



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

GEMS Training Delivery Report:

LIFE-OF PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND DESIGN MANAGEMENT

A Training Workshop for USAID/Zambia Staff & Partners

Held 7 May –11May, 2012 at
Protea Hotel, Chipata, Zambia



30 June 2012

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by The Cadmus Group, Inc. under USAID's Global Environmental Support (GEMS) project.

GEMS Training Delivery Report:

Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design Management ***A Training Workshop for USAID/Zambia Staff & Partners***

Held 7 – 11 May, 2012
Protea Hotel, Chipata, Zambia

30 June 2012

Prepared by:

Rosie Chekenya, 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). Sun Mountain International, principal partner (www.smtn.org). GEMS Activity AF5.



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.....	4
4. Issues for follow-up & lessons learned.....	6
5. Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements.....	7

Attachments

Final Agenda

Participant Lists

Evaluation Form

Acronyms

AFR	USAID Bureau for Africa	GB	gigabyte
AFR/SD	USAID Bureau for Africa, Office of Sustainable Development	IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
AOR	Agreement Officer's Representative	IP	Implementing Partner
BEO	Bureau Environmental Officer	IRS	Indoor Residual Spraying
CFR	Code of (US) Federal Regulations	LOP	Life-of-Project
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative	MEO	Mission Environmental Officer
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	Reg. 216	22 CFR 216
EMMP	Environmental Mitigation & Monitoring Plan	US	United States
ESDM	Environmentally Sound Design & Management	USG	United States Government
		USAID	United States Agency for International Development

1. Overview

In collaboration with and with funding from USAID/Zambia, GEMS delivered a Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design Management workshop for mission staff and Implementing Partners (IPs) over 7-11 May 2012 (4.5 days) in Chipata, Zambia.

The workshop trained participants in: (1) compliance with USAID's environmental procedures over life-of-project, and (2) the objective of these procedures: environmentally sound design and management (ESDM) of USAID-funded activities.

The workshop was the latest in a series initiated under USAID/AFR/SD's ENCAP project, and now continued under GEMS. It featured 2 half-day field visits, each designed to reinforce a key environmental compliance/ESDM skill cluster.

2. Goal, Objectives, Agenda & Learning Approach

Overall Goal. The overall goal of the workshop was to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in Zambia 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.

This overall goal was addressed via five main agenda components. These components, their entailed objectives, and the particular sessions they corresponded to are presented in the table below.

Agenda component	Objectives	How Achieved –(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, 3 (Presentations and Discussions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Environment? • 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 of 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. 	<p>Sessions 5A, 5B, 6, 7, 8 (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 LOP environmental compliance requirements. These requirements—and the compliance process—can be divided into “upstream” and “downstream” elements.</p> <p>Upstream 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>Downstream compliance consists primarily of 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.</p> <p>After surveying LOP environmental compliance and building needed core skills, participants split into two “streams” for a portion of the workshop: one focused on upstream compliance, and one on downstream compliance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All</i> Describe the basic elements of LOP compliance, and attendant roles and responsibilities. • <i>Upstream Participants:</i> Demonstrate basic proficiency in the pre-implementation environmental review process established by Reg. 216. • <i>Downstream Participants:</i> Demonstrate basic proficiency in developing environmental mitigation and monitoring plans. Articulate the environmental compliance reporting requirements attendant to EMMP implementation. 	<p>Session 4, 8, 10, 11, 12 Upstream (USAID Staff) & Downstream (Implementing Partners)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Life of Project Compliance for USAID Staff and Implementing Partners • Reg. 216 & Screening under Reg 216 • Effective IEEs • Translating IEE Conditions into Specific EMMP Implementation • Field site visits with Upstream & Downstream Focus. • IEE Review (upstream) or EMMP Development (downstream) Exercise and report-out.
<p>4. Understanding Key “Special Topics” in Compliance. 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"> • Explain the key compliance issues involved in each special topic, and articulate recommended best practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Experts • Socio Economics • Zambia Environmental Requirements • Special Topics- Water, IRS, Global Climate Change, Medical Waste
<p>5. Improving Compliance Processes. Achieving LOP compliance and ESDM requires both that individual USAID staff understand their roles and responsibilities and master key skills and that mission processes support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of environmental compliance processes in our team/mission against those 	<p>Session 17A, 17B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and IPs formed two groups to review the status of compliance and

"mainstream" environmental compliance.	in the region as a whole. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake or propose improvements to these processes following the workshop. 	identify gaps in light of training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPs developed their own action plan and key messages to their COPs/home offices.
--	--	--

3. Evaluations

Three different formal methods were used to evaluate the success of the workshop in meeting its objectives. All indicate that the workshop 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 in the training room room. As the workshop progressed, participants were periodically asked to review their expectations and put a check mark on those that had been met.

2. Environmental Compliance/ESDM Knowledge Presentations. Following the conclusion of EMMP development exercises and group work on Day 2, a test and review of this content was conducted in the form of presentations in which small teams presented EMMPs to an "upstream compliance bloc" that was able to practice their USAID staff role as receivers and reviewers of EMMPs.

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 relatively experienced and novice participants in the areas of ESDM and USAID environmental procedures.

The tables below summarize the responses received. *In all overall substantive evaluation categories (technical program, facilitation and field work; table A), the scores lie between "acceptable" and "excellent."*

A. Overall evaluation results:

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

Evaluation Element	Average Scores	Assessment: Good and Excellent (out of 29 evaluations)	
		Good	Excellent
Tech. Program	4.41	11	15
Facilitation	4.21	12	12
Logistics	3.79	12	7
Venue	4.00	15	7
Field Work	4.38	10	15

B. Impact

(3= ideal score in all cases)

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Average Score*	Interpretation
Empowerment (Knowledge & Capabilities)	1=not at all increased 2=moderately increased 3=strongly increased	2.76	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		2.64	

*average across all participants

C. Learning Approach:

(3=ideal score in all cases)

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Average Scores	Interpretation
Field vs. Class time balance	1=much more field time needed 3=right balance 5=much more classroom time needed	2.48	On average, the results indicate that slightly more field time and slightly more peer learning would be desirable, but overall participants felt that workshop was well-balanced.
Presentations vs. Exercises balance	1=much more emphasis on presentations needed 3=right balance; 5=much more exercise/discussion time needed	3.00	
Technical Level & Pace	1=too heavy; 3=about right 5=too light	2.61	
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	3.41	

*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:

- Total citations to high-rated sessions totaled ~25 whereas total citations of low-rated sessions totaled ~18, with many participants identifying no low-rated sessions.
- The highest-rated sessions were the focused bloc of sessions on EMMP development, the Why ESDM? presentation, and the field visits to the landfill and male circumcision medical center. Participants indicated in the comments section that the Why ESDM? Presentation was essential for becoming acquainted with key concepts and understanding the need for environmental compliance. These sessions correspond directly to the critical core content of the workshop.

The IRS 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, or unclear instruction.

4. Issues for follow-up & lessons learned

The final sessions of the workshop were dedicated to taking stock of where IPs and USAID/Zambia stand with LOP compliance, and identifying actions to address gaps. This included separate IP and USAID staff focus group sessions, development of joint recommendations, and individual action plans.

Action Plan Recommendations: USAID Zambia Staff. USAID/Zambia staff identified a number of lessons learned at the conclusion of this workshop and created action items for follow-up upon return to the mission office.

- A number of AOR/CORs at the mission had not yet received environmental compliance training. The Mission Environmental Officer (MEO) will lobby management to create time for abbreviated environmental compliance training in FY 2012.
- USAID/Zambia staff who participated in this training agreed to review current IEEs upon return to the mission office to determine necessary actions, such as:
 - If some activities are not included in the current IEE then the IEE will either be (a) revised to include the identified activities or (b) draft a complete new IEE, both actions will require informing/sharing the IEE to the concerned Implementing Partners to either revise their EMMPs or draft new EMMPs. This will involve Team Leaders, CORs, AORs and Implementing partners.
- The MEO will request that the management and contracting office include environmental compliance requirements in the post-award briefing.
- When IPs submit their work plan, budget and PMP, they should be requested to submit their draft EMMPs as well, meaning CORs/AORs should share IEE to IPs upon award of project.

Action Plan Recommendations: Implementing Partners. The 15 Implementing Partners in attendance represented 15 different organizations. These attendees identified gaps in performance and areas to strengthen, including:

- Only five out of the 15 IP participants knew if their organization had a copy of their IEE, and only 3 IPs had developed EMMPs. Seven of 15 knew the name of their AOR/COR.

- IPs committed to confirming the status of IEEs/environmental compliance documents & briefing COPs on gaps identified.
- Strongly recommended strengthening communication & using resources received at this training to conduct in-house trainings.

Joint Key Recommendations and Way Forward. Attendees of this workshop were made up of 15 AORs/CORs and 15 Implementing Partner organizations. The facilitators and participants acknowledged the following gaps in USAID and IP compliance and advanced the following suggestions to assure future compliance:

- There is limited awareness of compliance requirements and presence of compliance documents.
- Participants were confused in their understanding of LOP environmental compliance process and individual responsibilities before training. However, many participants noted that their awareness and comprehension of environmental compliance procedures and actions was greatly improved due to this training.
- USAID staff suggest that more frequent 4.5 day- trainings are undertaken and short refresher courses run often.
- Project planning must include a timeline for IEE preparation and staff must be aware of this timeline and use existing information if available.
- During site visits, there should be more emphasis on the EMMP). Currently, far more attention is given to branding and gender.
- Environmental compliance is a shared responsibility and therefore should be mainstreamed and taken seriously.

Facilitator recommendations for future trainings in this series, based on participant evaluations.

Issue	Recommendation
Agenda too heavy.	Revisit training material and focus on critical/key points
Too many Special Topics sessions.	Reduce topics to a maximum of 3. Special topics have a tendency to become too technical.
Not enough time allocated to sessions in agenda.	In order to get a balance between the presentations/discussions and exercises, enforce better time keeping, start on time after breaks, and reduce number of slides by ensuring no information is repetitive.

5. Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements

Place, Date and Participants

Dates	7 – 11 May, 2012
Venue	Protea Hotel; Chipata, Zambia provided training and accommodation facilities for the workshop.
Participants (full participant list is attached)	29 participants (15 Implementing Partners; 14 USAID Staff) Training team: USAID: (see "USAID facilitators," below)

	GEMS: 3 facilitators (see “GEMS training team,” below).
Working language	English

Staffing and Logistics

Planning leads and coordination	<p>USAID /Zambia provided logistics for the workshop, coordinating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations, RSVP tracking • Venue Booking • Group transfer by bus to the training venue. • Case site transport and drivers • Stand-by vehicle & driver during the workshop. • On-site business support.
Local Expertise	<p>Mr. Mawxell Nkoya – Senior Inspector, Zambia Environmental Management Agency</p> <p>Ms. Naomi Sakala – Chipata Town Council</p>
GEMS Training Team	<p>Rosie Chekenya (Cadmus, GEMS) served as the lead trainer.*</p> <p>Jane Kahata (Cadmus, GEMS) served as a co-facilitator.</p> <p>The lead GEMS trainer had responsibility for coordinating the course agenda, assigning presenters, and presented 5 of the course sessions and did the day reviews and orientations. The facilitation team met at the end of each day to review and strategize. Ms Chekenya had the responsibility for managing flow and time and organizing group work and exercises.</p>
USAID Training Team	<p>Joyce Jatko (USDA/PASA for USAID/AFR/SD) served as a co-facilitator.</p> <p>Patricia Sitimela, USAID/Zambia MEO served as a co-facilitator and had a key role in workshop organization/logistics.</p>

Contracts, Funding, and Cost-Shares

Cost shares & Sources of funding	<p>Participants’ respective organizations/projects covered travel and per diem costs for their staff.</p> <p>USAID trainers’ respective missions/offices covered their travel & per diem. Lodging was charged at a conference rate that covered rental of the primary meeting room and tea breaks. This was within the allowed USG per diem rate for Zambia.</p> <p>USAID/Zambia buy-in to GEMS covered labor and travel of the GEMS training team, GEMS home office support, and workshop materials.</p> <p>USAID/AFR/SD funded Joyce Jatko’s participation via a USDA/PASA engagement.</p>
----------------------------------	--

Contract mechanisms	USAID/Zambia buy-in to GEMS.
---------------------	------------------------------

Agenda, Content, and Materials

Development lead	Mark Stoughton, Cadmus.														
Agenda	The final agenda is attached. See also notes on agenda in section 2.														
Hardcopy materials	<p>Participants were provided with the following materials in hardcopy:</p> <p>Sourcebook. 1.5" 3-ring binder containing the agenda, a brief objectives statement/overview of each module, presentations and exercises.</p> <p>GEMS Site Visit Briefings. Each participant received a copy of each of the GEMS Site Visit Briefings. These served as guides for the six site visits.</p> <p>The sourcebooks were reproduced in the U.S. by The Cadmus Group and then shipped to USAID/Zambia.</p>														
Memory sticks (Flash Drives)/MEO Resource Center	Participants were provided with an 8GB flashdrive containing the sourcebook and all content on the ENCAP website.														
Case site visits	<p><i>The final site visit program was as follows. Site representatives hosted each visit.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Day & Focus of Visit</th> <th>Group 1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Day 1</i></td> <td><i>Damview Basic School</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Day 1</i></td> <td><i>Manje Basic School</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Day 1</i></td> <td><i>District Warehouse for ZISSP IRS</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Day 3</i></td> <td><i>Chipata Water and Sewerage Company (CWSC)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Day 3</i></td> <td><i>The SFH Male Circumcision Centre</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Day 3</i></td> <td><i>PLAN Agricultural Sites</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Day & Focus of Visit	Group 1	<i>Day 1</i>	<i>Damview Basic School</i>	<i>Day 1</i>	<i>Manje Basic School</i>	<i>Day 1</i>	<i>District Warehouse for ZISSP IRS</i>	<i>Day 3</i>	<i>Chipata Water and Sewerage Company (CWSC)</i>	<i>Day 3</i>	<i>The SFH Male Circumcision Centre</i>	<i>Day 3</i>	<i>PLAN Agricultural Sites</i>
Day & Focus of Visit	Group 1														
<i>Day 1</i>	<i>Damview Basic School</i>														
<i>Day 1</i>	<i>Manje Basic School</i>														
<i>Day 1</i>	<i>District Warehouse for ZISSP IRS</i>														
<i>Day 3</i>	<i>Chipata Water and Sewerage Company (CWSC)</i>														
<i>Day 3</i>	<i>The SFH Male Circumcision Centre</i>														
<i>Day 3</i>	<i>PLAN Agricultural Sites</i>														
Materials archive	Materials are archived on the GEMS website (www.usaidgems.org)														

Key Contacts

bhirsch@usaid.gov

Organization	Name & Position	Contact Info
USAID/Zambia	Mlotha Dameseke MEO	mdamaseke@usaid.gov
	Patricia Stimela	psitimela@usaid.gov

Organization	Name & Position	Contact Info
	M&E Specialist Deputy MEO	
USDA/PASA for USAID/AFR/SD	Joyce Jatko Facilitator	jjatko@verizon.net
CADMUS/GEMS	Mark Stoughton, GEMS Team Leader	mark.stoughton@cadmusgroup.com
	Mike Minkoff	micheal.minkoff@cadmusgroup.com
	Jane Kahata Facilitator	Jane.kahata@cadmusgroup.com
	Rosie Chekenya, Lead Facilitator	rchekenya@gmail.com +263 773 751 097