



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# GEMS Training Delivery Report:

## Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management: *An Africa Regional Advanced Training Workshop for USAID Staff*

Held 23-27 March 2015 at  
La Palme Hotel, Musanze, Rwanda



**13 May 2015**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Ashley Fox & Mark Stoughton of The Cadmus Group, Inc.

Cover Photo: Hillside terracing in Nyabihu, Rwanda. Photo Credit: Diana Shannon

# GEMS Training Delivery Report:

## **Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management: *An Africa Regional Advanced Training Workshop for USAID Staff***

**Held 23-27 March 2015 at  
La Palme Hotel, Musanze, Rwanda**

**Prepared by:**

Ashley Fox & Mark Stoughton, Ph.D. The Cadmus Group, Inc.

**Prepared under:**

The Global Environmental Management Support (GEMS II) project, a USAID/E3 program.  
Award Number AID-OAA-M-13-00018. The Cadmus Group, Inc., Prime Contractor. Activity AF17b.

The Cadmus Group, Inc.  
100 Fifth Avenue, Suite 100  
Waltham, MA 02451  
617-673-7000 Fax 617-673-7001  
[www.cadmusgroup.com](http://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.....	5
5. Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements.....	8
Attachment: Final Agenda .....	11
Attachment: Evaluation Form.....	17

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

## I. Overview

Over 23–27 March, 2015, an advanced Africa Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff in “Life of Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management” was conducted in Musanze, Rwanda.

The workshop was hosted by USAID/Rwanda and sponsored by USAID/AFR/SD. Key technical assistance was provided by the GEMS project. Excluding the GEMS facilitation team, the workshop had 23 participants: all were USAID staff, representing more than 18 Washington- and Africa-based operating units.

The workshop was the latest in a series of Africa Regional Environmental Compliance and ESDM trainings for USAID staff.<sup>1</sup> The overall goal of these workshops is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in Africa by assuring that participants (including USAID MEOs, CORs/AORs, Activity Managers, Team Leaders, M&E Officers & PDOs) 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 and identify ways forward regarding current environmental compliance and ESDM issues, including Mission needs for technical assistance and backstopping.

Towards these ends, the workshop used a refined and technically advanced version of the “life of project” agenda that was first delivered under the ENCAP project in Bagamoyo, Tanzania at the 2008 Africa regional training workshop for USAID staff.<sup>2</sup> Similar to the immediately previous workshop in the series (Toubacouta, Senegal; February 2014), the curriculum covered basic environmental compliance and ESDM topics in an accelerated and compressed way, with the large majority of the workshop devoted to technically advanced topics in impact assessment and complex environmental compliance and ESDM issues. This advanced curriculum is a material departure from workshops in the series held prior to 2014.

The full training program, inclusive of the ‘advanced’ technical curriculum, was developed by GEMS in consultation with and with key contributions from the USAID facilitation team. Logistics support was provided by GEMS and USAID/Rwanda.

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The most recent previous workshops in this series were held in Toubacouta, Senegal (2014) and Mangochi, Malawi (2013).

<sup>2</sup> 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.encapafrika.org/about.htm](http://www.encapafrika.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, workshops prior to 2008 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.

Following the 2008 workshop, the “life of project” (LOP) materials and agenda have undergone significant further development and evolution within the LOP organizing concept, and maintaining the adult learning principles described above.

For the 2014 workshop in Toubacouta, Senegal, the USAID workshop planning committee determined that the workshop would feature an advanced curriculum. While participants at all levels were welcome, the 2014 workshop covered “core” life-of-project environmental compliance and ESDM topics in an accelerated and compressed way, with the large majority of the workshop devoted to technically advanced topics in impact assessment and complex environmental compliance and ESDM issues. (E.g. addressing the more complex environmental management challenges that emerge in the context of an EA versus at the IEE level.) This advanced curriculum was a material departure from prior workshops in the series.

The advanced curriculum was driven by participant needs: it is not uncommon for some participants to have attended two or more previous trainings; these are typically the participants who must, in the course of their MEO or other roles, consistently address advanced and complex compliances and environmental management issues.

**Adaptations and improvements for the 2015 workshop.** The USAID workshop planning team determined that the 2015 workshop would also feature an advanced LOP curriculum. The agenda developed by GEMS in consultation with the USAID planning team incorporated the compressed approach to core content developed for the 2014 workshop, but made a number of changes to the advanced topics selected and the treatment of these topics. The net effect was an agenda and materials that were somewhat more advanced than those of the 2014 workshop. Specifically:

1. The following advanced impact assessment process and topics sessions were developed for or heavily modified for this workshop:
  - Session 8: Scoping, EA & PEA Basics
  - Session 9: “Impact Assessment 201”
    - Session 9b: Cumulative Impacts
    - Session 9c: Indirect Impacts
    - Session 9d: Ecosystem Services
    - Session 9e: Social Impacts
    - Session 9f: GCC & Impact Assessment
  - Session 10: Integrative Case Study(ies) (illustrating Impact Assessment 201 concepts, as above)

2. A series of sectoral special topics were selected by the USAID workshop planning team for Day 4 and developed by GEMS and the USAID planning team. These topics were selected as both relevant to USAID's portfolio in sub-Saharan Africa and for the environmental compliance complexity they present, from a technical and/or institutional perspective.

Following short (10 min) "poster" presentations on each topic, concurrent roundtables allowed participants to discuss and explore the topic of their choice in greater depth with the cognizant BEO and/or a subject matter expert.

These sectoral sessions, all developed for this workshop, were as follows:

- Session 12: Best Practice & Compliance for Investment Promotion
  - Session 13b: USAID's Construction Assessment and implications for activities involving construction
  - Session 13c: AFR's PERSUAP "stocktaking" and way forward
  - Session 13d: WQAP Assessment and new model WQAP language
  - Session 13e: Medical Waste: Situations where USAID supports, but does not control, care delivery, and other complex situations.
  - Session 13f: Climate Smart Agriculture
3. Sessions were also developed to obtain participant feedback on draft updates to key AFR environmental compliance document templates and standards:
    - Session 7: Effective IEEs – Feedback on AFR's IEE template
    - Session 18: Feedback: Updated AFR Environmental Compliance Best Practice Standard
  4. Finally, new field visit briefings and exercises were developed, specific to the case sites near Musanze and aligned with the technically advanced nature of the training curriculum.

### 3. Evaluations

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

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

(The Knowledge Game, frequently used in this workshop series, was fully updated for the revised, advanced workshop curriculum.)

#### **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 (table A), the technical (non-venue) scores range between good and excellent in all categories for all classes of participants. With the exception of the venue score, they are the best, by a narrow margin, of all workshops in this series since the current evaluation format was adopted in 2008.

#### A. Overall evaluation results:

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

Evaluation Element	Current workshop (Musane 2015)				Previous workshops in the series	
	Average scores by type of participant				Average scores for all participants	
	All (20)	Among self-described. . .			Toubacouta, Senegal, 2014	Mangochi, Malawi 2013
Advanced (8)		Mid-level (8)	Novice (4)			
Technical Program	4.65	4.50	4.67	5.00	4.33	4.25
Facilitation	4.40	4.25	4.25	5.00	4.14	4.33
Logistics	4.50	4.125	4.625	5.00	3.22	4.36
Venue	3.80	3.625	4.00	3.75	2.95	4.12
Field Visit	4.50	4.375	4.625	4.50	4.14	4.24

#### 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	2.58	All participants reported that their motivation and empowerment were either moderately or strongly increased, with the latter predominating.
Motivation	3=strongly increased	2.74	

\*average across all participants

#### 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	2.75	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	3.65	Slightly more emphasis on exercise/discussion needed.
Technical Level & Pace	1=too heavy; 3=about right 5=too light	3.06	About Right.

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	3.65	Slightly more opportunities for peer learning desired.
--	--	------	--

\*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:

- Total citations to high-rated sessions totaled 36 whereas total citations of low-rated sessions totaled 18, with many citing low-rated sessions because of lack of time, or because too much material was considered “refresher” topics.
- The sessions that were most consistently high-rated were Session 6 on EIA Skills Part II & “Downstream” compliance: Monitoring, EMMPs & Reporting; Session 8 on Scoping, EA & PEA Basics; and Session 11, the Field-based EA scoping OR EMMP exercise. These sessions correspond directly to the critical core content of the workshop.

The only pattern that emerged amongst low-rated sessions was Session 12 on Best Practice & Compliance for Investment Promotion. The few comments received indicated that the session was too short for such an important topic.

A spreadsheet containing a full transcription of the evaluations is available from the GEMS program upon request and has been archived to the GEMS google site at <https://sites.google.com/a/usaaid.gov/gems-ii/home>. Individual comments on the evaluations offer a number of insights for strengthening future workshops in the series.

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

**Stocktaking & Action Plans.** On the last day of the workshop, participants were split into two groups (East Africa and other) to identify key issues/items to communicate to mission management and to the BEOs and USAID/Washington. Some of these recommendations are in line with action items agreed to at the BEO-REA retreat that immediately followed the workshop. :

#### Recommendations/Key Messages to Mission Management (many also applicable to USAID/Washington)

1. AORs/CORs & IPs should undertake a mandatory environmental compliance and ESDM training similar to the Gender 101 training. A 2–3 day training should be a prerequisite for appointment of AOR/COR and Activity Managers. Environmental Compliance modules in the Programming Foreign Assistance and AOR/COR training should also be strengthened.
2. The Mission Program Office should be more involved in compliance processes to enhance effectiveness of mission environmental compliance.
3. To bridge the existing gaps in the use of environmental compliance language (ECL) in solicitations and awards, the Mission’s Office of Acquisition and Assistance (OAA) should work more closely with the MEO. Currently, even when the MEO is asked for ECL by OAA, there are no provisions for the MEO to check if the appropriate language was inserted or not; and if it captures all pertinent issues. The OAA should give the MEO a copy of the section on environmental compliance inserted in solicitations/awards for review.
4. Ensure adequate resources are allocated for environmental compliance.

5. Environmental compliance responsibilities of AORs/CORs should be emphasized in their designation letters.
6. Missions should share good practices with each other as a means of enhancing environmental compliance.
7. The information in the environmental procedures briefing in the workshop sourcebook should be conveyed to all staff. Periodic environmental compliance refresher trainings should be organized and mandated that convey key roles and responsibilities information.

#### **Recommendations/Key Messages to BEOs and USAID/Washington**

1. MEOs/REAs should have quarterly teleconferences with the BEO to discuss pertinent environmental compliance matters. Brian Hirsh would be responsible for coordinating this effort.
2. Key environmental compliance messages to Missions such as a summary of the BPR findings or messages to mission management as identified above should come from the BEO to the Mission Director for a greater impact. This should also be reviewed annually.
3. MEOs need to be supported through the implementation of recommendations from this workshop including those from the workshop held last year in Senegal. In addition, BEOs should also not allow mission staff to side step MEOs in decision-making pertaining to Reg. 216 document approvals and other environmental compliance issues.
4. Mission Orders on Environmental Compliance vary from one Mission to another. The template for Mission orders should be standardized and should capture all pertinent environmental compliance issues.
5. Missions should be made more aware of GEMS services and how to access them.
6. IEE review and approval in Washington should be undertaken in a timely manner to avoid unnecessary delays in commencement of activities in the field. It would also help if the AOR/COR/Activity Managers can initiate the process of preparing the necessary Reg. 216 documentation early to avoid situations where approvals are treated as an emergency.
7. Link GLAAS to the ECD so that obligation actions must reference a specific Reg. 216 documentation, and the contracts or awards covered by any given Reg. 216 document can be identified via the ECD.
8. All IEEs and EMMPs for centrally funded mechanisms for the Global Health Bureau (GH) and other pillar bureaus should be cleared by the respective MEOs. This would help put the MEOs in the loop about such programs and also enhance environmental compliance at the mission level.
9. Harmonize and coordinate environmental compliance procedures across bureaus. Environmental compliance should be better coordinated with PPL.
10. Develop environmental monitoring field visit guides/tools.

**Recommendations for future workshops in this series.**

1. The “refresher” (basic, core) material should be limited since most of the participants have attended prior workshops and more time should be allocated to discussions.
2. Integrate pillar bureau content more substantively.
3. This Africa Regional Workshop should be rebranded as the annual MEO conference or retreat /meeting on strategy and planning. The annual event could integrate sectoral training modules and emerging environmental issues as a justification for the MEOs to continue attending the event annually. All MEOs and REAs should also attend the annual meeting and its importance should be emphasized.
4. Sub-regional training events similar to the current Africa Regional workshop should be held and these should be open to AORs/CORs who may be interested.
5. Workshop content should include a short primer on workplace safety and personal protective equipment (PPE) and work in crisis environments should also be included. It was reported that two worker deaths had occurred in Rwanda recently.
6. Gaps pertaining to DO-level IEEs and government-to-government (G2G) compliance processes should be filled and/or clarified
7. Implement measures to offset/reduce workshop carbon footprint.

**Distribution of shared e-mail contact list.** At the conclusion of the workshop participants confirmed that they wished to share their email addresses as part of a full participant contact list. This will enable participants to remain in contact and to continue certain conversations that were started on the topics of environmental compliance and ESDM for USAID programming in Africa.

**Facilitator lessons learned: advanced curricula require additional time for Q&A/discussion.** The technical sophistication of many of the new workshop topics frequently led to extended discussions. These were often curtailed in order to keep to the scheduled program. Although time was added to the “parking lot” for further discussion of these topics at the end of the workshop, individual sessions should account for more discussion following the technical presentation.

## 5. Key workshop attributes & implementation arrangements

### Place, Date and Participants

Dates	23-27 March 2015
Venue	La Palme Hotel in Musanze, Rwanda provided training facilities, including coffee break service, a mini-bus for field site visits, and a reception on Sunday night. La Palme Hotel also provided all accommodations as well as breakfast and lunch for workshop participants.
Participants	Total full-time participants, including training team: 28 Full-time participants, excluding training team: 21 representing 16 USAID operating units Training team: USAID: 2 core, plus additional contributors (see “USAID facilitators,” below) GEMS: 5 (see “GEMS workshop team,” below)
Working language	English

### Staffing and Logistics

Planning leads and coordination	<b>Key planning leads:</b> Logistics: Ashley Fox, Cadmus Participant Registration & Overall Tracking: Ashley Fox, Cadmus Field site selection: Rosie Chekenya & Ashley Fox, Cadmus; Aimée Mpambara, USAID/Rwanda (pre-planning) Material preparation: Mark Stoughton, Cadmus Host Mission team: Aimée Mpambara & Cibeles Garcia Burt, USAID/Rwanda In the two months preceding workshop delivery, 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. Brian Hirsch (AFR BEO) sent the workshop announcement/invitation.
In-country logistics	Kigali-based Silver Limotours provided group transportation to/from Musanze and transportation to/from the field site locations in/around Musanze. USAID/Rwanda supported participants with eCC and visas. GEMS supported participants by arranging airport transfers upon arrival in country, transit hotel bookings, and bookings at La Palme Hotel. La Palme Hotel provided 1 mini bus to support field site transportation on Day 1.

	Logistics supervision was provided by Ashley Fox.
GEMS Workshop Team	<p>Mark Stoughton (Cadmus) served as the Lead trainer.</p> <p>Scott Solberg (Sun Mountain International) served as co-trainer.</p> <p>Patrick Hall (Cadmus) served as co-trainer.</p> <p>Jane Kahata (Cadmus) served as co-trainer.</p> <p>Ashley Fox (Cadmus) provided logistics support.</p>
USAID Training Team	Brian Hirsch (USAID/AFR/SD) and Teresa Bernhard (USAID/E3 BEO) provided the majority of USAID facilitation support, with additional contributions from David Kinyua (USAID/EA REA), Diana Shannon (USAID/SA REA) and Rachel Dagovitz (USAID/GH BEO).

### Contracts, Funding, and Cost-Shares

Cost shares & Sources of funding	<p>Participants' respective missions/offices covered travel and per diem costs for their staff.</p> <p>USAID Facilitators' respective missions/offices covered travel and per diem costs.</p> <p>Using obligated USAID/AFR funding, GEMS covered: 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; case site transport, and transportation to/from Musanze.</p> <p>USAID/Rwanda provided the time of the core mission team (see above) for workshop preparation.</p>
Contract mechanisms	<p>USAID/AFR/SD buy-in to GEMS funded GEMS delivery costs as above.</p> <p>Cadmus, as GEMS prime contractor, subcontracted with Sun Mountain International for the contributions of Scott Solberg. Cadmus contracted with the venue, La Palme Hotel, and Silver Limotours for transportation to/from Musanze and case site transport.</p>

## Agenda, Content and Materials

Development lead	Mark Stoughton, Cadmus														
Agenda	The final agenda is attached.														
Hardcopy materials	<p>Participants were provided with the following materials in hardcopy:</p> <p><b>Sourcebook.</b> 1” three-ring binder containing the agenda, a brief objectives statement/overview of each module, presentations and exercises.</p> <p><b>ENCAP Visual Field Guides.</b> Each participant received a copy of each of the 5 ENCAP Visual Field Guides.</p> <p>Due to quality requirements, the sourcebooks, ENCAP visual field guides, and workshop certificates were reproduced in the US and either shipped or hand-carried to Musanze.</p>														
Memory sticks (Flash Drives)	Participants were provided with an 8GB USB flashdrive containing the sourcebook and an off-line version of the GEMS 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 Musanze.														
USAID-branded hats	Each participant received one USAID-branded baseball cap embroidered with the workshop name, location and dates. The hats were shipped to Musanze.														
USAID-branded water bottles	Each participant received one USAID-branded high-quality reusable water bottle. The water bottles were ordered in the U.S. and shipped to Musanze.														
Case site visits	<p>The final site visit program was as follows. The visits were finalized immediately prior to workshop delivery and hosted by site representatives.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Day &amp; Focus of Visit</th> <th>Group 1</th> <th>Group 2</th> <th>Group 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Day 1: Practicing EIA Skills</td> <td>Agropharm</td> <td>Agropharm</td> <td>Ruhengeri Hospital</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Day 3: Field-Based Environmental Assessment Scoping/EMMP Exercise</td> <td>Bigogwe Milk Collection Center</td> <td>Pyrethrum Plant + Farmers' Cooperatives</td> <td>Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation Project</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Day & Focus of Visit	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Day 1: Practicing EIA Skills	Agropharm	Agropharm	Ruhengeri Hospital	Day 3: Field-Based Environmental Assessment Scoping/EMMP Exercise	Bigogwe Milk Collection Center	Pyrethrum Plant + Farmers' Cooperatives	Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation Project
Day & Focus of Visit	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3												
Day 1: Practicing EIA Skills	Agropharm	Agropharm	Ruhengeri Hospital												
Day 3: Field-Based Environmental Assessment Scoping/EMMP Exercise	Bigogwe Milk Collection Center	Pyrethrum Plant + Farmers' Cooperatives	Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation Project												

## **Attachment: Final Agenda**

## AGENDA (version date: 02 Feb 2015)

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

*An Africa Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff*

Musanze, RWANDA  
23–27 March 2015

#### Overall Goal & Objectives:

The overall goal of the workshop is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in Africa by assuring that participants have the motivation, and knowledge and skills *beyond the introductory level* necessary to: (1) achieve environmental compliance over the life environmentally and programmatically complex projects; and (2) otherwise integrate environmental considerations in project and activity design and management to improve overall project acceptance and sustainability.

#### Overview:

- Day 1 MOTIVATION, CORE EIA CONCEPTS AND SKILLS, PRE-IMPLEMENTATION COMPLIANCE
- Day 2 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, ADVANCED IMPACT ASSESSMENT
- Day 3 FIELD VISITS AND GROUP WORK: EA SCOPING
- Day 4 COMPLIANCE AND BEST PRACTICE FOR INVESTMENT FACILITATION AND SECTORAL ACTIVITIES
- Day 5 BRINGING TRAINING TO REALITY

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
Sun 22 Mar.	ARRIVAL	
6:00 -	Welcome Reception/Dinner	
Mon 23 Mar.	MOTIVATION, CORE EIA CONCEPTS AND SKILLS, PRE-IMPLEMENTATION COMPLIANCE	
8:00 – 8:30.	Registration	
8:30 – 8:45	Welcome & Opening Statements	
8:45 – 9:15	<b>Session 1: Intro &amp; Objectives</b>	Articulate workshop plans, objectives, goals, and participants' introductions and expectations. Review the agenda and logistics.
9:15 – 10:15	<b>Session 2: Environmental Compliance for Environmentally Sound Design &amp; Management</b>	Achieve a common understanding of “environment.” Summarize the legal basis of USAID’s environmental procedures and the life-of-project requirements they establish.
	<i>Part A: Presentation</i>	With illustrations by example, understand the need for such procedures to systematically address environmental issues in development activities—even for activities not primarily focused on “biophysical interventions”
	<i>Part B: Video short</i>	
	<i>Part C: Participant Examples, Brief Discussion</i>	
10:15 – 10:30	Break	

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
10:30-11:30	<b>Session 3: EIA Concepts, Process &amp; Skills, Part I</b> <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	USAID's Environmental Procedures are a specific implementation of the general EIA process. Understanding USAID's procedures requires understanding the general EIA process.  Define key concepts —baseline, impact, activity; brief the EIA process; and learn essential classroom theory for baseline characterization, impact identification & mitigation design and how they apply in the EIA framework. We also establish how the EIA process is a framework for achieving ESDM.
11:30 – noon	<b>Session 4: Field Exercise: Practicing EIA Skills</b> <i>Part A: Briefing</i>	Practice observation skills needed to characterize the baseline situation and identify impacts/issues of concern
noon – 13:00	Lunch	
13:00 – 15:00 <i>(including travel)</i>	<i>Part B: Field Visits</i> <i>Agropharm (2 groups)</i> <i>Ruhengeri Hospital (1 group)</i>	Synthesize field observations and prioritize impacts/issues of concern; discuss possible approaches for limiting adverse effects on the environment.
15:00 – 16:00 <i>(coffee break taken at leisure)</i>	<i>Part C: Group Work &amp; Plenary Synthesis</i>	Synthesize field observations and prioritize impacts/issues of concern; discuss possible approaches for limiting adverse effects on the environment.
16:00 – 17:00	<b>Session 5: Reg. 216: USAID's pre-implementation EIA Process</b> <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Understand USAID's implementation of the EIA process as defined by 22 CFR 216 and the relationship of the process to the program cycle; understand how 22 CFR 216 documents establish environmental management requirements for USAID-funded/managed activities.
<b>Tues 24 Mar.</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, ADVANCED IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
8:30 – 8:45	Day 1 review & Day 2 prospectus	
8:45 – 9:45	<b>Session 6: EIA Skills Part II &amp; "Downstream" compliance: Monitoring, EMMPs &amp; Reporting</b> <i>Part A: Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Review the objective and key principles of environmental monitoring and indicator selection.  Understand EMMP purpose, concept, formats & appropriate level of detail. Introduce a key resource: AFR's <i>EMMP Factsheet</i> .  Understand AFR expectations regarding IP environmental compliance reporting, and the EMMP as the basis for such reporting.
9:45 – 10:00	<i>Part B: Conditions to Actions: Small Group Exercise</i>	Practice a key EMMP skill: translating IEE conditions to specific mitigation actions.
10:00 – 10:15	<b>Break</b>	
10:15 – 10:30	<b>Session 7: Effective IEEs</b> <i>7a: Briefing: IEE Review Criteria, Common gaps, AFR's updated template</i>	Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) are USAID's version of the <i>preliminary assessment</i> and the most common type of Reg. 216 documentation.  This session will brief the characteristics of effective IEEs, summarize common shortfalls from the BEO/REA perspective, and introduce AFR's draft revised IEE templates.

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
10:30—noon	<i>7b: Review, Group Feedback/Discussion</i>	AFR's draft revised IEE templates will be reviewed in-depth in facilitated small group format and feedback provided.
Noon – 12:30	<b>Session 8: Scoping, EA &amp; PEA Basics</b> <i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Understand how USAID Environmental Procedures apply in situations where activities present the potential for significant adverse impacts. Discuss the process and expertise needed to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA), and meaningful alternatives analysis and consultation as essential to the process.
12:30 – 13:30	<b>Lunch</b>	
13:30 – 13:40	<b>Session 9: Impact Assessment “201”</b> <i>Part A: Orientation</i>	In a series of 15 minute mini-briefings, this session introduces a set of key concepts in impact assessment beyond the introductory level. These concepts are then explored in the integrative case study that follows.
13:40–13:55	<i>Part B: Cumulative Impacts</i>	
13:55–14:10	<i>Part C: Indirect Impacts</i>	
14:10 – 14:15	<b>Mini-break</b>	
14:15–14:30	<i>Part D: Ecosystem Services</i>	
14:30 – 14:45	<i>Part E: Social Impacts</i>	
14:45 – 15:00	<i>Part F: GCC &amp; impact assessment</i>	
15:00 – 15:15	<b>Break</b>	
15:15 – 16:30	<b>Session 10: Integrative Case Study(ies)</b>  The Great Ruaha River (TZ) Other(s)?	In small groups, discuss case study briefing materials and identify cumulative, indirect & social impacts, and GCC and ecosystem services issues. Discuss how USAID should approach programming under regional development plans/initiatives to deliver long-term benefits and not worsen unforeseen impacts.
16:30 – 17:00	<b>Session 11: Field-based EA Scoping OR EMMP Exercise</b>  <i>Part A: Site &amp; Exercise Briefing</i>	Over this extended session, small groups will EITHER (1) develop the outline of a scoping statement using a provided template; or (2) develop an EMMP for an EA.  In both cases, the exercise will respond to a provided project scenario and be informed by field visits we undertake at the beginning of Day 3.
17:00 – 17:30	<i>Part B: Group Preparation</i>	Groups view briefing materials and discuss overall approach/strategy
<b>Wed 25 Mar.</b>	<b>FIELD VISITS AND GROUP WORK: EA SCOPING</b>	
8:00–13:00 (includes return)	<i>Part C: Field Visits</i> <i>Sites:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farmer Dairy Cooperative (milk collection and processing, veterinary services)</li> <li>Pyrethrum plant + farmer cooperatives</li> <li>WB/GoR Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting &amp; Hillside Irrigation site near Musanze</li> </ul>	Small groups complete site visits near Musanze. The sites are relevant to the provided project scenarios, and are illustrative of the environmental and social issues presented by the proposed projects.

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
<b>Return – 2:00</b>	<b>Lunch &amp; Freshen up</b>	
14:00 – 17:00 (coffee break taken at leisure)	<i>Part D: Group work: develop outline scoping statement or EMMP; prepare group presentation</i>  <i>BEOs available for “office hours” from 16:00 for any groups that may finish early.</i>	Small groups will synthesize findings and observations from the field visits, working to develop key content of an EA Scoping Statement OR EMMP.  Groups will be ready to present first thing on Thursday morning.
<b>Thurs 26 Mar.</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE AND BEST PRACTICE FOR INVESTMENT FACILITATION AND SECTORAL ACTIVITIES</b>	
8:30 – 8:45	Day 3 review & Day 4 prospectus	
8:45 – 10:15	<i>Part E: Group Presentations</i>	Working groups present their document/findings and recommendations in approx. 20-minute presentations with feedback from facilitators.
<b>10:15 – 10:30</b>	<b>Break</b>	
10:30 – 12:15	<b>Session 12: Best Practice &amp; Compliance for Investment Promotion</b>  <i>Presentation, Small Group Discussions, BEO Panel?</i>	Discuss how the concept of <b>indirect impacts</b> applies to programming approaches in which a donor facilitates private sector investments, but does not fund the investments or have an equity stake.  Overview accepted int'l good practice for such programming approaches.  Identify and discuss how these practices may/should be reflected in 22 CFR 216 determinations and conditions for these activities.
12:15–12:20	<b>Session 13: Sector Mini-sessions I</b>  <i>Part A: Introduction</i>	Briefings on sector-specific new developments and current issues in the area of ESDM and environmental compliance
12:20–12:30	<i>Part B: USAID’s Construction Assessment and implications for activities involving construction</i>	
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch  <i>(reconvene/housekeeping)</i>	
13:35–13:45	<i>Part C: AFR’s PERSUAP “stocktaking” and way forward</i>	Briefing on AFR’s PERSUAP “stocktaking” effort, and discussion of ways forward for a next-generation PERSUAP to reduce costs of preparing review documents and focus effort on safer use in the field.
13:45–13:55	<i>Part D: WQAP Assessment and new model WQAP language</i>	Briefing on AFR’s evaluation of the effectiveness of Water Quality Action Plans (WQAPs), findings, and the new model WQAP language that has resulted. Way forward discussion and feedback.
13:55–14:05	<i>Part E: Medical Waste Management where USAID supports, but does not control, care delivery.</i>	
14:05 – 14:15	<i>Part F: Climate Smart Agriculture</i>	
14:15 – 14:20	Mini-break (session switch)	

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
14:20–15:00	<b>Session 14: Sector Roundtables</b> <i>(Breakout format)</i>	Follow-up on the 10-minute “mini-session” of your choice by joining a follow-on roundtable discussion / Q&A with a BEO/subject expert.  <i>(Multiple roundtables will run concurrently. Choose the one of most interest.)</i>
15:00 – 15:15	Break	
15:15 – 16:00	<b>Session 15: Roles, Responsibilities &amp; Resources</b> <i>Half of session time is reserved for Q&amp;A</i>	Review Environmental Compliance roles and responsibilities, with reference to ADS requirements & the programming cycle. Introduce the key resources available to support environmental compliance and ESDM.
16:00–17:15	<b>Session 16: Synthesis Game</b>	Review of key workshop content in form of a small-team competition
<b>Fri 27 Mar. BRINGING TRAINING TO REALITY</b>		
<b>ATTN: PLEASE arrive at opening session ready for departure</b>		
8:30 – 8:45	Day 4 review & Day 5 prospectus	
8:45 – 9:15	<b>Session 17: “Parking Lot”</b>	Address unresolved questions with reference to the issues and questions “parking lot” created over the course of the workshop.
9:15– 10:15	<b>Session 18: Feedback: Updated AFR Best Practice Standard</b>	As part of its response to the OIG’s global environmental compliance audit, AFR has committed its missions to undertaking an environmental procedures best practices review (BPR) every 5 years. BPRs are a voluntary environmental compliance review of a mission’s portfolio, as well as of mission compliance capacity and processes.  With BPRs just entering their second cycle AFR is updating the “best practice standard” against which BPRs are performed. The update reflects lessons learned and ADS and programming changes.  This session will review and provide feedback on the current draft.
10:15 – 10:30	Break	
10:30–11:30	<b>Session 19: Stocktaking &amp; Action Plans</b>	Work individually and in small groups to develop: (1) key issues/items to communicate to mission/team management after the workshop; (2) individual action plans.
11:30 – 11:45	<b>Session 20: Evaluations</b>	
11:45 – 12:15	<b>Certificates and Closing</b>	
12:15–	Lunch	
13:15	<b>Departure (Buses to Kigali)</b>	

## **Attachment: Evaluation Form**

## Workshop evaluation

### Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management An Africa Regional Advanced Training Workshop for USAID Staff

Musanze, Rwanda ▪ 23–27 March 2015

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

### Highest/Lowest-rated sessions

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

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

**Overall evaluations** *Please check the assessment you most agree with.*

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

**Pre-workshop Knowledge of Env Compliance/ESDM** *Please circle the characterization you most agree with.*

Question	Characterization			Comments
<b>Baseline Knowledge</b> In light of what you have learned in this workshop, how would you rate your understanding of ESDM and USAID's Environmental Procedures BEFORE this workshop?	Had poor or limited understanding	Understood the basics, lacked some details	Had a strong and detailed understanding	

**Impact** *Please circle the characterization you most agree with.*

<b>Knowledge and Skills</b> To what extent has this workshop increased your <u>knowledge and skills</u> to address environmental compliance requirements in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	Not at all	Moderately	Strongly	
<b>Motivation</b> To what extent has this workshop increased your <u>motivation</u> to <i>proactively</i> address environmental compliance and ESDM in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	Not at all	Moderately	Strongly	

**Key topics not covered**

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

**Support needs**

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

***Additional comments welcome on any topic.***