



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

GEMS Training Delivery Report:

Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management:

An Asia Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff and Implementing Partners

Held 21-25 May 2012 at

The USAID Asia Regional Training Center (ARTC), Bangkok, Thailand



25 September 2012

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Patrick Hall of The Cadmus Group, Inc.

GEMS Training Delivery Report:

Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management:

an Asia Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff and Implementing Partners

Held 21 – 25 May 2012

The USAID Asia Regional Training Center (ARTC), Bangkok, Thailand

Prepared by:

Patrick Hall, The Cadmus Group, Inc.

Prepared under:

The Global Environmental Management Support (GEMS) project, a USAID Bureau for Africa, Office of Sustainable Development program. Contract Number GS-10F-0105J, Task Order No AID-OAA-M-11-00021. The Cadmus Group, Inc., Prime Contractor.

The Cadmus Group, Inc.
100 Fifth Avenue, Suite 100
Waltham, MA 02451
617-673-7000 Fax 617-673-7001
www.cadmusgroup.com

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	1
2. Agenda & learning approach.....	2
3. Evaluations.....	3
4. Issues for follow-up & lessons learned.....	4
5. Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements.....	6

ATTACHMENTS

Final Agenda

Participant List

Evaluation Form

ACRONYMS

AFR	USAID Bureau for Africa	ESDM	Environmentally Sound Design & Management
AFR/SD	USAID Bureau for Africa, Office of Sustainable Development	GB	gigabyte
ANE/TS	USAID Bureau for Asia	GEMS	Global Environmental Management Support (Program)
AOR	Agreement Officer's Representative	GH	USAID Bureau for Global Health
ARTC	(USAID) Asia Regional Training Center	IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
BEO	Bureau Environmental Officer	IP	Implementing Partner
CFR	Code of (US) Federal Regulations	LMS	USAID Learning Management System
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative	LOP	Life-of-Project
EA	Environmental Examination or East Africa	M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	MEO	Mission Environmental Officer
EMMP	Environmental Mitigation & Monitoring Plan	PDO	Program Development Officer
EMCB	Environmental Management Capacity-Building (Program)	REA	Regional Environmental Advisor
ENCAP	Environmentally Sound Design and Management Capacity-Building Support for Africa	REO	Regional Environmental Officer
ERF	Environmental Review Form	RDMA	Regional Development Mission-Asia
ERR	Environmental Review Report	Reg. 216	22 CFR 216
		US	United States
		USG	United States Government
		USAID	United States Agency for International Development

I. OVERVIEW

Over 21 – 25 May 2012, an Asia regional training workshop for USAID staff and IPs in “Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management” was conducted in Bangkok, Thailand.

The workshop was hosted by USAID/RDMA and sponsored by USAID/ANE/TS. Key technical assistance was provided by the GEMS project. 28 participants attended: 15 were USAID mission staff, representing 11 missions, including one in Africa region; and 13 were IPs, representing 10 USAID-funded or linked partners in the region.

The workshop was the latest in a series of Asia Regional Environmental trainings for USAID staff.¹ The overall goal of these workshops is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in Asia by assuring that participants (including USAID MEOs, CORs/AORs, Activity Managers, Team Leaders, M&E Officers & PDOs, and IPs) 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.

Secondarily, these workshops provide a forum for mission and regional staff to discuss current environmental compliance and ESDM issues, including Mission needs for technical assistance and backstopping.

Towards these ends, the workshop used a refined version of the “life of project” agenda first delivered under the ENCAP project in Bagamoyo, Tanzania at the 2008 Africa regional training workshop for USAID staff.² However, in this workshop, participants were divided into two blocs for approximately one day, with one bloc focused on pre-implementation compliance, and one on compliance during project implementation (“upstream” and “downstream” compliance, respectively). Participant evaluations strongly indicate that workshop achieved its objectives.

The training program was developed by GEMS in consultation with and with key contributions from the USAID facilitation team. Logistics support was provided by GEMS, USAID/RDMA, and ARTC.

This report is not a proceedings document, but is intended to document the workshop’s:

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

¹ The most recent previous workshops in this series were held in Luxor, Egypt (March 2010) and Bangkok, Thailand (October 2009) under the Environmental Management Capacity Program (EMCB). EMCB was implemented for USAID/ANE/TS by Chemonics International, Inc., prime contractor, and The Cadmus Group, Inc., subcontractor, via EPIQ Task Order EPP-I-00-03-00014-00.

² Environmentally Sound Design and Management Capacity Building for Partners and Programs in Africa (ENCAP) was a program of USAID/AFR/SD implemented by International Resources Group, prime contractor, and The Cadmus Group, Inc., subcontractor via contract no. EPP-I-00-03-00013-00, Task Order No. 11. Additional information on the ENCAP program is available at www.encapfrica.org/about.htm

2. AGENDA & LEARNING APPROACH

Background: the “Life of Project” agenda. The June 2008 ENCAP workshop in Bagamoyo, Tanzania (see Section 1) piloted a new training agenda and substantially new materials, and focused on environmental compliance and ESDM across the project lifecycle. Consistent with adult learning techniques and a focus on practical application, the agenda reflected the principle that group exercises/field visits should represent at least 50 percent of total workshop time, if not more, and that classroom theory should be systematically reinforced with exercises and a field visit component. In addition, the training concept was progressive, beginning with basic skills and addressing the project lifecycle sequentially, from beginning to end.

In contrast, previous workshops had focused substantially on building skills and knowledge for “upstream” compliance—i.e., for the pre-implementation environmental review process defined by Reg. 216, IEE development and associated EIA skills. Incremental refinements to this agenda were made and some materials upgraded for delivery of the two most recent Asia Regional Environmental trainings for USAID staff (Bangkok, 2009 & Luxor, Egypt, 2010).

Adaptations and improvements for this workshop. This workshop retained the basic elements of the existing LOP agenda, but made two key changes in structure:

1. Following 1.5 days of sessions that covered core skills and concepts as well as an *overview* of LOP compliance requirements, participants were divided for the next day into two blocs, one focused on upstream compliance (see Background above) and one on downstream compliance (i.e. implementation of IEE and EA conditions, with a focus on the environmental mitigation and monitoring plan (EMMP) as a tool to facilitate this process).

This responded to key participant comments from previous workshops and permits participants to engage in more depth with the LOP compliance elements most relevant to their responsibilities without detracting from time spent on other topics. This approach is particularly beneficial when training USAID staff and IPs in the same workshop curriculum, as each group typically engages on issues of environmental compliance and ESDM at different points in the project lifecycle.³

2. A series of Special Topic sessions selected by USAID/RDMA for delivery on Day 4 following conclusion of the bifurcated upstream/downstream component and field visit. Special Topics were selected based on the regional project portfolio, and as well alignment with other workshop training themes.

In addition, this workshop made use of substantially upgraded training materials for environmental monitoring and EMMP development that were developed for the June 2010 ENCAP “Environmental Compliance and ESDM in Project Implementation” training workshop for USAID/Sudan partners. The successful environmental compliance/ESDM game (content review) conducted at the end of the workshop was developed under USAID/ANE/TS’s EMCB Project.

Finally, new field visit briefings and exercises were developed, specific to the case site visit to the peri-urban Klong Jinda community southwest of Bangkok.

³ This structure was piloted at a similar training workshop for USAID/Philippines staff and partners held in Manila in October 2010. The workshop was co-funded by USAID/Philippines and USAID/ANE/TS, under the EMCB Project.

3. EVALUATIONS

Two different formal methods were used to evaluate the success of the workshop in meeting its objectives. These indicate that the workshop strongly achieved its objectives:

I. EXPECTATIONS TRACKING.

In the first session of the workshop, participants were asked to share their expectations for the workshop, which were recorded on a flip chart and affixed to the side wall of the room. At the conclusion of the workshop, the facilitation team led a review of the expectations and confirmed those that had been met. 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. INDIVIDUAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION & FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT.

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were also asked to complete the standard LOP/ESDM individual workshop evaluation form, in use since 2008 (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.

The tables below summarize the responses received. *In the overall evaluation categories (“All” column, table A), the scores range between good and excellent and are consistent with recent trainings in this series.*

TABLE A: OVERALL EVALUATION RESULTS

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

Evaluation Element	Current workshop (Bangkok 2012) <i>Average scores by type of participant</i>				Previous workshops in the series <i>Average scores for all participants</i>	
	All (27)	Among self-described . . *			Luxor, Egypt 2010	Bangkok 2009
		Advanced (3)	Mid-level (13)	Novice (8)		
Technical Program	4.02	4.33	3.96	4.00	4.06	4.00
Facilitation	4.02	4.33	3.73	3.75	4.41	3.93
Logistics	4.09	4.00	4.04	4.13	4.33	4.45
Venue	4.43	4.67	4.27	4.50	4.11	
Field Visit	4.27	3.67	4.39	4.00	4.41	4.11

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

TABLE B: IMPACT

(3= ideal score in all cases)

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Score*	Interpretation
Empowerment (Knowledge & Capabilities)	1=not at all increased 2=moderately increased	2.64	Nearly all participants reported that their motivation and empowerment were either moderately or strongly increased, with the latter predominating.
Motivation	3=strongly increased		

*average across all participants

TABLE C: LEARNING APPROACH

(3=ideal score in all cases)

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Score*	Interpretation
Field vs. Classtime balance	1=much more field time needed 3=right balance 5=much more classroom time needed	2.64	Nominally more field time needed
Presentations vs Exercises balance	1=much more emphasis on presentations needed 3=right balance; 5=much more exercise/discussion time needed	3.00	Ideal balance
Technical Level & Pace	1=too heavy; 3=about right 5=too light	2.88	Slightly less dense approach preferred
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	3.16	Slightly more opportunities for peer learning desired

*average across all participants

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 40 whereas total citations of low-rated sessions totaled 22, with many participants identifying no low-rated sessions.
- The sessions that were most consistently high-rated were the focused blocs of sessions on upstream and downstream compliance, the core EIA skills sessions, the field visits and the EIA & ESDM session. These sessions correspond directly to the critical core content of the workshop.

The most frequent-cited reasons for assigning a session a low rating were relevance of the content and delivery, particularly among Special Topics (e.g., pesticides, GMOs, Feed the Future). Several participants were also critical of the Green Building tour, which was seen as irrelevant to field-level implementation of many USAID activities in the region.

A spreadsheet containing a full transcription of the evaluations is available from the GEMS program upon request. Individual comments on the evaluations offer a number of insights for strengthening future workshops in the series.

4. ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-UP & LESSONS LEARNED

Distributing Mission Order on Environmental Procedures. During the “Way Forward” session held at the end of the workshop, the colleague from USAID/Philippines offered to share a Mission Order on Environmental Procedures as developed by the USAID/Philippines MEO. Participants at large were receptive to this offer, viewing it as a means of modeling or communicating in their own roles how USAID can prioritize environmental compliance and ESDM at the mission level, and how

the MEO and other environment-related staff can be empowered in their professional responsibilities.

Creating online community of practice. Also an output of the Way Forward session, participants expressed modest interest in maintaining contact with their colleagues from the workshop, and to joining a virtual community of practice in which challenges, issues, solutions, observations, etc. could be openly shared across the group. Sun Mountain will initiate this process by establishing a collaborative forum using the online Basecamp application.

FACILITATOR LESSONS LEARNED.

- **Provide adequate time for participants to refresh following return from field visits.** The site visit was a 90-minute drive from the ARTC, requiring a lengthy round trip. A lunch was also hosted by the community in which the site visits were conducted, meaning there was essentially no break between return from the site visit and commencement of the scheduled afternoon sessions. Most participants were fatigued and showed little enthusiasm for the nominal small-group discussions programmed in the agenda. In the future, lengthy site visits (inclusive of transit time) should be buffered by at least a 15-minute break allowing participants to refresh and cool off, particularly in hot and humid weather.
- **Upstream/downstream split worked well, but provide opportunities for cross-learning.** The evaluation instruments and verbal feedback both indicated that participants highly valued having the time to engage in depth with upstream and downstream material—the primary objective of implementing the upstream/downstream dual-track structure during the workshop. However, a majority of participants did express a preference in the EMMP-centered downstream track, including several who ultimately participated in the upstream component. Future workshops might allocate time for an evening working session with upstream participants interested in better understanding the development of EMMPs based on IEE conditions.
- **Be prepared to field challenges to “correct” answers to ESDM Knowledge Game questions.** The Knowledge Game was facilitated in part as a discussion-type format where the questions and answers from each round were discussed at large following the submission of each team’s answer sheet, and concurrent with scoring. While helpful in understanding the challenging nature of each question, and establishing a link with workshop content, this forum gave rise to several challenges to the “correct” responses. Such exchanges are generally very rich and offer an ideal instructional opportunity. However, the competitive nature of the Knowledge Game places the facilitators in the position of determining right and wrong on otherwise nuanced or unclear issues. Facilitators should be prepared to respond to such challenges in a manner that respects the opinions or perspectives of the participants while maintaining the integrity of the competition.
- **Establish clear linkage between guest speakers/special guests and workshop agenda and learning objectives.** Although the facilitation team was able to draw upon the knowledge and experience of several USAID/RDMA staff (conveniently located downstairs from ARTC), the rather ad hoc contribution of these subject matter experts was not maximized to enhance the workshop agenda and strengthen the conveyance of key topics and issues. Participants were challenged to understand how such material was relevant, or applied to their own project work, particularly with regard to LEED/green building and climate change adaptation and mitigation. The future involvement and contribution of technical specialists—even on an opportunistic basis—will ideally be integrated with key workshop themes and offer clear relevance or value to a majority of participants.

5. KEY WORKSHOP ATTRIBUTES & IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

PLACE, DATE AND PARTICIPANTS

Dates	21-25 May 2012
Venue	ARTC, Bangkok, Thailand provided training facilities and on-site logistical support (e.g., printing, copying, A/V assistance, etc.) for the workshop. Participants were responsible for their own lodging arrangements, as needed.
Participants (full participant list is attached)	Total full-time participants, including training team: 33 Full-time participants, excluding training team: 28 representing 11 missions and 10 USAID partner organizations Training team: REA/REO: 2 (see “USAID facilitators,” below) GEMS: 2 GEMS Trainers, 1 Facilitator (see “GEMS training team,” below.)
Working language	English

STAFFING AND LOGISTICS

Planning leads and coordination	Key planning leads: Logistics: Mark Stoughton, Cadmus & Scott Solberg, Sun Mountain International ⁴ Workshop Registration & Overall Tracking: Kristin Taddei, Cadmus Case sites: Promboon Panitchpakdi, Raks Thai Foundation (contractor to Sun Mountain International) Material preparation: Mark Stoughton & Patrick Hall, Cadmus Mission team: Saengroaj Srisawaskraisorn, RDMA REO In the two months preceding the workshop, weekly planning teleconferences were held by this core planning team.
Registration	Registration for the workshop was divided into two phases: pre-registration followed by registration via the online USAID Learning Management System (LMS). Pre-registration served as a gating/control process for LMS registration, as well as a means to gather additional information about participant backgrounds and training needs. The pre-registration form was designed for this purpose and attached to the workshop announcement. R Macleod (ANE BEO) and S Srisawaskraisorn sent multiple sets of workshop announcements/invitations.
In-country logistics	In-country logistical support was provided by ARTC and Raks Thai Foundation staff. ARTC staff typically provide a high level of on-site support to groups using the training facility. Raks Thai Foundation staff provided logistical and planning support under contract to Sun Mountain International, primarily in relation to the case site program. Raks Thai Foundation staff also served as interpreters during the case site visits. Supervision was provided by Saengroaj Srisawaskraisorn and Scott Solberg (pre-

⁴ Sun Mountain International is principal partner to The Cadmus Group, Inc. in implementing the GEMS program.

	delivery) and training facilitator Malory Hendrickson of Sun Mountain International (during delivery).
GEMS Training Team	Scott Solberg (Sun Mountain International) served as the lead trainer. Patrick Hall (Cadmus) served as a co-trainer. Malory Hendrickson (Sun Mountain International) served as facilitator and coordinator for the case site program.
USAID Training Team	Andrei Barannik (REA Central Asia) and Saengroaj Srisawaskraisorn (RDMA REO) participated as trainers/facilitators.

CONTRACTS, FUNDING, AND COST-SHARES

Cost shares & Sources of funding	<p>Participants' respective missions/offices and projects covered travel and per diem costs for their staff.</p> <p>USAID Facilitators' respective missions/offices covered travel and per diem costs.</p> <p>No direct costs were incurred for use of ARTC facilities and on-site logistical support.</p> <p>Using obligated ANE/TS funding, GEMS covered: daily coffee/tea breaks with light refreshments (provided by on-site ARTC café operator Rittee Tan); travel, salary and per diem for the GEMS training team; development of workshop agenda and training materials, including selection and integration of case site program; and case site transport.</p> <p>USAID/RDMA provided the time of the core mission team (see above) for workshop preparation. ARTC provided the time of center staff for workshop preparation.</p>
Contract mechanisms	<p>No contract was required for use of ARTC facilities or support from ARTC staff. Raks Thai Foundation was engaged under agreement with Sun Mountain International. Case site transport for participants and the training team was provided by the Plaza Athénée Bangkok hotel (located adjacent to RDMA and ARTC) and charged to the guest room account of workshop co-trainer Patrick Hall. Payment for coffee/tea break catering by Rittee Tan was made on site at ARTC according to invoice terms.</p>

AGENDA, CONTENT AND MATERIALS

Development lead	Mark Stoughton, Cadmus & Scott Solberg, Sun Mountain International
Agenda	The final agenda is attached. See also notes on the agenda in section 2.
Hardcopy materials	<p>Participants were provided with the following materials in hardcopy:</p> <p>Sourcebook. 1.5" three-ring binder containing the agenda, a brief objectives statement/overview of each module, presentations and exercises.</p> <p>ENCAP Visual Field Guides. Each participant received a copy of each of the 3 ENCAP Visual Field Guides. These were the basis for an environmental monitoring exercise on Day 2.</p> <p>Sourcebooks were reproduced in Bangkok under the direction of ARTC staff from PDF originals prepared by Cadmus. Due to quality requirements, the ENCAP visual field guides and workshop certificates were reproduced in the US and hand-carried to Bangkok.</p>

Memory sticks (Flash Drives)	Participants were provided with a 4GB USB flashdrive containing the sourcebook and an off-line version of the ENCAP program Web site, including all of the technical resources used in conjunction with course delivery. The drives were procured and loaded by Cadmus and hand-carried to Bangkok. Participants were also advised that the GEMS program Web site is under development, and that the majority of ESDM and environmental compliance resources available on the ENCAP Web site will be migrated to the GEMS Web site.							
USAID-branded hats	Each participant received one USAID-branded baseball cap custom-embroidered with the workshop name, location and dates. The hats were hand-carried to Bangkok.							
Case site visits	<p>The final site visit program was as follows. The visits were hosted by site representatives, and each group was accompanied by Raks Thai Foundation staff who served as interpreters.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DAY & FOCUS OF VISIT</th> <th>GROUP 1</th> <th>GROUP 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Day 3: “IEE Review” (Upstream group) and “EMMP Development” (Downstream group)</td> <td>Combination of Upstream Group 1 & Downstream Group 1: Klong Jinda community— peri-urban decorative plant and fruit and vegetable cultivation</td> <td>Combination Upstream Group 2 & Downstream Group 2: Klong Jinda community—peri-urban fruit and vegetable cultivation</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		DAY & FOCUS OF VISIT	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	Day 3: “IEE Review” (Upstream group) and “EMMP Development” (Downstream group)	Combination of Upstream Group 1 & Downstream Group 1: Klong Jinda community— peri-urban decorative plant and fruit and vegetable cultivation	Combination Upstream Group 2 & Downstream Group 2: Klong Jinda community—peri-urban fruit and vegetable cultivation
DAY & FOCUS OF VISIT	GROUP 1	GROUP 2						
Day 3: “IEE Review” (Upstream group) and “EMMP Development” (Downstream group)	Combination of Upstream Group 1 & Downstream Group 1: Klong Jinda community— peri-urban decorative plant and fruit and vegetable cultivation	Combination Upstream Group 2 & Downstream Group 2: Klong Jinda community—peri-urban fruit and vegetable cultivation						

6. ATTACHMENT: FINAL AGENDA

Agenda

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

An Asia Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff & Partners

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

Type	Length	Start	Finish	#	Session Name	Objectives/Content Summary
Day 1/Monday						
	0:15	8:15	– 8:30		Arrival/Registration	
	0:15	8:30	– 8:45		Official Opening	
E	0:40	8:45	– 9:25	1	Participant & Facilitator Introductions, Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Facilitation Team Introductions, Roles and Responsibilities b. Participant Introductions c. Overview of Agenda: Tools and Techniques d. Administrative Matters e. Setting Expectations f. Establishing a Learning Agreement g. Creating a Parking Lot
P	1:05	9:25	– 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	0:15	10:30	– 10:45		Tea Break	
P	0:40	10:30	– 11:10	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	0:30	11:10	– 11:40	4	Overview of Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance for USAID Staff	<p>Brief the origin of, mandate behind and purpose of USAID's mandatory, EIA-based environmental procedures.</p> <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	0:50	11:40	– 12:30	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.
B	1:00	12:30	– 13:30		Lunch	

P	1:30	13:30	–	15:00	6a	Virtual Field Visit: Practicing Core EIA Skills	Build and apply the core EIA skills briefed in Session 5 via a virtual field visit & follow-up group work.
F	1:55	15:00	–	16:55	6b	Environmental Impacts of Built Structures and Green Building Tour	Build and apply the core EIA skills briefed in Session 5 with application to build structures, centering on a green building tour and group work.

Day 2/Tuesday

	0:15	8:30	–	8:45		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	1:30	8:45	–	10:15	6	Wrap-up group work & plenary synthesis, 6A&B	
B	0:15	10:15	–	10:30		Tea Break	
P	0:45	10:30	–	11:15	7	Core EIA skills Part 2: Environmental 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	1:15	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	1:00	12:30	–	13:30		Lunch	
P	0:40	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	0:05	14:10	–	14:15		Short break to change over to parallel sessions	

Parallel Session Bloc: Upstream Compliance Vientiane Room 2514

P	0:45	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	0:15	15:00	–	15:15		Tea Break	
E	1:00	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.
P	0:30	16:15	–	16:45	11a	Effective IEEs: Well- Considered & Well- Written	The IEE is USAID's "Preliminary Assessment" and the most common type of environmental 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.)

E	0:10	16:45	16:55	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.
---	------	-------	-------	-----	---	--

Parallel Session Bloc: Downstream Compliance
Rangoon Room 2513

P	0:30	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	0:30	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	0:15	15:15	– 15:30		Tea Break	
E	1:25	15:30	– 16:55	11b	EMMP Development: Group Work + Field Visit Briefing	See 11a; (note--participants work on their laptops to fill in a provided EMMP template.)

Day 3/Wednesday

	0:05	8:00	– 8:05		Assembly for Field Visit Departure	
F	4:55	8:05	– 13:00	11c	Field Visits for EMMP Development exercise (upstream compliance) / IEE Review (downstream compliance)	
B	1:00	13:00	– 14:00		Lunch	

Parallel Session Bloc: Upstream Compliance
Vientiane Room 2514

E	1:15	14:00	– 15:15	11d	Classroom Follow-up for IEE Review Field Visit (small group work)	See 11b above
P	0:45	15:15	– 16:00	ST	IEE Determinations & Conditions for "Tricky Activities"	E.g., Policy development; Trade; SME Support; Private Sector Credit Support including DCA.

Parallel Session Bloc: Downstream Compliance
Rangoon Room 2513

E	2:00	14:00	– 16:00	11d	Field visit follow-up: EMMP Development small group work	Continue EMMP development exercise. Finalize presentation.
B	0:15	16:00	– 16:15		Tea Break	

E	0:40	16:15	– 16:55	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.
---	------	-------	---------	-----	--------------------------	---

Day 4/Thursday

	0:10	8:30	–	8:40		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
E	0:35	8:40	–	9:15	11e	EMMP Group Presentations, cont'd	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	0:30	9:15	–	9:45	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.
P	0:15	9:45	–	10:00	ST	Feed the Future: Environmental Compliance and ESDM	Briefs FtF and notes—but does not go into detail—on 4 complicated environmental compliance/ESDM issues that attain particular significance under (but not only under) Feed the Future programming: a. Pesticide compliance and safer use; b. Use of GMOs; c. Relationship of USAID's environmental procedures to those of host country and MDB partners; d. Design for robustness to global climate change. Each is the subject of its own session.
P	0:15	10:00	–	10:30	ST	GMOs and USAID's Biosafety Procedures	Brief the environmental concerns (and political sensitivities) attendant to the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), particularly in agriculture. Achieve a basic understanding of the special environmental compliance requirements that apply to USAID support for field testing or open release of GMOs.
B	0:15	10:30	–	10:45		Tea Break	
P	1:00	10:45	–	11:45	ST	Pesticide Risks, Compliance and Safer Use	Brief the environmental, economic and human-health concerns attendant to Pesticide Use. Achieve a common understanding of the special environmental compliance requirements that apply to pesticide use & procurement, and of the key elements of safer pesticide use.
E	0:45	11:45	–	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	1:00	12:30	–	13:30		Lunch	
E	1:00	13:30	–	14:30	ST	Incorporating GCC Adaptation and Mitigation in Project Design (cont'd)	Briefing on mitigation & adaptation concepts, followed by small group exercise identifying adaptation and mitigation measures that could be integrated into hypothetical projects; report-out.
P	1:00	14:30	–	15:30	ST	Relationship of USAID's Environmental Procedures to Host Country and MDB partner Procedures	Current USAID programming & policy directions—particularly Feed the Future and USAID Forward—make more urgent and critical the issue of the relationship between USAID's Environmental Procedures and those of its institutional partners. This session addresses three aspects of this issue: satisfying host country and USAID procedures simultaneously; satisfying USAID and MDB procedures simultaneously; extent of deferral to host country EIA systems in G2G assistance.
B	0:15	15:30	–	15:45		Tea Break	
E	1:15	15:45	–	17:00	13	ESDM/Environmental Compliance Knowledge Game	Review and synthesize workshop content via a small-teams competition
E	0:30	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

	0:10	8:30	–	8:40		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	0:10	8:40	–	8:50	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	0:40	8:50	–	9:30	16	State of Environmental Compliance in USAID Missions: Results of BPRs to date	Presents synthesis of BPR results to date; identifies good mission/project practices and common deficits.
E	1:00	9:30	–	10:30	17a	Separate focus sessions: (1) USAID Staff + (2) IPs	Informed by the preceding session, Identify key messages to communicate to mission management/sector team leaders (USAID staff) and COPs (IP staff) to prioritize and strengthen LOP environmental compliance; develop an individual plan for workshop follow-up to strengthen LOP environmental compliance in your project, team, or mission/operating unit.
B	0:15	10:30	–	10:45		Tea Break	
E	1:00	10:45	–	11:45	17b	Way Forward discussion	Includes brief report-outs from the 2 focus sessions
	0:15	11:45	–	12:00	18	Evaluations	Fill in individual evaluation forms
	0:30	12:00	–	12:30		Closing & Certificates	
B		12:30	–			Lunch and Departure	

7. ATTACHMENT: PARTICIPANT LIST

Final Participant List: USAID Regional Staff and Partner Workshop, Bangkok May 2012

	Last Name	First Name	USAID Mission <u>or</u> Implementing Partner Organization
1	Aziz	Asim	USAID/Pakistan
2	Bellamine	Fatine	USAID/Morocco
3	Brownell	Aaron	USAID/Senegal
4	Chomsookprakit*	Chutima	RESPOND, Emerging Pandemic Threats (EPT) Program
5	Dos Reis	Carlos P.	USAID/Timor-Leste
6	Foster	Michael C.	USAID/Vietnam
7	Halbmaier	Crystal	PSI Myanmar
8	Haxra	Monali Zeya	USAID/India
9	Jantalae*	Phatthamon	RESPOND SEA Office
10	Kalasin	Suriya	Mekong Adaptation and Resilience to Climate Change (ARCC) Project
11	Kelly*	Robert	FHI 360
12	Lin	Gene	USAID/Afghanistan
13	Llewellyn	Bronwyn	USAID/Nepal
14	Makara	Chheng	Pact, Inc. (Myanmar-based, for USAID Shae Thot program)
15	Manurung	Roma Chrysta	USAID/Indonesia
16	Noriega*	Shanthi	FHI 360
17	Novia	Rafni	Coral Triangle Center
18	Oo-Keh	Saw-Nay	Pact, Inc. (Myanmar-based, for USAID Shae Thot program)
19	Paoluglam	Kornpreeya	USAID/RDMA
20	Phanayanggor	Preeyanat	USAID/RDMA
21	Reeves	Kerry	USAID/Philippines
22	Soe	Dr. Khant	IRC Project for Local Empowerment (Mae Sot, Thailand)
23	Thammarangsee	Narit	IRC Project for Local Empowerment (Mae Sot, Thailand)
24	Treechairasmee	Showsiri	USAID/RDMA
25	ViraSingh	Praveena	USAID/RDMA
26	Wah	Saw Doh	Environmental Conservation and Development for Myanmar
27	Watt	Jamey	USAID/Vietnam
28	Win	Khin Thuzar	UNDP Myanmar

Workshop Facilitators

1	Barannik	Andrei	USAID/CAR
2	Hall	Patrick	The Cadmus Group, Inc.
3	Hendrickson	Malory	Sun Mountain International
4	Solberg	Scott	Sun Mountain International
5	Srisawaskraisorn	Saengroaj	USAID/RDMA

* attended partial workshop program

8. ATTACHMENT: EVALUATION FORM

Workshop evaluation

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

▪ May 2012

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

Learning approach

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

Issue	Assessment					Comments
Balance of time in classroom to time in field	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	
In the classroom, balance of presentations to exercises, group work & discussions	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	
Technical level & pace	Much too heavy	A little too heavy	About right	A bit too light	Much too light	
Opportunities for peer exchange & learning	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
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 BEFORE this workshop?	Had poor or limited understanding	Understood the basics, lacked some details	Had a strong and detailed understanding	
Empowerment 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	
Motivation 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.