, Agenda &amp; Materials Prep: Mark Stoughton (GEMS Team Leader)</p> <p>Registration &amp; Preparations Tracking: Kristin Taddei (GEMS)</p> <p>Core Mission team: Benjamin Opoku (USAID/WA), Justice Odoi (USAID/Ghana), Bob Buzzard (USAID/WA), with B Opoku leading all follow-up for field arrangements.</p> <p>In the 2 months preceding the workshop, near-weekly planning telecons were held by this core planning team.</p>	
<b>In-country logistics</b>	<p>In-country logistics were provided by <b>Sunlife Travel and Tours</b> under subcontract to Cadmus (Sunlife also has a standing support contract with the US Embassy and USAID Missions in Accra).</p> <p>Sunlife Travel and Tours arranged transit and venue hotel bookings and served as the hotel payment agent and provided case site and Accra—Takoradi transport, airport meet-and-greet, and other support services. Supervision was provided by Cadmus/ Mark Stoughton. Sunlife Travel and Tours provided an on-site logistics manager (Peter Anum) for the duration of the workshops.</p>	
<b>GEMS Training Team</b>	<b>Africa Regional USAID Staff Workshop:</b>	<b>IP Workshop</b>
	Lead Trainer: Mark Stoughton (Cadmus)	Lead Trainer: Rosie Chekenya (Cadmus)
	Co-Trainer: Scott Solberg (SMTN) Co-Trainer: Rosie Chekenya (Cadmus)	Co-Trainer: John Azu (Cadmus)

	Host County Environmental & Agricultural Expert: John Azu (SMTN)	
<b>USAID Training Team</b>	<p>Teresa Bernhard (GH BEO)</p> <p>Brian Hirsch (AFR BEO, GEMS COR)</p> <p>David Kinyua (USAID/EA)</p> <p>Ariane Neigh (DCHA-AAAS Fellow)</p> <p>Benjamin Opoku (USAID/WA)</p>	<p>Benjamin Opoku (USAID/WA)</p> <p>Justice Odoi (USAID/Ghana)</p> <p>Bob Buzzard (USAID/WA)</p>

### Contracts, Funding, and Cost-Shares

<b>Cost shares &amp; Sources of funding</b>	<p>Participants’ respective organizations/projects covered travel and per diem costs for their staff.</p> <p>USAID trainers’ respective missions/offices covered their travel &amp; per diem.</p> <p>Lodging was charged at a conference rates that covered rental of the primary meeting room and tea breaks. This was within the allowed USG per diem rate for Ghana.</p> <p>GEMS delivery costs included home office and training team labor, training team travel, training materials reproduction and shipping, and in-country logistics costs (participant transfer from Accra→Takoradi, case site transfer, Sunlife Travel and Tours management fee for bookings and payment agent services, etc.)</p> <p>For the first (USAID Staff) workshop, GEMS costs were funded in the entirety by USAID/AFR/SD via its buy-in to GEMS.</p> <p>For the second (IP) workshop, GEMS costs were to be funded by equal buy-ins to GEMS by USAID/Ghana and USAID/West Africa. As of the date of this report, these buy-ins were still pending.</p> <p>USAID/West Africa and USAID/Ghana also provided the time of the core mission team (see above) for workshop preparation.</p> <p>Core AFR/SD funding of GEMS supported the GEMS preplanning exercise, including field visit by R. Chekenya. .</p>
<b>Contract mechanisms</b>	<p>USAID/AFR/SD, USAID/WA and USAID/Ghana buy-ins to GEMS funded GEMS delivery costs as above.</p> <p>Cadmus, as GEMS prime contractor, subcontracted with Sun Mountain International and Sunlife Travel and Tours for trainer and logistics services, respectively.</p>

### Agenda, Content and Materials

<b>Development lead</b>	Mark Stoughton, Cadmus.
<b>Agenda</b>	The final agendas are attached. See also notes on agenda in section 2.
<b>Hardcopy materials</b>	<p>Participants were provided with the following materials in hardcopy:</p> <p><b>Sourcebook.</b> 1.5” 3-ring binder containing the agenda, a brief objectives statement/overview of each module, presentations and exercises.</p> <p><b>Excerpts of the USAID Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa</b> relevant to the site visits.</p>

	<p><b>ENCAP Visual Field Guides.</b> Each participant received a copy of each of the 5 ENCAP Visual Field Guides. These were the basis for an environmental monitoring exercise on Day 2 and supported the site visits.</p> <p>All hardcopy materials were reproduced in the US by Advantage Productions (Belmont, MA) from PDF originals prepared by The Cadmus Group.</p>												
<p>Memory sticks (Flash Drives)/MEO Resource Center</p>	<p>Participants were provided with an 8GB flashdrive containing the sourcebook and all content on the ENCAP website. The drives were procured and loaded by GEMS/Cadmus and hand-carried to Ghana.</p>												
<p>USAID-branded water</p>	<p>Each participant received one USAID-branded water bottle to reduce consumption of one-use single-serving plastic bottles during the workshop. These were funded as part of the training materials by AFR/SD.</p>												
<p>Case site visits</p>	<p>The final site visit program was identical for both workshops, and was as follows. Site representatives hosted each visit.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Day &amp; Focus of Visit</th> <th>Group 1</th> <th>Group 2</th> <th>Group 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Day 1: Core EIA Skills</td> <td>Takoradi Road Widening Project</td> <td>Port of Takoradi &amp; Zeal Environmental Technologies Ltd.</td> <td>WATSAN Component of the WASH-UP Program</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Day 3: IEE Review OR EMMP Development</td> <td>Norpalm Ghana Ltd. Oil Palm Plantation</td> <td>Sekondi-Takoradi Landfill</td> <td>Dixcove Hospital</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Day & Focus of Visit	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Day 1: Core EIA Skills	Takoradi Road Widening Project	Port of Takoradi & Zeal Environmental Technologies Ltd.	WATSAN Component of the WASH-UP Program	Day 3: IEE Review OR EMMP Development	Norpalm Ghana Ltd. Oil Palm Plantation	Sekondi-Takoradi Landfill	Dixcove Hospital
Day & Focus of Visit	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3										
Day 1: Core EIA Skills	Takoradi Road Widening Project	Port of Takoradi & Zeal Environmental Technologies Ltd.	WATSAN Component of the WASH-UP Program										
Day 3: IEE Review OR EMMP Development	Norpalm Ghana Ltd. Oil Palm Plantation	Sekondi-Takoradi Landfill	Dixcove Hospital										
<p>Materials archive</p>	<p>Materials are archived on the USAID/AFR Environmental Officers Knowledge Exchange sharepoint site at <a href="http://afr-sd.sharepoint.afr-sd.org/gems/Ghana2012/default.aspx">http://afr-sd.sharepoint.afr-sd.org/gems/Ghana2012/default.aspx</a></p>												

# Agenda -- 2012 Africa Regional USAID Staff Workshop

## Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design & Management

An Africa Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff

version: 17Jan2012

Session type: P=presentation. E=exercise/discussion; F= field visit; B=Break

Type	Lngh	Start	Finish	#	Session Name	Objectives/content summary
<b>Day 1/Monday</b>						
	00:15	08:15	– 08:30		Arrival/Registration	
	00:15	08:30	– 08:45		Official Opening	
E	00:40	08:45	– 09:25	1	Participant & Facilitator Introductions, Objectives	a. Facilitation Team Introductions, Roles and Responsibilities; b. Participant Introductions c. Overview of Agenda: Tools and Techniques d. Administrivia: Room and Board e. Setting Expectations f. Establishing a Learning Agreement g. Creating a Parking Lot
P	01:05	09:25	– 10:30	2	What is Environment? Why Environmentally Sound Design and Management?	Achieve a common understanding of "environment"; motivate ESDM as a necessary and explicit objective for effective development; establish the basic principles for achieving ESDM.
B	00:15	10:30	– 10:45		Tea Break	
P	00:30	10:30	– 11:00	3	EIA and ESDM	Achieve a common, basic understanding of the EIA process and key EIA concepts; Motivate the EIA process by establishing that EIA is the internationally accepted standard framework for achieving ESDM in project-based development
P	00:30	11:00	– 11:30	4	Overview of Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance for USAID Staff	Achieve a common understanding of the key LOP environmental compliance requirements created by these procedures.  Specifically establish (1) that the primary environmental compliance responsibility of IPs is implementation of environmental conditions resulting from the pre-implementation environmental review process, and (2) that providing participants with the tools, skills and knowledge to do so is the primary purpose of the workshop.
P	00:50	11:30	– 12:20	5	Core EIA Skills Parts 1 (Baseline Characterization/Identifying Issues of Concern + Principles of Mitigation.)	Build familiarity with the principles and processes that constitute these core EIA skills. Establish that because effective mitigation design must be highly responsive to site conditions, effective mitigation design requires baseline characterization and issues identification skills.
P	00:10	12:20	– 12:30	6a	Field Visit: Practicing Core EIA Skills	Field visit briefing
B	01:00	12:30	– 13:30		LUNCH	
P	00:30	13:30	– 14:00			Local context briefing (invited expert)
F	03:00	14:00	– 17:00	6a	Field Visit: Practicing Core EIA Skills (cont'd)	Build and apply the core EIA skills briefed in Session 5 via a field visit & follow-up group work to (1) synthesize field observations, and (2) with reference to the Small-Scale Guidelines, identify possible mitigation measures to respond to issues of concern. (This exercise is generic and conducted without reference to the specific requirements of Reg. 216.) .
<b>Day 2/Tuesday</b>						
	00:15	08:30	– 08:45		Review of Day 1, Orientation to Day 2	a. Day One Review/What have we learned? b. Review of Expectations c. Day Two at a Glance
E	01:30	08:45	– 10:15	6b	Field Visit--Follow-up Group Work	see 6a, above
B	00:15	10:15	– 10:30		Tea Break	

P	00:45	10:30 – 11:15	7	Core EIA skills Part 2: Env Monitoring	Establish the objective of environmental monitoring (determining clearly and cost-effectively if mitigation is sufficient and effective); brief the two types of monitoring indicators & achieve a common understanding of the principles of monitoring design.
E	01:15	11:15 – 12:30	8	Indicators exercise (break-out groups)	Build and apply indicator selection skills (a key constituent skill for EMMP development) in a scenario-based small group exercise centered on the ENCAP Visual Field Guides.
B	01:00	12:30 – 13:30		Lunch	
P	00:40	13:30 – 14:10	9	Intro to EMMPs	a. Brief the EMMP concept. b. Establish that EMMPs are critical to effective and systematic implementation of IEE/EA conditions. c. Explain the mechanisms by which USAID Missions can require IPs to develop and implement EMMPs.
B	00:05	14:10 – 14:15		Short break to change over to parallel sessions	
<b>parallel session bloc: upstream compliance</b>					
P	00:45	14:15 – 15:00	10a	Intro to Reg. 216 & Screening Activities Under Reg. 216	Reg 216 sets out USAID's mandatory pre-obligation EIA process. Environmental mitigation and monitoring conditions established by this process become required elements of activity design and implementation. This session briefs the entire process and then examines in detail the first step in this process: screening.
B	00:15	15:00 – 15:15		Tea Break	
E	01:00	15:15 – 16:15	10b	Exercise: Screening Activities Under Reg. 216	Screening activities for a proposed project using Reg. 216 criteria. (Working groups). The project will be related to the Day 3 field visit. The IEE is USAID's "Preliminary Assessment" and the most common type of env. review documentation required by Reg. 216. Overview of the IEE (Structure, purpose, nature of "determinations") + characteristics of well-written, well-considered IEEs. (These characteristics also apply to subproject environmental review reports.)
P	00:30	16:15 – 16:45	11a	Effective IEEs: Well-Considered & Well-Written	
E	00:15	16:45 – 17:00	11b	IEE Review exercise: Briefing & field visit preview	For the project screened above, we will review and critique a draft IEE. (provided in 2-page bullet format). We undertake a field visit to the project site to better evaluate the IEE.
<b>parallel session bloc: downstream compliance</b>					
P	00:30	14:15 – 14:45	10	Translating General IEE Conditions into Specific Implementation: Key Principles	Addresses a key challenge facing many partners in developing EMMPs: IEE conditions are extremely general, and require IPs to translate them into specific mitigation actions.
E	00:30	14:45 – 15:15	11a	EMMP Development Exercise: Project Scenario & Briefing	Integrate, build and apply all EMMP skills in an EMMP development exercise using a field visit informed by a field visit
B	00:15	15:15 – 15:30		Tea Break	
E	01:30	15:30 – 17:00	11b	EMMP Development: Group Work	see 11a; (note--participants work on their laptops to fill in a provided EMMP template.)
<b>Day 3/Wednesday</b>					
	00:10	08:30 – 08:40		Review of Day 2, Orientation to Day 3	a. Day Two Review/What have we learned? b. Review of Expectations c. Day Three at a Glance
F	03:15	08:45 – 12:00	11c	Field Visits for EMMP Development exercise (upstream compliance) / IEE Review (downstream compliance)	
B	01:00	12:00 – 13:00		Lunch	
<b>parallel session bloc: upstream compliance</b>					
E	01:15	13:00 – 14:15	11d	Classroom Follow-up for IEE Review Field Visit (small group work)	see 11b above
P	00:45	14:15 – 15:00	ST	IEE Determinations & Conditions for "Tricky Activities"	e.g., Policy development; Trade; SME Support; Private Sector Credit Support including DCA.
<b>parallel session bloc: downstream compliance</b>					
E	02:00	13:00 – 15:00	11d	Field visit follow-up: EMMP Development small group work	Continue EMMP development exercise. Finalize presentation.
B	00:15	15:00 – 15:15		Tea Break	
E	01:15	15:15 – 16:30	11e	EMMP Group Presentations	Teams will present their EMMPs in plenary, participants in the "upstream compliance" bloc will attend these presentations, practicing their USAID staff role as receivers and reviewers of EMMPs
P	00:30	16:30 – 17:00	12	IP Reporting on Environmental Compliance	Achieve a common understanding of the two basic elements of IP environmental compliance reporting: (1) providing USAID with an auditable record of IP environmental compliance; and (2) "mainstreaming" critical elements of environmental soundness/compliance into one or more core program performance indicators.

**Day 4/Thursday**

	00:10	08:30	–	08:40		Review of Day 3, Orientation to Day 4	a. Day Two Review/What have we learned? b. Review of Expectations c. Day Three at a Glance
P	00:50	08:40	–	09:30	ST	Subproject Review	Understand the subproject review process, its appropriate use, and the responsibilities its places on IPs and COTRs. Introduce the Environmental Review Form and Environmental Review Reports.
						Medical Waste	Briefing on environmental best practices, compliance expectations, and implementation challenges related to management of health care waste
P	01:00	09:30	–	10:30	ST	Feed the Future: Environmental Compliance and ESDM	Survey key environmental compliance/ESDM issues relevant to Feed the Future (FtF) activities: Pesticide Compliance & PERSUAPs, Biosafety Procedures, Integrated Pest Management (IPM)
B	00:15	10:30	–	10:45		Tea Break	
E	01:45	10:45	–	12:30	ST	Incorporating GCC Adaptation and Mitigation in Project Design	Briefing on mitigation & adaptation concepts, followed by small group exercise identifying adaptation and mitigation measures that could be integrated into hypothetical projects; report-out.
B	01:00	12:30	–	13:30		Lunch	
P	02:00	13:30	–	15:30	ST	Indoor Residual Spraying: Env Compliance & Best Practice	IRS Spray Contractor will provide a briefing on environmental management aspects of IRS activities and a short practical demonstration of spray techniques. Participants will have the opportunity to don PPE and practice proper spray technique.
B	00:15	15:30	–	15:45		Tea Break	
E	01:15	15:45	–	17:00	13	ESDM/Env Compliance Knowledge Game	review and synthesize workshop content via a small-teams competition
E	00:30	17:00	–	17:30	14	Final technical Q&A	address questions raised by the knowledge game and any technical questions remaining in the "parking lot"

**Day 5/Friday**

	00:10	08:30	–	08:40		Review of Day 4, Orientation to Day 5	a. Day 4 Review/What have we learned? b. Review of Expectations c. Day 5 at a Glance
P	00:10	08:40	–	08:50	15	Resources for ESDM and Compliance	Become familiar with the key resources available on the ENCAP website to support the EMMP exercise, and environmental compliance and ESDM more generally; introduce the offline version of the ENCAP website.
P	00:40	08:50	–	09:30	16	State of Environmental Compliance in AFR Missions: Results of BPRs to date	Presents synthesis of BPR results to date; identifies good mission practices and common deficits
E	01:00	09:30	–	10:30	17a	Separate focus sessions: (1) MEOs + (2) A/COTRs & other functions	Informed by the preceding session,
B	00:15	10:30	–	10:45		Tea Break	
E	01:00	10:45	–	11:45	17b	Way Forward discussion	Includes brief report-outs from the 2 focus sessions;
	00:15	11:45	–	12:00	18	Evaluations	Fill in individual evaluation forms
	00:30	12:00	–	12:30		Closing & Certificates.	
B		12:30	–			LUNCH & DEPARTURE	

# Agenda -- IP Workshop

## Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design & Management in Project Implementation

version: 20Jan2012

A Training Workshop for USAID/Ghana and USAID/West Africa Implementing Partners

Session type: P=presentation. E=exercise/discussion; F= field visit; B=Break

Type	Lngh	Start	Finish	#	Session Name	Objectives/content summary
<b>Day 1/Monday</b>						
	00:15	08:15	– 08:30		Arrival/Registration	
	00:15	08:30	– 08:45		Official Opening	
E	00:40	08:45	– 09:25	1	Participant & Facilitator Introductions, Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Facilitation Team Introductions, Roles and Responsibilities</li> <li>b. Participant Introductions</li> <li>c. Overview of Agenda: Tools and Techniques</li> <li>d. Administrivia: Room and Board</li> <li>e. Setting Expectations</li> <li>f. Establishing a Learning Agreement</li> <li>g. Creating a Parking Lot</li> </ul>
P	01:05	09:25	– 10:30	2	What is Environment? Why Environmentally Sound Design and Management?	Achieve a common understanding of "environment"; motivate ESDM as a necessary and explicit objective for effective development; establish the basic principles for achieving ESDM.
B	00:15	10:30	– 10:45		Tea Break	
P	00:30	10:30	– 11:00	3	EIA and ESDM	Achieve a common, basic understanding of the EIA process and key EIA concepts; Motivate the EIA process by establishing that EIA is the internationally accepted standard framework for achieving ESDM in project-based development
P	00:30	11:00	– 11:30	4	Overview of Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance for USAID Staff & Partners	<p>Achieve a common understanding of the key LOP environmental compliance requirements created by these procedures.</p> <p>Specifically establish (1) that the primary environmental compliance responsibility of IPs is implementation of environmental conditions resulting from the pre-implementation environmental review process, and (2) that providing participants with the tools, skills and knowledge to do so is the primary purpose of the workshop.</p>
P	00:50	11:30	– 12:20	5	Core EIA Skills Parts 1 (Baseline Characterization/Identifying Issues of Concern + Principles of Mitigation.)	Build familiarity with the principles and processes that constitute these core EIA skills. Establish that because effective mitigation design must be highly responsive to site conditions, effective mitigation design requires baseline characterization and issues identification skills.
P	00:10	12:20	– 12:30	6a	Field Visit: Practicing Core EIA Skills	Field visit briefing
B	01:00	12:30	– 13:30		LUNCH	
P	00:30	13:30	– 14:00			Local context briefing (invited expert)
F	03:00	14:00	– 17:00	6a	Field Visit: Practicing Core EIA Skills (cont'd)	Build and apply the core EIA skills briefed in Session 5 via a field visit & follow-up group work to (1) synthesize field observations, and (2) with reference to the Small-Scale Guidelines, identify possible mitigation measures to respond to issues of concern. (This exercise is generic and conducted without reference to the specific requirements of Reg. 216.) .
<b>Day 2/Tuesday</b>						
	00:15	08:30	– 08:45		Review of Day 1, Orientation to Day 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Day One Review/What have we learned?</li> <li>b. Review of Expectations</li> <li>c. Day Two at a Glance</li> </ul>
E	01:30	08:45	– 10:15	6b	Field Visit--Follow-up Group Work	see 6a, above
B	00:15	10:15	– 10:30		Tea Break	

P	00:45	10:30 – 11:15	7	Core EIA skills Part 2: Env Monitoring	Establish the objective of environmental monitoring (determining clearly and cost-effectively if mitigation is sufficient and effective); brief the two types of monitoring indicators & achieve a common understanding of the principles of monitoring design.
E	01:15	11:15 – 12:30	8	Indicators exercise (break-out groups)	Build and apply indicator selection skills (a key constituent skill for EMMP development) in a scenario-based small group exercise centered on the ENCAP Visual Field Guides.
B	01:00	12:30 – 13:30		Lunch	
P	00:45	13:30 – 14:15	9	Intro to EMMPs	a. Brief the EMMP concept. b. Establish that EMMPs are critical to effective and systematic implementation of IEE/EA conditions. c. Explain the mechanisms by which USAID Missions can require IPs to develop and implement EMMPs.
P	00:30	14:15 – 14:45	10	<i>Translating General IEE Conditions into Specific Implementation: Key Principles</i>	<i>Addresses a key challenge facing many partners in developing EMMPs: IEE conditions are extremely general, and require IPs to translate them into specific mitigation actions.</i>
E	00:30	14:45 – 15:15	11a	<i>EMMP Development Exercise: Project Scenario &amp; Briefing</i>	<i>Integrate, build and apply all EMMP skills in an EMMP development exercise using a field visit informed by a field visit</i>
B	00:15	15:15 – 15:30		Tea Break	
E	01:30	15:30 – 17:00	11b	<i>EMMP Development: Group Work</i>	<i>see 11a; (note--participants work on their laptops to fill in a provided EMMP template.) May involve sectoral best practice briefings/orientations to individual groups by facilitators</i>

### Day 3/Wednesday

	00:10	08:30 – 08:40		Review of Day 2, Orientation to Day 3	a. Day Two Review/What have we learned? b. Review of Expectations c. Day Three at a Glance
F	03:15	08:45 – 12:00	11c	<i>Field Visits for EMMP Development exercise (upstream compliance) / IEE Review (downstream compliance)</i>	
B	01:00	12:00 – 13:00		Lunch	
E	02:00	13:00 – 15:00	11d	<i>Field visit follow-up: EMMP Development small group work</i>	<i>Continue EMMP development exercise. Finalize presentation.</i>
B	00:15	15:00 – 15:15		Tea Break	
E	01:15	15:15 – 16:30	11e	EMMP Group Presentations	Teams will present their EMMPs in plenary, participants in the "upstream compliance" bloc will attend these presentations, practicing their USAID staff role as receivers and reviewers of EMMPs
P	00:30	16:30 – 17:00	12	IP Reporting on Environmental Compliance	Achieve a common understanding of the two basic elements of IP environmental compliance reporting: (1) providing USAID with an auditable record of IP environmental compliance; and (2) "mainstreaming" critical elements of environmental soundness/compliance into one or more core program performance indicators.

### Day 4/Thursday

	00:10	08:30 – 08:40		Review of Day 3, Orientation to Day 4	a. Day Two Review/What have we learned? b. Review of Expectations c. Day Three at a Glance
P	00:50	08:40 – 09:30	ST	Subproject Review	Understand the subproject review process, its appropriate use, and the responsibilities its places on IPs and COTRs. Introduce the Environmental Review Form and Environmental Review Reports.
P	01:00	09:30 – 10:30	ST	Medical Waste Feed the Future: Environmental Compliance and ESDM	Briefing on environmental best practices, compliance expectations, and implementation challenges related to management of health care waste Survey key environmental compliance/ESDM issues relevant to Feed the Future (FtF) activities: Pesticide Compliance & PERSUAPs, Biosafety Procedures, Integrated Pest Management (IPM)
B	00:15	10:30 – 10:45		Tea Break	
E	01:45	10:45 – 12:30	ST	Incorporating GCC Adaptation and Mitigation in Project Design	Briefing on mitigation & adaptation concepts, followed by small group exercise identifying adaptation and mitigation measures that could be integrated into hypothetical projects; report-out.
B	01:00	12:30 – 13:30		Lunch	
P	02:00	13:30 – 15:30	ST	Indoor Residual Spraying: Env Compliance & Best Practice	IRS Spray Contractor will provide a briefing on environmental management aspects of IRS activities and a short practical demonstration of spray techniques. Participants will have the opportunity to don PPE and practice proper spray technique.
B	00:15	15:30 – 15:45		Tea Break	
E	01:15	15:45 – 17:00	13	ESDM/Env Compliance Knowledge Game	review and synthesize workshop content via a small-teams competition
E	00:30	17:00 – 17:30	14	Final technical Q&A	address questions raised by the knowledge game and any technical questions remaining in the "parking lot"

## Workshop evaluation

### Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management in Project Implementation Training Workshops for USAID/Ghana and USAID/West Africa Staff & Implementing Partners

Takadori, Ghana ▪ March 2012

*Your frank and honest feedback will help strengthen future trainings and help prioritize ESDM and environmental compliance support to USAID/Sudan Programs. Thank-you for your time!*

### Learning approach

*For each issue, please check the assessment you most agree with*

Issue	Assessment					Comments
<b>Balance of time in classroom to time in field</b>	Much more time in field needed	A bit more time in field needed	About right	A bit more time in classroom needed	Much more time in classroom needed	
<b>In the classroom, balance of presentations to exercises, group work &amp; discussions</b>	Much more emphasis on presentations needed	A bit more emphasis on presentations needed	About right	A bit more emphasis on exercises/ discussions needed	Much more emphasis on exercises/ discussions needed	
<b>Technical level &amp; pace</b>	Much too heavy	A little too heavy	About right	A bit too light	Much too light	
<b>Opportunities for peer exchange &amp; learning</b>	Needed to hear and learn much more directly from facilitators	Needed to hear and learn more directly from facilitators	About right	Some more opportunities for peer learning/ exchange are needed	Many more opportunities for peer learning/exchange are needed	

### Highest/Lowest-rated sessions

Please identify the 1 or 2 sessions that you rate most highly (for content, usefulness, approach or for other reasons). Please also identify the 1 or 2 sessions that you found least engaging/useful/relevant. Please briefly indicate the reasons for your choice. (You may wish to refer to the agenda to refresh your memory.)

Session	Comment (Please explain why you made this choice.)
HIGH-RATED	
HIGH-RATED	
LOW-RATED	
LOW-RATED	

## Overall evaluations

Please check the assessment you most agree with.

Issue	Assessment					Comments
	Very poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	
Technical quality (Program & Content)						
Facilitation						
Logistics						
Venue						
Field visits						

## Impact

Please circle the characterization you most agree with.

Question	Characterization			Comments
<b>Baseline Knowledge</b> In light of what you have learned in this workshop, how would you rate your understanding of ESDM and USAID's Environmental Procedures BEFORE this workshop?	Had poor or limited understanding	Understood the basics, lacked some details	Had a strong and detailed understanding	
<b>Empowerment</b> To what extent has this workshop increased your <u>knowledge and capabilities</u> to address environmental compliance requirements in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	Not at all	Moderately	Strongly	
<b>Motivation</b> To what extent has this workshop increased your <u>motivation</u> to <i>proactively</i> address environmental compliance and ESDM in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	Not at all	Moderately	Strongly	

## Key topics not covered

Were there any topics of key important to you that were not covered/given very limited attention?	
---	--

## Support needs

Are there particular environmental compliance/ESDM support needs or resources that you require?	
---	--

**Additional comments welcome on any topic.**