



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

GEMS Training Delivery Report:

Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management: *A Training Workshop for USAID/Zimbabwe Staff and Implementing Partners*

Held 28 January – 1 February 2013 at
Pandhari Lodge, Harare, Zimbabwe



15 July 2013

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: *A Training Workshop for USAID/Zimbabwe Staff and Implementing Partners*

**Held 28 January – 1 February 2013 at
Pandhari Lodge, Harare, Zimbabwe**

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 | 5 |

ATTACHMENTS

FINAL AGENDA

PARTICIPANT LIST

EVALUATION FORM

ACRONYMS

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

I. OVERVIEW

Over 28 January – 1 February 2013, a training workshop for USAID/Zimbabwe staff and IPs in “Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management” was conducted in Harare, Zimbabwe.

The workshop was hosted and sponsored by USAID/Zimbabwe, with key technical assistance provided by the GEMS project. The workshop had 47 participants: 16 were USAID staff; and 31 were IPs, representing nearly 20 USAID-funded or linked organizations.

The workshop was the latest in a series of bilateral trainings for USAID staff and partners delivered in the Africa Region.¹ The overall goal of these workshops is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in Zimbabwe by assuring that participants (including USAID MEO, 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 staff and IPs to discuss current environmental compliance and ESDM issues, including the potential need for technical assistance.

Towards these ends, the workshop used a slightly modified version of a “hybrid” agenda developed in late 2012 by GEMS principal partners The Cadmus Group, Inc. and Sun Mountain International and first delivered in Adama, Ethiopia in December 2012 in a course for USAID/Ethiopia staff and partners. The hybrid agenda sought to combine the strongest elements of existing Life of Project curricula developed by Cadmus and Sun Mountain under previous contracts, and independent of the current collaboration. Indeed, development of a unified approach to training in environmental compliance + ESDM for USAID staff and partners was a stated objective of the GEMS project. The new training agenda was well received in Ethiopia (workshop evaluations are provided in Section 3 for comparison purposes), and required only minor revisions for the USAID/Zimbabwe workshop.

In the most significant departure from other previous bilateral trainings in the Africa Region, the hybrid agenda no longer divides participants into two blocs for targeted skill building in pre-implementation compliance and compliance during project implementation—“upstream” and “downstream” compliance, respectively. Participants were, however, asked to self-select for two blocs of concurrent sessions on Day 4, though this was done as a means of accommodating additional Special Topics and generally maximizing content delivery.

The final training program was developed by GEMS in consultation with USAID/Zimbabwe. Logistics support was provided by GEMS and USAID/Zimbabwe.

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 Adama, Ethiopia (December 2012), Chipata, Zambia (May 2012), and Takoradi, Ghana (March 2012), all of which were delivered under the Global Environmental Management Support (GEMS) project.

2. AGENDA & LEARNING APPROACH

Background: the “Life of Project” agenda. The first Life of Project training agenda and materials were piloted at a June 2008 workshop in Bagamoyo, Tanzania delivered under the ENCAP project.² This curriculum focused on environmental compliance and ESDM across the project lifecycle, and serves as the basis—along with similar content developed by Sun Mountain International—for the “hybrid” training program developed under GEMS and adapted for USAID/Zimbabwe. 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 bilateral workshops in the Africa Region prior to the December 2012 launch of the “hybrid” program in Adama, Ethiopia (Takoradi, Ghana, March 2012 & Chipata, Zambia, May 2012).

Adaptations and improvements for this workshop. Through a slightly revised hybrid agenda, this workshop carried forward the basic elements of the earlier LOP agenda and training delivery, but made two key changes in structure:

1. Participants were no longer divided into “upstream” and “downstream” compliance sub-groups following the delivery of ‘core’ content. The upstream/downstream approach was taken in numerous preceding bilateral and regional workshops as a means of allowing 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 After covering core skills and concepts as well as an *overview* of LOP compliance requirements, one group focused on upstream compliance (see Background above) and one on downstream compliance (with a focus on the environmental mitigation and monitoring plan [EMMP] as a tool to facilitate this process).
2. A series of Special Topic sessions selected by USAID/Zimbabwe for delivery on Day 4 and Day 5 following conclusion of the delivery of core content and EMMP development and report out. Special Topics were selected based on the regional project portfolio, and as well alignment with other workshop training themes.

Finally, new field visit briefings and exercises were developed, specific to the case site visits conducted in/around Harare (detailed in Section 5).

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

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 all of those expectations had been met.

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 generally 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 (Zimbabwe 2013) | | | | Previous workshops in the series | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Average scores by type of participant | | | | Average scores for all participants | | |
| | All (47) | Among self-described. . . | | | Adama, Ethiopia Dec. 2012 | Chipata, Zambia May 2012 | Takoradi, Ghana March 2012 |
| | | Advanced (11) | Mid-level (26) | Novice (10) | | | |
| Technical Program | 4.25 | 4.36 | 4.15 | 3.80 | 4.45 | 4.41 | 4.58 |
| Facilitation | 3.89 | 3.55 | 3.81 | 3.10 | 4.44 | 4.21 | 4.29 |
| Logistics | 4.09 | 3.64 | 4.12 | 3.80 | 4.23 | 3.79 | 4.47 |
| Venue | 3.96 | 3.82 | 4.04 | 3.60 | 2.85 | 4.00 | 4.30 |
| Field Visit | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.35 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.38 | 4.76 |

*Not all evaluation elements were rated by each self-described participant.

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 | 2.78 | |

*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 | 2.83 | 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 | 3.45 | Slightly more exercise/discussion time needed |
| Technical Level & Pace | 1=too heavy; 3=about right 5=too light | 2.78 | 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 | 3.39 | Some opportunities for more 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. Overall, there were 61 citations to high-rated sessions, whereas citations of low-rated sessions totaled only 29. Specifically:

- The most consistently high-rated sessions represent a significant portion of the workshop’s up-front ‘core’ instructional content, including sessions on the EMMP, ESDM, Fundamental Skills of EIA, and USAID Environmental Procedures. The two site visit-centered sessions were also highly ranked. Highly rated ‘special topics’ include sessions on pesticides, water quality testing, and climate change.
- However, the special topic session on pesticides was also the most frequently cited low-rated session, indicating a distinct difference of opinion among participants. The special topic session on medical waste management was the second-most cited low-rated session. This pattern is not uncommon and is reflective of a large training group (i.e., nearly 50 participants) with diverse technical interests and expertise—agriculturalists are generally less interested in issues related to health care provision, and vice versa.
- There was also feedback critical of the Day One site visit, which focused on development of core EIA skills.

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. LESSONS LEARNED

1. **Adequately brief guest presenters on workshop agenda.** Although the facilitation team was bolstered by the participation of multiple guest presenters (e.g., from EMA), the content delivered by these presenters was not fully aligned with the training agenda, or the stated objectives of the guest presenter-led sessions. Notwithstanding their technical qualifications, the addition of the guest presenters increased variability in the style and effectiveness of workshop

facilitation. At a minimum, guest presenters should submit their proposed material for review and, as appropriate, comment prior to the workshop.

2. **Better coordination of conference package arrangements confirmed through Mission.** There was confusion and a lack of communication following workshop delivery regarding the Pandhari Lodge conference package procured by USAID/Zimbabwe. A purchase order was issued to Pandhari Lodge based on a per-person conference fee (training room facilities and lunch and coffee break service). The estimated cost was based on 45 participants (inclusive of workshop facilitators). However, final workshop participation inclusive of workshop facilitators was exceeded by approximately five people/day solely as a result of the USAID/Zimbabwe-managed registration process. Following conclusion of the workshop, the GEMS facilitation team was contacted directly by Pandhari Lodge in their effort to recoup the approximately \$800 difference between the original estimate—against which the purchase order was prepared—and cost of the conference services as rendered. USAID/Zimbabwe was unresponsive to the efforts of the GEMS team to resolve the situation. The GEMS team was consequently placed in the inappropriate position of being asked to settle an account to which it was not party. In future instances where the mission is intent on making certain logistical arrangements independent of the GEMS mechanism, better coordination is needed to ensure that cost estimates and payments are (re)aligned with the registration/enrollment process and that workshop facilitators are not left to answer for issues over which they exercise no control and that may ultimately reflect poorly on the project and its staff.
3. **Reconsider Day 1 off-site field exercise.** The training agenda prioritizes the reinforcement of presentation content and instructional material through small-group and field-based exercises, the latter effectively taking the learning ‘beyond the classroom.’ While overall beneficial, field activities (e.g., site visits, site surveys, etc.) are usually logistically complex and time consuming, particularly with a training group of nearly 50 participants. The Day 1 site visit was designed to help develop/hone skills in baseline characterization and impact assessment. Unfortunately the Day 1 agenda also entailed several lengthy technical presentations, in addition to the need for participants to generally adapt to the demands of a week-long training and new group dynamic. Several of the Day 1 site visits required lengthy roundtrips and a number of participants indicated that the field component was simply too much to accommodate at the end of an already taxing day. In the future, skill-building in baseline characterization and impact assessment—both important Day 1 components—should prioritize on-site opportunities, such as site surveys at or adjacent to the training venue. With appropriate planning (e.g., hypothetical development scenarios and opportunities for stakeholder interviews/consultation), such on-site exercises can yield similar benefits while requiring less time, resources and logistical coordination.
4. **Confirm daily schedule and reduce the number of sessions.** Despite the use of concurrent blocs to integrate extra sessions, the training program was ultimately too compressed and the popular Knowledge Game was cut from the program at the last minute. Also, the daily start and end times established in the final agenda were deemed sub-optimal by participants at workshop kick-off. The facilitation team was able to adjust these times to accommodate the training group, however such elements are ideally be confirmed during the agenda development process.

5. KEY WORKSHOP ATTRIBUTES & IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

PLACE, DATE AND PARTICIPANTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Dates | 28 January – 1 February 2013 |
| Venue | Pandhari Lodge, Glen Lorne, Harare, Zimbabwe On-site logistics provided through Tropic Travel & Tours under agreement with USAID/Zimbabwe. Participants were responsible for their own lodging arrangements, as needed. However, most if not all, participants were resident in Harare and commuted to/from the workshop venue on a daily basis. |
| Participants (full participant list is attached) | Total full-time participants, including training team: 53 Full-time participants, excluding training team: 47 (16 from USAID/Zimbabwe and 31 IPs representing nearly 20 USAID-funded or linked organizations) Training team: MEO: 1 (see “USAID facilitators,” below) GEMS: 2 GEMS Trainers (see “GEMS training team,” below) + 3 local experts |
| Working language | English |

STAFFING AND LOGISTICS

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Planning leads and coordination | Key planning leads: Logistics: Patrick Hall & Rosie Chekenya, Cadmus Case sites: Rosie Chekenya, Cadmus & Hamfrey Sanhokwe, USAID/Zimbabwe MEO Material preparation: Patrick Hall & Rosie Chekenya, Cadmus Mission team: Hamfrey Sanhokwe, USAID/Zimbabwe MEO |
| Registration | Participant registration/enrollment was handled exclusively by USAID/Zimbabwe. |
| In-country logistics | In-country logistical support was provided by GEMS and by Tropic Travel & Tours (under direct agreement with USAID/Zimbabwe). Supervision was provided by Rosie Chekenya (Cadmus) and Hamfrey Sanhokwe (USAID/Zimbabwe). |
| GEMS Training Team | Patrick Hall (Cadmus) served as the lead trainer. Rosie Chekenya (Cadmus) served as co-trainer and coordinator for the case site program. Naome Chimbetete (GEMS Consultant), local socio-cultural expert Theodora Rondozi (GEMS Consultant), local EIA expert Ivy Gertrude Mutsa Saunyama (GEMS Consultant), pesticide safer use expert |
| USAID Training Team | Hamfrey Sanhokwe (USAID/Zimbabwe MEO) served as a facilitator for multiple small-group exercises and led several technical presentations/discussions . |

CONTRACTS, FUNDING, AND COST-SHARES

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Cost shares & Sources of funding | <p>Participants' respective offices and projects covered any travel and per diem costs for their staff.</p> <p>Venue costs (including conference facilities and coffee break and lunch service) for Pandhari Lodge, on-site logistical/secretarial support, and the cost of site visit transportation were covered by USAID/Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Using obligated USAID/Zimbabwe funding, GEMS covered: travel, salary and per diem for the GEMS training team; and development of the workshop agenda and training materials, including selection and integration of case site program.</p> |
| Contract mechanisms | <p>USAID/Zimbabwe managed contractual arrangements directly with Pandhari Lodge and with Tropic Travel & Tours (for provision of on-site logistical/secretarial support and vehicle rental for transportation to/from the site visits on Day 1 and Day 3).</p> <p>Local GEMS Consultants Naome Chimbetete, Theodora Rondozi, and Ivy Gertrude Mutsa Saunyama were engaged through sub-contract agreements issued by GEMS prime contractor The Cadmus Group, Inc.</p> |

AGENDA, CONTENT AND MATERIALS

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Development lead | Patrick Hall, Cadmus |
| 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.</p> <p>Sourcebooks were reproduced and assembled in Harare under the direction of Rosie Chekenya 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 Harare.</p> |

Case site visits

The final site visit program was as follows. The visits were hosted by site representatives, and each group was accompanied by a workshop trainer/facilitator.

| DAY & FOCUS OF VISIT | Day 1: | Day 3: |
|----------------------|---|--|
| | Site Visit to practice baseline assessment and EIA skills | Site Visit for EMMP development |
| GROUP 1 | COSMO (Conservation Society of Monvale)—nurseries and organic farming demonstration | New Start Centre—HIV/AIDS testing and clinic |
| GROUP 2 | Chitungwiza Static Clinic—reproductive health and family planning services | Jekesa Pfungwa—community-based NRM |
| GROUP 3 | Spilahouse MCC—male circumcision center | O’Enem Meats-livestock processing |
| GROUP 4 | WFP warehouse—food storage facility | Negomo Cooperative Society—agricultural production and marketing |
| GROUP 5 | Two by Two (Epworth)—school group-based waste management and sanitation. | |

6. ATTACHMENT: FINAL AGENDA

USAID/Zimbabwe Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design & Management Workshop

Harare, Zimbabwe

28 January – 1 February, 2013

Training Objective:

The overall goal of the workshop is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in Zimbabwe 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.

Key Activities:

- Day 1 Overview of ESDM and skill-building in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
- Day 2 Explain USAID Environmental Procedures and compliance documentation; prepare for Day 3 site visits.
- Day 3 Complete site visits and develop EMMPs; begin small-group presentation of findings and recommendations.
- Day 4 Complement core training content with special topics related to USAID-funded activities in Zimbabwe.
- Day 5 Synthesize workshop proceedings and skill-building and consider professional and organizational next steps.

| Day/Time | Module | Objective/Content Summary | Presenter/Facilitator |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| Day 1 | Motivation, Core Skills and Overview of Environmental Compliance over Life of Project | | |
| 8:30-9:00 | Participant Registration | | |
| 9:00-9:15 | Welcome and Opening Statements | Highlight the value of workshop content and expected results. | USAID/Zimbabwe Mission |
| 9:15-10:00 | Session 1: Workshop Objectives and Logistics; Participant Introductions | Establish workshop objectives; brief the agenda and learning approach. Review logistics. Introduce participants; articulate expectations. | Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| 10:00-10:15 | Break | | |
| 10:15-11:15 | Session 2: Environmentally Sound Design & Management (ESDM) as a Foundation for Environmental Compliance <i>Presentation and dialogue</i> | Motivate the need to systematically address environmental considerations in development activities. Understand linkage between ESDM and project success, consider examples from Zimbabwe. View this process in the context of environmental compliance. | Hamfrey Sanhokwe, USAID/Zimbabwe Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| 11:15-12:00 | Session 3: Environmentally Sound Design & Management (ESDM) in the Zimbabwean Context <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Review and discuss socio-cultural considerations in the application of ESDM in Zimbabwe. | Naome Chimbetete, Local GEMS Consultant |
| 12:00-13:00 | Lunch | | |
| 13:00-14:00 | Session 4: Fundamental Skills of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Define key terms—baseline, impact, activity—and learn essential classroom theory for baseline characterization, impact identification & mitigation design and how they apply in the EIA framework; the EIA framework is the basis for USAID Environmental Procedures. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 14:00-14:15 | Session 5a: Site Visit – Brief and Classroom Preparation | Receive instruction on the methodology and objectives of the Site Visit. Understand the | Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |

| Day/Time | Module | Objective/Content Summary | Presenter/Facilitator |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <i>Presentation and small-group work</i> | proposed activity and baseline conditions to be assessed. Divide into small groups for the exercise. | |
| 14:15-17:00 (includes return from field) | Session 5b: Site Visit <i>Practical exercise</i> | Practice observation and assessment skills needed to characterize the baseline situation and identify impacts/issues of concern. | Small-group Exercise |
| Day 2 Motivation, Core Skills and Overview of Environmental Compliance over Life of Project | | | |
| 9:00-10:00 | Session 5c: Site Visit – Synthesis and Report-out <i>Group work and dialogue</i> | Synthesize field observations and prioritize impacts/issues of concern; discuss possible approaches for limiting adverse effects on the environment. Small groups present and discuss findings. | Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| 10:00-10:15 | Break | | |
| 10:15-11:15 | Session 6: Environmental Impact Assessment and “USAID Environmental Procedures”: the Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) and Beyond <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Review USAID’s implementation of the EIA process and the preparation of project environmental compliance documents; understand how these documents establish environmental management criteria for USAID-funded activities. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 11:15-12:00 | Session 7: The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Process in Zimbabwe | Understand national- and local-level EIA requirements and procedures in Zimbabwe and how they apply to USAID-funded activities. | Theodora Rondozi, Local GEMS Consultant |
| 12:00-13:00 | Lunch | | |
| 13:00-13:15 | Session 8a: IEE Critique – Introduction and Overview | Receive instruction on the methodology and objectives of the IEE Critique. Convene small groups for the exercise. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 13:15-14:15 | Session 8b: IEE Critique – Small-Group Synthesis and Report-out | Discussion of illustrative IEE. Small groups present critical review/findings. | Small-group Exercise Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 14:15-15:00 | Session 9: Principles of Environmental Monitoring <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Review key aspects of monitoring to ensure that project environmental compliance requirements are met and potential adverse impacts effectively mitigated; highlight the selection of clear and cost-effective monitoring indicators. | Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| 15:00-15:15 | Break | | |
| 15:15-16:00 | Session 10: The Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Understand the EMMP concept and formats: Who develops them. Their role in “operationalizing” key elements of USAID Environmental Procedures and establishing and maintaining project environmental compliance. Introduce key guidance: <i>EMMP Factsheet</i> . | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 16:00-16:15 | Session 11: Introduction to the USAID <i>Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa</i> <i>Presentation</i> | Deepen familiarity with environmental resources and guidelines, particularly the <i>Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa</i> (EGGSSA) | Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| 16:15-17:00 | Session 12a: Site Visit – Brief and Classroom Preparation <i>Presentation and small-group work</i> | Gain a general awareness of the case study sites that will be visited in the field on Day 3. Divide participants and distribute field guides. Discuss potential adverse impacts of the case study sites. Review background and reference materials and discuss approach for EMMP development in small-group format. | Rosie Chekenya & Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitators |
| Day 3 Complete site visits and develop EMMPs | | | |

| Day/Time | Module | Objective/Content Summary | Presenter/Facilitator |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8:00-13:00 (includes return from field) | Session 12b: Site visits: Experiential Practice Developing an EMMP <i>Field visit</i> Technical Areas: 1. Health: clinic operations and med. waste 2. Ag.: nursery and forest management 3. Ag.: smallholder farming and irrigation 4. Livestock: pork and beef processing | Build and apply the core Environmental Analysis skills briefed in Day 1 and Day 2 via a field visit and follow-up group work to: 1) synthesize field observations; and 2) identify possible mitigation measures for the top two issues/impacts of concern at each site, with reference to the EGSSAA. | Group Participants |
| 13:00-14:00 | Refresh and lunch | | |
| 14:00-16:00 (tea break taken at leisure) | Session 12c: Develop EMMP and Prepare Small-Group Presentation <i>Small group work</i> | Advance discussions and compilation of field visit results into an EMMP format and a group presentation. | Group Participants |
| 16:00-17:00 | Session 12d: EMMP Group Presentations <i>Group presentations in plenary</i> | Articulate field visit findings, analysis, and EMMP development. | Group Participants Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| Day 4 Special Topics | | | |
| 9:00-10:00 | Session 12d (cont'd): EMMP Group Presentations <i>Group presentations in plenary</i> | Articulate field visit findings, analysis, and EMMP development. | Group Participants Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 10:00-10:30 (choose one) | Session 13a: Environmental Compliance Reporting <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Guidance on EMMP-related and other environmental compliance reporting, including integration with broader project M&E and PMP reporting requirements. | Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| | Session 13b: Preparing an Effective IEE <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Review and discuss key concepts for developing well written and well considered IEEs for USAID/Zimbabwe activities. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 10:30-10:45 | Break | | |
| 10:45-11:30 | Session 14: Special Topic – Climate Change <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Review the role and impact of Global Climate Change (GCC) on the design and implementation of USAID/Zimbabwe activities; understand the capacity of ESDM to mitigate the effects of GCC. | Veronica Gundu, Climate Change Office |
| 11:30-12:00 | Session 15: Roles, Responsibilities & Resources <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Summarize the various responsibilities of USAID staff and Implementing Partners (IPs); introduce additional key resources available to support environmental compliance and ESDM. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 12:00-13:00 | Lunch | | |
| 13:00-14:30 | Session 16: Pesticide Risks, Safer Use & Compliance <i>Technical presentation with live demonstration and dialogue</i> | Brief the environmental, economic and human-health concerns related to pesticide use. Achieve a common understanding of the special environmental compliance requirements that apply to pesticide use and procurement. Review key elements of safer pesticide use, including Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and the use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). | Ivy Gertrude Mutsa Saunyama, Local GEMS Consultant |
| 14:30-14:45 | Break | | |
| 14:45-15:45 (choose one) | Session 17a: Special Topic – Medical Waste Management <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Develop capacity to environmentally manage programs that directly or indirectly contribute to the generation of medical waste. | Clorence Matehwe, Environmental Management Agency |
| | Session 17b: Environmental Compliance Best Practice for “Tricky Activities” + General Reg. 216 Discussion | Understand limitations on use of Categorical Exclusions, particularly for nuanced activities related to policy development, SME support and | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |

| Day/Time | Module | Objective/Content Summary | Presenter/Facilitator |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | <i>Technical presentation and Q&A session</i> | credit sector strengthening. Technical presentation will be followed by Reg. 216-focused Q&A session geared toward IEE development. | |
| 15:45-17:00 | Session 18: Environmental Compliance/ESDM Knowledge game <i>Small-group competition</i> | Reinforce key “core session” content in a small-group competition. | Rosie Chekenya & Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitators |
| Day 5 | Way Forward | | |
| 9:00-9:30 | Session 19: Special Topic – Water Quality Testing <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i> | Review the requirements and procedures involved with water quality testing in USAID-funded development programs. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 9:30-10:00 | Session 20: Parking lot session <i>Plenary session</i> | Address unresolved questions or issues and summarize information presented throughout the training. | Patrick Hall, GEMS Facilitator |
| 10:00-10:15 | Break | | |
| 10:15-11:45 | Session 21: Environmental Priorities for USAID Activities in Zimbabwe + Bringing Curricula to Reality <i>Panel and group discussion followed by individual action planning</i> | With the technical training now complete, panelists will share perspectives on environmental priorities and challenges for USAID activities in Zimbabwe. Participants will use these and other insights to frame lessons-learned and identify practical actions that can be operationalized as part of project implementation. | Hamfrey Sanhokwe, USAID/Zimbabwe Rosie Chekenya, GEMS Facilitator |
| 11:45-12:00 | Workshop Final Evaluations | Participants complete evaluation form | Patrick Hall, GEMS |
| 12:00-12:30 | Closing Ceremony | Conclude workshop and distribute certificates. | USAID/Zimbabwe Mission |

7. ATTACHMENT: PARTICIPANT LIST

8. ATTACHMENT: EVALUATION FORM

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

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

A Training Workshop for USAID Staff & Partners

Harare, Zimbabwe ▪ 28 January - 01 February 2013

Your frank and honest feedback will help strengthen future trainings and help prioritize ESDM and environmental compliance support to USAID Programs and Missions in Africa and globally. 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.