PD. ABH-758

FINAL REPORT

AN EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT PROJECTS

(A.I.D. Project #'s 598-0605/597-0035 & 598-0780)

Contract Number: AEP-0085-I-06-3001-00
Delivery Order No. 6

February 15, 1994

MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
INTERNATIONAL

600 Water Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024
USA

202/484-7170
Fax: 202/488-0754

WPDATA\R_PORTS\1707-006\006-004.W51
(2/94)

FINAL REPORT

AN EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT PROJECTS

(A.I.D. Project #'s 598-0605/597-0035 & 598-0780)

Contract Number: AEP-0085-I-06-3001-00
Delivery Order No. 6

February 15, 1994

ACRONYMS

AAAS	American Academy for the Advancement of Science
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USAID/W	U.S. Agency for International Development/Washington, D.C. Office
BOSCOSA	Forest Conservation and Management Project (USAID/Costa Rica)
CCT	Tropical Science Center
CEQ	U.S. Council on Environmental Quality
CDSS	Country Development Sector Strategy
CORDEP	Cochabamba Regional Development Project (USAID/Bolivia)
DEMO	Development of Environmental Management Organizations Project (USAID/Jamaica)
DEMS	Development of Environmental Management Systems Project
EA	Environmental Assessment
E/NR	Environment and Natural Resources
ESP	Environmental Support Project
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean Bureau
LAC/DR/E	Latin American and Caribbean Region/Development Resources/Environment Division
MAYAREMA	Maya Biosphere Resource Management Project (USAID/Guatemala)
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PARC	Protected Areas Resource Conservation Project (USAID/Jamaica)
PSSA	Professional Services Special Agreement
PSC	Personal Service Contract
PP	Project Paper
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
REA	Regional Environmental Advisor
RENARM	Renewable Natural Resource Management Project
SAR	Semi-Annual Review
RSSA	Resource Services Special Agreement
SUBIR	Sustainable Uses of Biological Resources Project (USAID/Ecuador)
TA	Technical Assistance
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES

ANNEXES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. THE DEMS AND ESP PROJECTS

Since 1979, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has been implementing two sequential projects designed to stimulate and support environmental conservation activities in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region. The Development of Environmental Management Systems (DEMS) Project was authorized in 1979 and carried out through 1989, with an authorization of $10,757,000. This project provided long-term environmental advisors to assist the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) office in Washington, D.C., and three regional environmental advisors (REAs) to serve the needs of Missions in Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. These technical advisory positions have provided USAID Missions, USAID/Washington, and host countries with specialized expertise in project planning, design and evaluation, environmental assessments, special studies and short-term assistance related to national and regional environmental problems. The project also provided grant support for more than 50 pilot projects, studies, and training related to regional environmental issues, and the conservation of biodiversity and tropical forests.

The Environmental Support Project (ESP) was authorized in March of 1990, and has largely formalized and continued the earlier activities of DEMS. The six-year, $12.3 million project consists of three major components:

- authorization for up to 13 long-term technical advisors to assist USAID missions and the LAC/DR/E office, and host country institutions in the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of USAID-supported projects and other natural resource management activities;
- support for pilot projects and studies directly related to biodiversity in LAC region; and
- support for the development of studies and pilot projects focusing on regional environmental issues and training activities, including ad hoc requests from Congress for specific environmental activities.

ESP has been underway for approximately three years, and the present evaluation will serve as a mid-term monitoring of project objectives and accomplishments. At the same time, the evaluation provides an opportunity for USAID to reflect on the results which have occurred as a consequence of both the DEMS and ESP investments. Taking both of these projects in context, the LAC Bureau has been supporting technical assistance, pilot project demonstrations, research and training in environmental management and conservation initiatives through DEMS and ESP for more than 13 years. The present evaluation provides an opportunity for the Bureau and the Agency as a whole to identify the lessons which have been learned during this time, and to indicate how this information can be used to guide future interventions in environmental management and conservation in the region.

2. METHODOLOGY

The DEMS and ESP evaluation was conducted by reviewing written documentation of project activities maintained in the LAC Bureau offices in Washington, D.C., and through interviews with individuals directly or indirectly involved with the projects during the periods of implementation. Interviews were conducted with (a) USAID personnel in Washington D.C.; (b) Mission staff throughout the LAC region; (c) representatives from NGOs, host country agencies, or other donor groups in the LAC region; and (d) individuals or representatives from groups who have received financing for biodiversity and environmental management pilot projects.

Site visits were also conducted by the evaluation team in Ecuador, Barbados, Guatemala, and Honduras. Extensive interviews were conducted with USAID personnel, project-financed Regional Environmental Advisors, host country agencies, and NGO representatives in each of these locations, and field visits were made to review some completed or on-going pilot project activities.

3. RESULTS

The DEMS and ESP projects represent one component of USAID's response to the U.S. Congressional mandates requiring enhanced environmental management in all USAID financed activities. Through increased technical assistance provided by additional environmental specialists in Washington, D.C. and in select regional locations, the projects have attempted to improve USAID's responsiveness to environmental concerns.

The project has resulted in some important beneficial outputs through the financing of technical advisors in both Washington, D.C. and regionally throughout LAC. A summary of the productive outputs which can be at least partly attributed to the activities financed through DEMS and ESP technical assistance services includes the following:

1. The DEMS and ESP projects have made significant contributions to USAID compliance with environmental regulations and Congressional Mandates.

2. The DEMS and ESP projects have enabled the LAC Bureau and country Missions to incorporate Environment and Natural Resources concerns cross-sectorally within USAID. Principally, the dramatic increase in the number of Initial Environmental Examinatons (IEEs) and Environmental Assessments (EAs) completed, project reviews and assistance in project designs has increased the direct responses to these mandates.

3. Project personnel have contributed to increased awareness and responsiveness by USAID Mission personnel in relation to environmental regulations and policies.

However, these services have also been constrained by a variety of factors which can be attributed to the project design or implementation. A summary of these limitations in the technical assistance component of DEMS and ESP includes:

1. The monitoring of most USAID-financed endeavors, as required through Congressional mandates, is inadequate largely due to the limited number of trained personnel available to carry out the required tasks.

2. The demand for the services of LAC/DR/E technical advisors and REAs exceeds the amount of time available for these individuals.

3. The services and capabilities available through the project are poorly understood by USAID Mission personnel.

The pilot projects financed through DEMS and ESP have enabled USAID, host country agencies, other donors, and NGOs to experiment with many potential solutions to environmental problems. The selection and implementation of projects has resulted in many beneficial outputs for USAID Missions, host country agencies, other donors, and NGOs throughout the region, and a summary of these outputs includes the following:

1. Pilot projects particularly addresssed existing Congressional mandates by providing inexpensive demonstrations of potential solutions to a wide range of forest management, biodiversity conservation and other environmental problems.

2. Pilot projects increased the knowledge base from which environmental planning and decision-making could proceed.

3. USAID Mission, host country, and other donor project or program initiatives have emerged as a direct or indirect consequence of earlier pilot project activities.

4. Pilot project activities enhanced the capabilities and increased the participation of many U.S. and host country NGOs in USAID Mission and LAC/DR/E project and program initiatives. For example, pilot projects served as the precedent and influence for the Forest Conservation and Management Project in Costa Rica, the Sustainable Uses of Biological Resources in Ecuador, the Natural Resource Management Project in Bolivia, and several others.

The pilot projects could have been enhanced through improvement in the following items:

1. Project activities were poorly monitored, and the historical record of lessons learned from these initiatives is sparse.

2. The authorization process and disbursement of funds was cumbersome and poorly understood by both USAID and participating NGOs.

3. Requiring NGOs to demonstrate matching funds before disbursement of USAID finances prevented some smaller NGOs from participating in the project.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The DEMS and ESP projects have resulted in a variety of lessons which will be important guides in future LAC environmental interventions. In general, the outputs from the projects can be largely viewed as positive. The projects have significantly contributed to a greater regional and country-specific understanding of environmental issues, and Congressionally mandated responsibilities of USAID. Mission and regional offices have greatly benefitted from having a central office in D.C. which can provide up-to-date interpretations of complex environmental concerns, and from regional advisors to respond to pressing issues. The output from many of the financed pilot projects served as an important foundation for more ambitious environmental interventions implemented by USAID Missions or other donors. These cutting edge pilot projects have demonstrated important paths to pursue or avoid as practical environmental solutions are determined.

The principal limitations of the projects were based on having a greater demand for the services offered than could be satisfied by the personnel involved or financial resources available. This prevented the projects from fully achieving their full potentials. The ambitions of the projects have been constrained by the limited number of specialists assigned to respond to the needs of more than 20 country missions, while maintaining on-going communication with Congressional and other governmental and NGO entities in the U.S. At the same time, the projects have provided poor documentation of results, and have rarely been able to provide the depth of assistance and training which is strongly needed by regional and country mission personnel. This has severely limited the learning process which should result from such an ambitious endeavor as DEMS and ESP.

A synthesis of the key lessons learned from the implementation of DEMS and ESP, and suggestions for actions which could enhance the outputs from ESP in its remaining years, or other similar environmental initiatives which may be mobilized in the LAC region in years to come can be summarized as follows:

1. The number of advisors supported through the LAC/DR/E office in Washington, D.C. should be maintained or increased. At a minimum, administrative assistants should be hired.

2. The LAC/DR/E office should increase the visibility and understanding of its role and services.

3. A standardized monitoring and reporting framework should be instituted by LAC/DR/E for services provided.

4. The REA positions should increasingly emphasize project design support, regional environmental strategies, communications between LAC/DR/E and

mission offices, and liaisons with host country agency organizations and other donors.

5. REAs should begin to direct a greater percentage of their efforts to training Mission personnel in environmental assessment and monitoring procedures.

6. REAs should be converted from a status of Personal Services Contract (PSC) to one of a Direct-Hire staff. Due to the paucity of USAID personnel with technical training in ecological and environmental sciences, REA personnel should continue to emphasize individuals with extensive training in the biophysical aspects of environmental management, and who have experience working with environmental policy and economic dimensions of environmental issues.

7. A minimum of three REAs should be retained, including representatives for Central America, South America and the Caribbean regions. The REAs should continue to be stationed in a USAID Mission office that provides the most conducive location for regional travel and communication.

8. Technical assistance should increase the attention provided to urban and industrial pollution, coastal zone degradation, water resource management needs, and other such "brown" concerns.

9. The financing of pilot projects designed to demonstrate creative solutions to persistent environmental problems should be continued along the original project themes, but also to include projects designed to demonstrate solutions to urban environmental problems and to stimulate projects that increase local NGO self-reliance, and enhance government/NGO communication. LAC/DR/E should strive to mobilize 3-5 pilot projects each year through the life the ESP project.

10. The financing and accounting mechanisms for supported pilot projects could be simplified and improved by allowing a single contractor to implement the activity.

11. Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans should be updated and strengthened in some locations as a response to changing legal, political, and environmental conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since 1979, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has been implementing two sequential projects designed to stimulate and support environmental conservation activities in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region. The Development of Environmental Management Systems (DEMS) Project was authorized in 1979 and carried out through 1989, with an authorization of $10,757,000. The project consisted of three major components: (1) the provision of long-term technical advisors to assist the Washington D.C. LAC/DR/E Office and USAID Missions, and benefit host countries in the design, implementation, and evaluation of USAID-supported projects and other natural resource management activities; (2) support for pilot projects and studies directly related to biodiversity and specific applications in the LAC region; and (3) support for the development of studies and pilot projects focusing on regional environmental issues and training activities, including ad hoc requests from Congress for specific environmental activities.

The DEMS project was informally defined, and no Project Paper (PP) was ever produced. However, through funding allocations, this project provided long-term environmental advisors to assist the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) office in Washington, D.C., and three regional environmental advisors (REAs) to serve the needs of Missions in Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. These technical advisory positons have provided USAID Missions and host countries with specialized expertise in project planning, design and evaluation, environmental assessments, special studies and short-term assistance related to national and regional environmental problems. The project also provided grant support for more than 50 pilot projects, studies, and training related to regional environmental issues, and the conservation of biodiversity and tropical forests.

The Environmental Support Project (ESP) was authorized in March of 1990, and has largely formalized and continued the earlier activities of DEMS. The six-year, $12.3 million project is intended to strengthen the capacity of the LAC Bureau to respond to Congressional mandates to protect tropical forests and biological diversity, and to take a lead in the implementation of the LAC Bureau Global Warming Initiative, which emphasizes reforestation, biodiversity conservation, energy efficiency, energy planning, and renewable energy sources. The project is also designed to increase the number of USAID personnel trained to work in environmental and natural resource management (E/NR).

The ESP project consists of three major components:

- authorization for up to 13 long-term technical advisors to assist USAID missions and the LAC/DR/E office, and host country institutions in the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of USAID-supported projects and other natural resource management activities;
- support for pilot projects and studies directly related to biodiversity in LAC region; and
- support for the development of studies and pilot projects focusing on regional environmental issues and training activities, including ad hoc requests from Congress for specific environmental activities.

A more specific description of the components and activities financed through the DEMS and ESP projects is provided in Appendix C.

1.1 Project Structure

The ESP project, much like its predecessor in DEMS, is structured to provide a supportive relationship between the central LAC/DR/E office in Washington, D.C. and country Missions throughout the LAC region. The project finances four advisory positions in the LAC/DR/E office, including three Environmental/Natural Resource advisors, and one Pest/Pesticide Management Advisor. These individuals serve as the linkage between Congressional mandated environmental responses by USAID, and field operations by USAID Missions in the LAC region. The general responsibilities of these individuals include providing technical backstopping on all environmental and natural resource management issues for USAID personnel in D.C. (USAID/W), and as a liaison on issues for Mission personnel throughout the region. These individuals generally serve as a critical source of information on technical, legislative, or policy issues for USAID personnel throughout the region.

The ESP project also finances three regional environmental advisors (REAs) based, respectively, in Guatemala, Barbados, and Ecuador. These individuals provide assistance in the areas of environmental impact assessment and mitigation, monitoring and environmental and natural resource management program development for USAID missions and host country institutions. They are also available to collect and disseminate technical information regarding host country and regional environmental issues, and assist in training host country and USAID personnel in environmental management. A fourth advisor is based in Puerto Rico, and specifically provides technical assistance on forestry issues throughout the Caribbean region.

The project(s) also provide a mechanism for NGOs to receive grant funding for environmental and natural resource pilot projects in the following areas: (1) biological resource inventory/survey, (2) sustainable management of forest (including non-timber) and water resources, (3) protected area development and management, (4) education/training and institution building. These projects, generally involving an alliance between host country and U.S. non-governmental organizations, are presented by NGO groups to country Mission offices. After receiving endorsement for the proposed pilot project from the USAID country Missions, the proposal is then forwarded by the Mission to LAC/DR/E for review and possible authorization. USAID grant financing requires the recipient NGO(s) to leverage 100 percent matching funds before financial disbursement is carried out. Implementation of the proposed pilot project is then carried out by the recipient NGO(s), with oversight provided by USAID Mission project officers. The objectives of these pilot projects are to:

A. Increase local and regional awareness and knowledge of environmental and natural resource management issues.

B. Demonstrate viable solutions for problems.

C. Provide an opportunity for NGOs to leverage the financial and technical resources for environmental management projects through the provision of seed money.

D. Encourage innovative approaches to environmental problems common throughout the region.

E. Focus the attention of host country institutions and USAID Missions on environmental issues of national or regional concern.

F. Provide an opportunity to strengthen local governmental or non-governmental institutions in order to improve local and regional capabilities in environmental management.

Additional grant funding has also been made available to carry out specific research and analysis endeavors within the LAC region. These research efforts were largely designed to provide country, regional, or topic-specific profiles defining environmental issues and appropriate responses which could be carried out by USAID or other donors.

1.2 Congressional Mandates for Environment and Conservation

The U.S. Congress has ordered USAID to follow a clearly defined set of environmental mandates. These procedures are modeled on the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), authorized by Congress in 1969, and subsequent guidelines developed by the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The environmental policy for USAID is specified in federal regulations CFR 22, Part 216. In summary, this legislation requires USAID to:

- Ensure that environmental consequences of USAID-financed activities are identified and considered by both USAID and the host country prior to a final decision to proceed, and that appropriate environmental safeguards are adopted within the project;

- Assist developing countries in strengthening their capabilities to appreciate and effectively evaluate the potential environmental effects of proposed development strategies and projects, and to select, implement, and manage effective environmental programs;

- Identify all impacts upon the environment resulting from USAID's actions, including those aspects of the biosphere affecting endangered species (Section 216.5) which are the common and cultural heritage of all humanity; and

- Define environmentally limiting factors which constrain development, and identify and carry out activities that assist in restoring the renewable resource base on which sustained development depends.

Sections 117 and 118 of the Foreign Assistance Act identify the procedures which USAID should follow in minimizing or avoiding adverse impacts to tropical forests and biodiversity. These mandates are advanced in Section 533 (c)(3) of the 1991 Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, which prohibits the use of economic assistance funds for "any program, project or activity which would result in any significant loss of tropical forest; or involve commercial timber extraction in primary tropical forest areas." The Act further requires USAID to make certain findings or determinations, before supporting any activities that could directly or indirectly affect tropical forest conditions. Specifically, Section 533 requires USAID to complete an EA which would accomplish the following:

(a) make specific environmental findings and disclose certain environmental impacts on tropical forests,
(b) determine if impacts are of a significant nature,
(c) identify if commercial timber extraction will occur in primary tropical forest areas,
(d) identify potential impacts from proposed activities on biological diversity within the affected area,
(e) demonstrate that all timber extraction will be conducted according to an environmentally sound management system which maintains the ecological function of the natural forest and minimizes impacts on biological diversity, and
(f) demonstrate that the activity will contribute to reducing deforestation.

In general, the Congressional mandates are designed to ensure that actions financed and carried out by USAID will not result in a significant loss or impairment of tropical forests or biological diversity. In situations where adverse impacts might occur, USAID is required to conduct the necessary investigation to ensure that potential impacts are identified, and that appropriate monitoring and mitigation measures are included to avoid or minimize the impacts.

One specific item included in the Congressional mandates is the directive to hire and train more USAID professional staff in environmental management. It is in this way that both the DEMS and ESP projects represent a direct response to the Congressional mandates.

2. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The stated purpose of the evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of DEMS and ESP in (1) providing technical support to Missions and USAID/W in the environment/natural resources management field; (2) stimulating Mission interest in important and unique pilot programs for the conservation of biological diversity; (3) supporting the development of country-specific and regional environmental studies; and (4) assisting in addressing the E/NR Congressional mandates as they arise.

ESP has been ongoing for approximately three years, and the present evaluation will serve as a mid-term monitoring of project objectives and accomplishments. At the same time, the

evaluation provides an opportunity for USAID to reflect on the results which have occurred as a consequence of both the DEMS and ESP investments. Taking both of these projects in context, the LAC Bureau has been supporting technical assistance, pilot project demonstrations, research and training in environmental management and conservation initiatives through DEMS and ESP for more than 13 years. The present evaluation provides an opportunity for the Bureau and the Agency as a whole to identify the lessons which have been learned during this time, and to indicate how this information can be used to guide future interventions in environmental management and conservation in the region.

The specific terms of reference for the evaluation are presented in Appendix A.

3. APPROACH

3.1 METHODOLOGY

The DEMS and ESP evaluation was conducted by reviewing written documentation of project activities maintained in the LAC Bureau offices in Washington, D.C., and through interviews with individuals directly or indirectly involved with the projects during the periods of implementation. Interviews were conducted with (a) USAID personnel in Washington D.C.; (b) Mission staff throughout the LAC region; (c) representatives from NGOs, host country agencies, or other donor groups in the LAC region; and (d) individuals or representatives from groups who have received financing for biodiversity and environmental management pilot projects. The questions posed in these interviews primarily addressed the experiences individuals have obtained working as a member of, or in association with, the DEMS or ESP projects. In addition, the interviews enabled individuals to identify the lessons learned from project activities, and indicated some important concerns and directions for USAID to be considering in planning future environmental management interventions in the LAC region. A list of individuals interviewed is included in Annex E. A list of the questions used in the interviews for each representative group is included in Annex F.

The literature search revealed a variety of documents which chronicle DEMS and ESP project activities and results. These documents include annual project activity summaries and Semi-Annual reports; publications and reports which have resulted from project-financed endeavors by both government and NGO entities; and memorandums providing a chronicle of actions and results. A list of the more important documents and reports consulted is included in Section 6.

Site visits were also conducted by the evaluation team in Ecuador, Barbados, Guatemala, and Honduras. Site visits were selected for Ecuador, Barbados and Guatemala to facilitate direct meetings with REAs based in each location. In Guatemala, the REA also arranged and participated in field visits to pilot project initiatives. A site visit to Honduras was timed to coincide with an unrelated assignment by one of the evaluation team members. Extensive interviews were conducted with USAID personnel, project-financed Regional Environmental Advisors, host country agencies, and NGO representatives in each of these locations, and field visits were made to review some completed or on-going pilot project activities.

The information obtained from the literature and file search, interviews, and site visits were compiled and evaluated using the qualitative methodology. The information was used to generate a list of direct and indirect outputs from the project(s), and to indicate the relationship between these outputs and the original project objectives. Information from the interviews and documents were then used to determine the significance of these outputs, and the pertinent lessons learned from implementation of the project(s).

4. RESULTS

The DEMS and ESP projects represent one component of USAID's response to the U.S. Congressional mandates requiring enhanced environmental management in all USAID-financed activities. Through increased technical assistance provided by additional environmental specialists in Washington, D.C. and in select regional locations, the pro have attempted to improve USAID's responsiveness to environmental concerns.

The projects have resulted in some important beneficial outputs through the financing of technical advisors in both Washington, D.C. and regionally throughout LAC. Section 4.1 describes some of the productive outputs which can be at least partly attributed to the activities financed through DEMS and ESP technical assistance services. However, these services have also been constrained by a variety of factors which can be attributed to the project design or implementation. A summary of these limitations in the technical assistance component of DEMS and ESP is presented in Section 4.2.

The pilot projects financed through DEMS and ESP have enabled USAID, host country agencies, other donors, and NGOs to experiment with many potential solutions to environmental problems. The selection and implementation of projects has resulted in many beneficial outputs for USAID Missions, host country agencies, other donors, and NGOs throughout the region, and a summary of these outputs in included in Section 4.3. The limitations or constraints experienced in this pilot project component of the projects is then reviewed in Section 4.4.

4.1 OUTPUTS FROM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The technical assistance component of the DEMS and ESP projects has made significant contributions to improved environmental management capabilities within USAID. Specifically, the projects have provided important support in USAID's efforts to respond to Congressional mandates, and enhanced the capacity of Missions to address and incorporate environmental issues within their portfolios. Table 1 provides a concise summary of the positive outputs which can be discerned from the technical assistance provided through DEMS and ESP financed personnel.

Between 1979-89 the DEMS project financed 108 activities, with an expenditure of $11,841,302. Of this total, 45 activities financed through PASA, RSSA, PSC, or AAAS agreements were intended to support on-going technical assistant efforts in both Washington, D.C. and regional or country-specific locations. This suggests that the demand for technical assistance is high, and USAID is able to respond to at least some of this demand through the

DEMS and ESP initiatives. The full listing of activities financed from 1979-89 is included in Appendix G.

Table 1. Productive Outputs from Technical Assistance

1. Project activities have enhanced USAID compliance with Congressional mandates.

2. Technical assistance provided through LAC/DR/E and the REAs has enabled LAC Bureau and Missions to incorporate E/NR concerns cross-sectorally within USAID.

3. DEMS and ESP have demonstrated improved mechanisms for evaluating environmental impacts and establishing mitigation efforts.

4. Technical assistance efforts have increased the awareness and responsiveness by Mission personnel in relation to environmental regulations and policies.

4.1.1 The DEMS and ESP projects have made significant contributions to USAID compliance with environmental regulations and Congressional Mandates.

The principal requirement of recent Congressional environmental mandates is for USAID to anticipate and mobilize effective responses to the needs for conservation of biodiversity and improved management of tropical forests throughout the LAC region. One of the more prominent mechanisms for addressing this mandate is the use of environmental assessments (EA), and subsequent mitigation and monitoring programs designed to carry out EA findings and recommendations. All USAID-financed projects and activities now include the EA process, which is recognized as a component of the project design.

The EA process begins with an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE), in which a reviewer determines if the proposed actions will have a significant impact on the environment. If the determination is that the activity will produce significant impacts, then a more comprehensive EA is carried out. The EA document is structured to predict the impacts of proposed activities on the physical, biological and social environment within the area affected by the activities. The EA then develops a set of responses which can then be implemented to mitigate or avoid any of the adverse impacts anticipated.

As defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the EA is required to identify all potential environmental impacts, and then suggest mitigative measures which could be pursued to minimize or avoid any adverse impacts. In many instances, the recommended mitigative measures are ultimately incorporated into a final project design.

The LAC/DR/E technical staff has assumed the responsibility for supervising, and, in some cases, carrying out this EA process throughout the LAC region. From 1982-1993 LAC/DR/E staff processed 674 IEEs, and 61 EAs. The Scopes of Work (SOW) for many of these EAs were prepared by LAC/DR/E staff or their REA counterparts in the field. Some of these IEEs were actually written by LAC/DR/E staff, and most of the IEES and EAs were reviewed and either approved or revised by the technical advisors or REAs financed through DEMS and ESP.

LAC/DR/E staff and REAs also serve an important role in interpreting the purpose and requirements of IEES and EAs for other agency personnel in Washington, D.C., Mission officials, NGOs, and representatives from other countries. It is apparent that many staff members from these latter groups still do not fully understand the intent and authority of an EA, and require this technical assistance.

Mission personnel also make frequent requests to LAC/DR/E staff and REA for assistance in interpreting environmental codes and Congressional mandates as they apply to specific project actions or program directions. A review of semi-annual reports indicates that LAC/DR/E technical advisors and REAs provide this interpretive assistance to Mission Directors, Environmental and Project officers several times each week.

4.1.2 The DEMS and ESP projects have assisted the LAC Bureau and Missions in incorporating Environment and Natural Resources concerns cross-sectorally within USAID.

Recent USAID directives have identified environmental concerns as a strategic objective supporting all agency program and project initiatives. In a statement issued February 3, 1994, the USAID Administrator stated before the U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs that sustainable development programs authorized should address the root causes of environmental harm, promote environmentally-sound patterns of growth and support improved management of the environment and natural resources. These activities include efforts to address urgent global environmental challenges, including the loss of biological diversity and global climate change, as well as efforts to address significant environmental problems within countries and regions. This directive essentially instructs all USAID sectors to recognize and incorporate environmental management needs within the domain of responsibility. The DEMS and ESP projects have contributed to this ideological evolution within USAID in several ways, principally through the development of policy documents, and by elevating the attention given to environmental accountability in project and program development.

The increasing emphasis and importance given to the preparation of EAs, and environmental management measures built within project designs, has raised the awareness of environmental needs within Mission personnel and USAID/W staff. The majority of USAID personnel interviewed attributed their recognition of the prominence of environment concerns to the increased emphasis being placed on environmental accountability within the agency. Individuals reported that while environment and natural resources (E/NR) was once seen to be a unique sector of its own, environmental management concerns are now viewed as an integral component of all sector activities. The requirement that all USAID initiatives prepare

an IEE, and potentially an EA, has strengthened this recognition. LAC/DR/E technical advisors and REAs have enhanced this recognition by providing assistance in IEE and EA preparation, review, and enforcement in all sectors.

In January of 1993 the LAC Bureau of USAID and the World Resources Institute published **Green Guidance for Latin America and the Caribbean: Integrating Environmental Concerns in A.I.D. Programming**. This document establishes a framework from which USAID/W and Mission personnel can define the principal environmental problems in the LAC region and incorporate environmental responses cross-sectorally into projects and programs. The document also demonstrates how USAID can involve governments in the region, other donors, NGOs, private enterprises and interested citizens in this process.

Documents such as **Green Guidance** provide a thorough demonstration of the ways in which every major sector of LAC affects and is affected by environmental degradation and resource depletion, ranging from pollution to soil erosion to loss of genetic resources. The document indicates the cross-sectoral impacts of environmental issues, which are most often manifested as economic losses and harm to human health and well-being. The report provides a detailed guide to overcoming these problems by applying crosscutting sectoral principles to effective actions which can be carried out The goal of the document is to ensure that policies, programs, and projects mobilized by USAID will integrate the sustainability of the environmental and natural resources base into traditional development programs and all activities of USAID, other governments, private enterprises, and citizens.

The LAC/DR/E technical advisors played a significant role in the development of this document, and have been actively working to promote and initiate its recommendations throughout the region. The document has been used to guide modifications in several USAID country development strategies (CDSS), regional program initiatives such as the Regional Natural Resource Management Project (RENARM) in Central America, and project designs and evaluations. The USAID Environmental Strategy for Jamaica (1992), and the subsequent Development of Environmental Management Organizations (DEMO) project in Jamaica, both of which received considerable technical input from LAC/DR/E staff and the Caribbean REA, are clear indications of ways in which environmental responses are being woven through a variety of sectors, including Health, Urban Development, Small Enterprise Development, and Education.

LAC Bureau officers stated that USAID Missions could be held accountable to the strategic objectives identified in publications emerging in USAID/W, regional or Mission policy statements. It is likely that Missions failing to respond to these objectives will be told to modify their programs as needed. This is a major commitment on the part of USAID to environmental responsibility, and DEMS and ESP-financed technical advisors can share at least a part of its reason for being in place.

4.1.3 Technical assistance provided through the projects has enhanced the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of environmental/natural resource projects in the LAC region.

Technical staff from the LAC/DR/E office and REAs have participated directly in the development, design, and review of E/NR projects in the LAC region, either as part of the EA team, or, in some cases on design or evaluation teams. The extensive experience of the technical advisors working with USAID environmental legislation, mandates and policies has provided an essential complement to regional or Mission-driven initiatives. REAS and LAC/DR/E technical staff have reviewed and contributed to virtually all of the environmental strategies and E/NR projects which have been developed in the region during the life of the DEMS and ESP projects. The assistance of these specialists helped ensure the responsiveness of the projects and related reports to changing USAID goals and objectives, and the Congressional mandates.

LAC/DR/E staff or REAs worked directly on design or review teams for the Development of Environmental Management Organizations (DEMO) project in Jamaica, the Sustainable Use of Biological Resources (SUBIR) project in Ecuador, the Cochabamba Regional Development Project (CORDEP), and numerous others in the region. Technical staff were involved in the planning and development strategies for RENARM for Central America, and participated in the development of country environmental strategies for several Caribbean and South American USAID Missions. At the invitation of Project Officers or other Mission staff, they have provided on-going technical advice during the implementation and modification of these projects.

Technical advisors from LAC/DR/E have recently begun a review of completed EAs to determine the degree to which recommended mitigative measures have been carried out. The results from this review will show the follow-up actions required to ensure that AID remains in compliance with Congressional environmental mandates. These results will also be important to demonstrate the project monitoring mechanisms which must be incorporated into LAC/DR/E practices.

Several environmental officers in USAID Mission offices offered strong praise for the quality and effectiveness of technical assistance provided principally through the central LAC/DR/E Washington, D.C. office. These officers credited the technical advisors in LAC/DR/E with increasing their understanding of USAID environmental policies and mandates, and in facilitating the necessary communication which must be maintained between the field offices and USAID/W. They also acknowledged that the participation of the technical advisors in specific project designs or reviews strengthened the overall environmental responsibility of the project.

4.1.4 Project personnel have contributed to increased awareness and responsiveness by USAID Mission personnel in relation to environmental regulations and policies.

Environmental accountability and responsibility is rapidly becoming institutionalized within USAID. Unquestionably, there is still considerable ground to cover as USAID personnel discover the financial, personnel, and infrastructure commitments essential to enacting meaningful environmental actions. However, the issues of environmental and ecological concern have become a recognized focus throughout the various agency sectors. Evidence of this increased environmental awareness is demonstrated in the cross-sectoral adoption of environmental issues described in Section 4.1.2.

To indicate the ways in which DEMS and ESP-financed technical advisors have contributed to this increased awareness and responsiveness, it is useful to define some of the duties routinely carried out by these personnel. In soliciting, supervising, and approving project and program EAs, the advisors provide a direct interpretation of the environmental implications of proposed activities. Advisors also review documents from on-going projects and programs, and provide technical guidance to ensure that implemented activities are providing the best possible environmental inputs. Frequently, the LAC/DR/E advisors and REAs work directly with Mission personnel in the field to respond to environmental conflicts , and expand the environmental impact of proposed or on-going activities.

The demand for this technical assistance has steadily increased since the inception of DEMS, and accelerated in recent years. The significant demand for these technical services was the original impetus for establishing the REAs in the field. The intent was to enable LAC regional Missions to access necessary technical assistance in environmental management needs quickly and effectively. The consistent demands for assistance from these REAs and the LAC/DR/E advisors indicates that the awareness of environmental needs has increased, and that USAID personnel are attempting to respond to mandates and recognized management needs.

4.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENT

It is important to also identify the ways in which the technical assistance component of DEMS and ESP did not fully achieve its potential. By analyzing these limitations, constraints, or inappropriate aspects experienced through the project, we can best determine how to improve future efforts, both in the remaining years of ESP and through other forthcoming USAID environmental responses. A summary of these limitations is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Limitations of the Technical Assistance

1. The demand for the services of LAC/DR/E technical advisors and REAs exceeds the amount of time available for these individuals.

2. The services and capabilities available through the project are poorly understood by USAID Mission personnel.

3. On-going monitoring and evaluation of some USAID-financed and Congressionally mandated endeavors, particularly environmental assessments and pilot project sub-grants, is inadequate largely due to the limited number of trained personnel available to carry out the required tasks.

4.2.1 The demand for the services of LAC/DR/E technical advisors and REAs exceeds the amount of time available for these individuals.

Many of the limitations or constraints experienced during the course of implementing DEMS and ESP have been largely the result of having a greater demand for technical assistance needs than can be supplied through existing environmental advisors. It should be pointed out that fulfilling the mandates of the DEMS and ESP projects is only one of several responsibilities bestowed upon these advisors. At various times these individuals may be carrying out the mandates of several other, possibly unrelated, project designs.

The REA for the Caribbean, for example, indicated that approximately 112 business days were spent in the field in both 1992 and 1993 providing Mission support, monitoring and evaluation of projects, assisting in host country training and other activities, and providing other specialized technical services upon the request of the ESP Project Officer. This REA commented that, even with this demanding travel schedule, he could have fulfilled even more demands if time had been available. All of the other REAs concurred with this observation. A review of their semi-annual reports shows very similar travel schedules and demands for services throughout each year.

The environmental response being mobilized by USAID has not achieved the potential needed. It is clear from the results of DEMS and ESP that the need for environmental management actions by USAID in the region is very real, and demands a stronger response than is presently being provided. If USAID is truly to consider environmental management and responsibility as a pillar of its operations, then the agency will need to establish the technical and administrative capacity to fulfill this goal.

The demands being placed on these advisors also prevents them from providing the depth of assistance that may be necessary to fully accomplish the environmental management tasks required in specific situations. LAC/DR/E directors have commented that they are frequently reluctant to encourage technical advisors to undertake extensive travel in the region, largely

because the volume of research, communications, and evaluation tasks which must be completed in Washington, D.C. will suffer. Similarly, Mission Directors and Project Officers in the USAID Missions housing the REAs have commented that they feel the REAs should travel less within the region, and devote more time to issues and concerns within that specific Mission.

This suggests that the extent of environmental response being mobilized by USAID has not achieved the potential needed. It also is a clear statement that the need for environmental management actions by USAID in the region is very real, and demands a stronger response than is presently being provided. If USAID is truly to consider environmental management and responsibility as a pillar of its operations, then the agency will need to establish the technical and administrative capacity to fulfill this goal. This will require a significant increase in the number of professional staff members, both in bureau offices in Washington, D.C. and throughout the LAC region in the field, who are capable and confident to work with environmental reviews, designs, and accountability. It will also require the infrastructure necessary to support such actions, including travel needs, training opportunities, and communication and information exchange facilities.

4.2.2 The services and capabilities available through the project are poorly understood by USAID Mission personnel.

In general, most Mission personnel are aware of the existence of the LAC/DR/E bureau office and the REAs, and have a fair understanding of some of the services available from these individuals. However, few Mission personnel felt they fully understood the purpose and services which this sector is required to fulfill. For most Mission staff, the technical advisors supported through DEMS and ESP represent the environmental "watchdogs" within USAID. These individuals are mostly seen as the entity responsible for ensuring that USAID complies with legislative and policy mandates, and as a potential source of technical information if no other immediate source can be found.

What is lost in this limited understanding of the LAC/DR/E role are the numerous other services which can be utilized to strengthen project, program, and policy designs; mobilize multi-lateral responses to problems; or respond to other government or private sector environmental management needs. While the technical advisors do assist with these needs, their participation appears to be much less than the demand, and certainly less than the attention given to other consistent demands for project environmental reviews, inter-agency communications, and legislative responses.

Several Mission Environmental Officers and other specialists in the LAC region reported that they do not usually consider the LAC/DR/E technical advisors or the REAs when seeking project or program design or implementation assistance, or when attempting to coordinate multi-organization activities. They report that they do not generally view these services as part of the repertoire available from these technical advisors, and are more likely to seek other agency assistance or contract outside support for these services. It is also rarely recognized that these technical assistance services are available without charge to Missions.

Given the present overwhelming demand for technical advisory services, as described in Section 4.2.1, it may seem inappropriate to suggest that the advisors should increase the nature and extent of services provided. However, the fact that demand is greater than supply should not encourage a dismissal of the demand. Instead, this represents further indications of the need to expand and strengthen the response which LAC/DR/E is capable of providing. It also suggests that the LAC/DR/E staff need to "market" their services with more informed definitions of the roles and capabilities of the technical staff, and to transfer some of their routine environmental review tasks, such as IEE and EA analyses, to the Missions, themselves.

4.2.3 On-going monitoring and evaluation of some USAID-financed and Congressionally mandated endeavors, particularly environmental assessments and pilot project sub-grants, is inadequate largely due to the limited number of trained personnel available to carry out the required tasks.

A principal consequence of insufficient technical staff to meet the demands for environmental assistance is a lack of follow-up and monitoring on EAs and project designs. A completed EA typically includes a set of recommendations intended to help mitigate or avoid any potential adverse environmental impacts which could occur as a result of implementing the proposed activities. These mitigative measures, in essence, represent an environmental "action plan" which can be built into the project or activity. However, financial constraints, limited technical or institutional capacity, or plain negligence on the part of the implementing agency sometimes prevent these mitigative measures from ever being carried out.

An important role for the LAC/DR/E technical advisors and REAs to fulfill is the monitoring of completed environmental reviews to ensure that recommended corrective measures are, in fact, done. These advisors also represent an important source of technical guidance for Project Officers and implementing agencies as they determine the mechanisms to use in carrying out these mitigative measures. However, with the excessive demands being placed upon them to simply complete the basic IEE and EAs, and respond to Congressional, inter-agency, and other requests, these advisors have not been able to provide the extent of monitoring that is warranted to ensure that mitigative measures and other recommendations are being carried out appropriately and effectively. Some follow-up monitoring and technical assistance in the implementation of EA recommendations is carried out by the REAs, but even these individuals are only able to provide limited assistance due, again, to demands for other services.

There are very few records available to show how EAs or other environmental reviews actually influenced and improved project and program activities. Essentially, this turns the EA into more of a historical record showing that the project or program, did, in fact, consider potential environmental impacts at one point. However, it weakens the potential for these analyses to serve as the springboards for environmental action plans that can actually improve the implementation of USAID projects and programs.

Similarly, the monitoring of pilot project initiatives has been very limited. This has resulted in poor documentation of pilot project results, and limited awareness of the significant impacts which have resulted from these cutting edge investments. This poor monitoring has been raised as a consistent issue is virtually every semi-annual review produced during both the DEMs and ESP projects. A more detailed discussion of this DEMS and ESP limitation is provided in Section 4.4.3.

4.3 OUTPUTS FROM FINANCED PILOT PROJECTS

Existing records indicate that the DEMS and ESP projects have financed 58 biodiversity pilot projects and studies in five general theme areas: (1) Biological Resource Inventory/Survey, (2) Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources, (3) Protected Areas, and (4) Education/Training (including Institution Strengthening), and (5) Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans. These pilot projects have provided valuable incentives for NGOs in the U.S. and other countries to mobilize demonstrations of possible solutions to pressing environmental problems. Finances provided through DEMS and ESP also enabled NGOs to obtain funds from other sources to address conservation and environmental management needs in the LAC region. The pilot projects also greatly contributed to the knowledge base of conservation needs and opportunities in the region, and identified actions which could be carried out to respond to some of these needs.

Insufficient funds forced LAC/DR/E to discontinue this pilot project activity for fiscal year 1994, and it is uncertain if this ESP component will be revitalized in the future. Given the many productive results from these pilot efforts, this appears to be a very unfortunate occurrence. Still, it will be important to review the consequences of projects which have been financed throughout the history of DEMS and ESP, and to determine the role and value of such pilot project activities in the future of ESP or other USAID projects or programs which may emerge. A summary of the productive outputs from the pilot project components of DEMS and ESP is presented in Table 3. Section 4.4 then describes some of the limitations or constraints of the pilot project component experienced during the course of the DEMS and ESP projects.

Table 3. Productive Outputs from Pilot Projects

1. Pilot projects provided inexpensive demonstrations of potential solutions to a wide range of environmental problems, and particularly addressed existing Congressional mandates.

2. Pilot projects increased the knowledge base from which environmental planning and decision-making could proceed.

3. USAID Mission, host country, and other donor project or program initiatives have emerged as a direct or indirect consequence of earlier pilot project activities.

4. Pilot project activities enhanced the capabilities and increased the participation of many U.S. and host country NGOs in USAID Mission and LAC/DR/E project and program initiatives.

4.3.1 Pilot projects provided inexpensive demonstrations of potential solutions to a wide range of environmental problems, and particularly addressed existing Congressional mandates.

The diversity of environmental issues facing countries in the LAC region is very great. Declining urban and rural water quality, coastal zone degradation and deteriorating fisheries, loss of forest cover and associated wildlife habitat, the disappearance of species before they are even recorded as an entity - the list is long, and the problems continue to mount daily. Perhaps the most complex problems, in terms of root causes and meaningful responses, are centered around the degradation of ecological and biological systems, and the correlated loss of biodiversity. We know so little about the dynamics of these systems that our strategies for reversing degradation trends are hopeful experiments, at best. However, this experimentation is essential, and must be widely replicated and expanded, if we have any hope of truly reversing the very obvious breakdown in biophysical and ecological systems that we are now witnessing.

The DEMS and ESP projects attempted to respond to this need by providing grant funds for U.S.-based or other NGOs willing to undertake research, demonstration, or training activities that could enhance our knowledge of practical solutions to environmental problems. The primary focus of these pilot projects were to investigate threats to biodiversity, tropical forests, watersheds, and natural systems, which enabled these projects to particularly demonstrate practical solutions to issues emphasized in the Congressional mandates. A total of 58 pilot projects were financed between 1980 and 1994, and several projects are still being implemented.

Unfortunately, the written records documenting the consequences of these projects are sparse (see Section 4.4.3 below). However, a considerable number of beneficial outputs have been observed in terms of enhanced technical information; follow-on project developments; and

increased technical capacity of NGO, USAID, and other participating personnel. The technical information which has resulted from pilot project activities includes (a) baseline scientific data, which can guide more detailed research and planning; (b) practical results from resource management schemes; (c) regional environmental, social, political, and legal characteristics to assist project and program planning and decision-making; and (d) foundations for training and education in environmental management. This information has been widely used to develop other, more extensive projects, and to guide program and policy strategies.

The development of new, and often more ambitious projects as a consequence of lessons learned through DEMS and ESP-financed pilot projects is evident in many current projects being implemented by USAID and other donors. A large percentage of the current E/NR projects being implemented by USAID reflect characteristics of earlier DEMS or ESP pilot project components. A review of some of these follow-on activities is presented in Section 4.3.3. below.

NGO staff have indicated that the pilot projects were particularly important in developing their own technical capabilities, and in defining program concentrations. The pilot projects enabled organizations to experiment with creative solutions to complex problems, and to build on their results with subsequent expanded investments of time, talent, and finances. The grant funds provided through DEMS and ESP frequently enabled these organizations to leverage additional finances, which facilitated these expanded efforts. In several cases, this gave NGOs an opportunity to elaborate on the original intent of pilot projects and produce more comprehensive results. For example, ESP grant funds to Conservation International to conduct research and demonstration activities on the harvest and marketing of non-timber forest products in Ecuador, have been multiplied several times through other donors to significantly broaden the impact of this project. DEMS financing of ethnobotanical and biological research carried out by the New York Botanical Gardens in Ecuador and Peru have been expanded to enable this organization to produce some of the most extensive data available on the floristics of this region, and potential marketable plant products from Andean tropical and sub-tropical forests.

Virtually all of the pilot project activities involved a partnership between a U.S. and host country NGO. These relationships provided important institutional development opportunities for NGOs from other countries, and the results are evident in the significantly increased number of active NGOs now concentrating on environmental and natural resource issues. Many of the original partners are now very visible as prominent participants in local or regional environmental activities.

In general, these pilot projects provided cutting edge demonstrations of the kinds of research, education, community mobilization, and field activities that need to be expanded if USAID and other donors are to have a meaningful impact on degrading environmental conditions.

4.3.2 Pilot projects increased the knowledge base from which environmental planning and decision-making could proceed.

As described in Section 4.3.1 above, the pilot projects enhanced the technical information base on tropical ecosystem dynamics; land and resource use and management characteristics; pollution abatement; habitat rehabilitation for terrestrial and aquatic systems; and a range of other parameters. Approximately 40 percent of the pilot projects financed included components designed to inventory or assess biological conditions in a specific geographic area. More than half of these projects were primarily devoted to biological inventories or surveys. Much of this information was baseline, indicating that no previous data existed on biological conditions in these locations. In addition, many of these projects were later expanded to encompass more extensive geographic coverage or additional research components.

As an example, the DEMS project financed research to collect and analyze plant specimens from Belizean forests that are known to be utilized for medicines, food, fibers, or fuels, and prepare a guidebook identifying and describing these plants. This information represented some of the first detailed attempts to provide scientific documentation of these data, and provided an important foundation for conservation initiatives attempted to preserve genetic strains of these species. Similar pilot project initiatives were financed and carried out in several regions of Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, and Peru. The research carried out in Ecuador has contributed to the market surge in several non-timber forest products, including medicinal plant derivatives supplied through Shaman Pharmaceuticals and other private sector companies, and clothing fibers marketed by Patagonia, L.L. Bean and other distributors.

Demonstration projects also represent an important source of information to guide environmental planning and decision-making. These projects attempted to implement activities designed to promote resource conservation through improved income-generating schemes; more sustainable utilization of resources; education; monitoring and enforcement of protected areas; or similar actions.

For example, the DEMS project provided grant financing for activities designed to conserve biodiversity in three coastal ecosystem habitats in an adjacent to the Hol Chan Marine Reserve in Belize. This pilot project intended to increase recreation income opportunities, conducted research on marine communities in the reserve, carried out local and regional education programs, and provided personnel to patrol protected reef areas. Outputs recognized by the implementing NGOs and the Belizean government include a significant increase in visitation at the reserve, greater public visibility of the marine ecosystems at risk, and improved management strategies for long-term conservation within the reserve.

A project financed through ESP investigated the economic and biological parameters within which tropical trees could be sustainably harvested in the Bolivian Amazon. Specifically, the project attempted to define the ecological factors which must be applied to practice sustainable lowland forest timber harvests; examine the degree to which current timber pricing policies in Bolivia encourage unsustainable logging; identify viable alternative pricing systems

that will increase government revenues and reduce environmental damage within the forest; and create a computer software program to help managers evaluate the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of alternative forest harvest strategies. The output from this research and demonstration effort has been applied to guide the development of USAID's Natural Resource Management Project in Bolivia, and has influenced environmental planning within Government of Bolivia agencies, as well. The results from this pilot project are also referenced in other natural forest management initiatives elsewhere in the LAC region.

DEMS and ESP have also influenced the planning and strategies being pursued by USAID, other governments, and other donors through the development of country and regional environmental profiles. These profiles included detailed descriptions of existing biophysical conditions; principal environmental concerns; practical management strategies to respond to these concerns; socio-economic characteristics relevant to environmental planning and decision-making; and the legal and political framework for addressing environmental needs. Profiles were financed for reports on Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Belize, Guatemala, Panama, Haiti, Jamaica, and Peru. This information is referenced consistently in USAID Project Papers, project evaluations, EAs, and related analytical documents.

4.3.3 USAID Mission, host country, and other donor project or program initiatives have emerged as a direct or indirect consequence of earlier pilot project activities.

Interviews with country officials and USAID personnel in the LAC region shows a consensus of agreement that DEMS and ESP sponsored pilot projects provided important information and guidance in the development of other environmental management schemes. USAID staff in several countries stated that pilot project results have been used to help develop more ambitious projects designed to follow on the original pilot project theme. A review of the more than 60 USAID E/NR projects currently in operation in the LAC region shows that the majority reflect actions or concerns which were raised in earlier DEMS and ESP-financed pilot projects addressing similar themes or geographic target areas.

For example, the present Natural Resource Management (sustainable forestry) project being implemented by USAID in Bolivia relied on information produced through several DEMS and ESP pilot projects to help define project components and target areas of concentration. The Forest Conservation and Management project (BOSCOSA) in Costa Rica similarly built project strategies from earlier DEMS-financied initiatives. USAID/Jamaica referred extensively to the DEMS-financed Jamaica Environmental Profile in developing its originally successful Protected Areas Management project (PARC), and the new follow-on Development of Environmental Management Organizations (DEMO) project. The Tortuguero Conservation and Development project is largely an outgrowth of earlier financed pilot project activities carried out by the Caribbean Conservation Corporation and Fundacion Neotropica in Costa Rica.

The BOSCOSA Project is a representative example of the impact these pilot projects and subsequent follow-on more ambitious projects can have on improving environmental management needs. The BOSCOSA initiative is attempting to address the rapid deforestation

and threats to biological diversity occurring in the Corcovado Peninsula of Costa Rica as a consequence of in-migration and population expansion. A $75,000 grant to the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in 1987 enabled WWF, along with the Costa Rican NGOs Fundación Neotrópica and Centro Cientifico Tropical (CCT), to demonstrate economically viable and environmentally sound forest management techniques in the buffer zone around Corcovado National Park. This initiative was later expanded into the BOSCOSA project by USAID to include biological inventories within the region; the development of multiple demonstration forest harvest sites; technicai assistance to forestry and agricultural cooperatives working with the BOSCOSA sustainable forest harvest methods; and regional environmental education. BOSCOSA includes a very strong local participation element, and has involved a large percentage of the local population in some aspects of the project components, ranging from non-formal education to selective harvesting of timber on private lands.

The BOSCOSA project has now received worldwide recognition, and similar forest management schemes have been mobilized throughout Central and South America and in Southeast Asia, referencing BOSCOSA as a model. USAID/Costa Rica has now begun to implement a correlated project designed to strengthen government legislation and institutions pertaining to forest management, and the Government of Costa Rica makes frequent reference to BOSCOSA as a preferred method of forest practices.

Similar statements could be made about such USAID-financed projects as the Natural Resource Management and Protection (NARMAP) project in Belize, the Maya Biosphere Natural Resources Management project in Guatemala, the Natural Resources Management (MARENA) project in Nicaragua, the Sustainable Uses of Biological Resources (SUBIR) project in Ecuador, the DEMO project in Jamaica, and the Sustaining Natural Resource Management project in the Dominican Republic, among several others. All of these projects reflect at least some resemblance to earlier pilot project initiatives financed through DEMS or ESP grants, and all are now having significant impacts on country environmental policies, and site-specific conservation measures. A summary of the projects which have motivated more ambitious follow-on efforts by USAID Missions is provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Pilot Project Follow-On Activities

Project Category	Total Number Projects	Follow-On Actions	Active Projects	Final Reports
Biological Inventories	9	8	2	4
Forest and Water Management	11	5	3	3
Protected Areas	14	7	7	5
Education/Training	15	5	2	5
Profiles/Studies	9	5	0	4
TOTALS	58	30	14	21

4.3.4 Pilot project activities enhanced the capabilities and increased the participation of many U.S. and host country NGOs, and local people in USAID Mission and LAC/DR/E project and program initiatives.

It is widely recognized that the NGO community, both U.S.-based and those from other countries, represent an important component in the implementation of environment and natural resource management strategies worldwide. The number of NGOs responding specifically to environmental concerns has increased dramatically in recent years, largely as a response to this increase in demand for their services. The DEMS and ESP projects can claim some role in the mobilization of several of these NGO entities through the provision of the grant funds for biodiversity and conservation.

It is uncertain if many of the pilot project initiatives carried out would have ever been financed and implemented by the participating NGOs if the DEMS and ESP grant funds had not been available. There is some reason to suspect that they would not have, and that these same NGOs would not have developed the institutional and technical capacities they now sustain. Through these pilot project activities many NGOs, particularly partner NGOs from other countries, received a significant amount of technical and administrative training, project implementation and management experience, and exposure to environmental planning and decision-making. This training and experience has propelled pilot project participant NGOs throughout the LAC region to a position where they are fully capable of designing, implementing, and managing environmental projects independent of outside assistance. In fact, many of these NGOs are the leading agencies speaking for environmental management needs in their respective countries.

Pilot projects also made considerable effort to ensure that local people played a strong role in project activities. The BOSCOSA Project in Costa Rica, for example, included activities to train locals in the practice and business-management aspects of sustainable silviculture systems, as well as youth and adult education programs. Local participation and recognition of local education needs was a strong component of virtually all pilot projects.

A strong example of the kinds of response which can result from pilot project initiatives carried out by NGOs is evident in the improvements being made to the Minerva Zoo in Quetzaltenango, Guatemala. This ESP-financed pilot initiative is being carried out by several Guatemalan NGOs in association with the City of Quetzaltenango. The overall intent is to improve the facilities, education programs, and infrastructure at this rural zoo in order to enhance environmental awareness and responsibility among the local population. The Minerva Zoo is one of the more popular stopping points for rural residents visiting Quetzaltenango to sell wares or purchase supplies, and the park is crowded on average weekdays. One of the more interesting and important results from this pilot project has been the elevated concern and respect being given by the city to these rural visitors to the zoo. The city has also taken a keen interest in the work and needs of the zoo's Director, Lucy Guzman, as a direct result of this project. At its core, however, the project will primarily provide the Minerva Zoo and affiliated NGOs with the experience of designing, implementing, and managing a complex project encompassing facility development, education,

and staff training. It is these sorts of NGO institutional strengths which appear to have resulted consistently from the DEMS and ESP-financed pilot projects.

4.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE PILOT PROJECT COMPONENT

As effective as the Pilot Project and Special Studies components of DEMS and ESP were, there are still measures which could have been applied to improve the overall results of such a granting mechanism. While these limitations do not appear to have constrained the significant benefits inherent in the pilot project component, they could easily be resolved in order to enhance any future grant programs which might be implemented.

In particular, the pilot project component suffered from poor administrative and monitoring procedures. NGO groups collectively stated that the administrative requirements for fulfilling grant financial disbursement obligations were very cumbersome, and costly in terms of time, effort, and finances required to accomplish the numerous tasks. At the same time, the project monitoring carried out by LAC/DR/E technical advisors, REAs, and Mission personnel was very limited, and resulted in poor documentation of pilot project results. A summary of the principal limitations observed in the pilot project component is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Limitations of the Pilot Projects

1. Project activities were poorly monitored, and the historical record of lessons learned from these initiatives is incomplete.
2. The authorization process and disbursement of funds was cumbersome and poorly understood by both USAID and participating NGOs.
3. Requiring NGOs to demonstrate matching funds before disbursement of USAID finances prevented some smaller NGOs from participating in the project.

4.4.1 Project activities were poorly monitored, and the historical record of lessons learned from these initiatives is incomplete.

The documentation available to interpret the activities carried out and results produced from the DEMS and ESP projects is incomplete, and sparse for many projects. Again, this issue has been raised in virtually every SAR conducted during DEMS and ESP. A review of the accomplishments of the pilot projects was requested from LAC/DR/E in 1991, but was never produced.

Final reports were only found for 50 percent of the completed activities. Most of the project files included a variety of memorandums, interim reports, semi-annual reports, or other assorted documentation. However, there was no consistency or paradigm to any of this reporting. Several of these projects produced final reports provided to sponsoring Missions,

but given the rapid personnel changes in most Missions, this may not be the most effective place to keep the reports.

No analysis of results was ever done by DEMS or ESP during the course of project lifespans, and efforts to determine the results and outputs from these pilot projects is difficult to establish at this late date. Many of the individuals involved with these projects are no longer associated with the recipient organization, or were not fully involved throughout the life of the project. As a result, there is no uniform method available for reviewing or evaluating project accomplishments. There are no consistent parameters against which all of the pilot projects can be measured.

Through interviews and informal communication with individuals involved in some of the pilot project activities, it is possible to provide a qualitative interpretation of the project results. However, the historical records of these projects will remain limited and sketchy for some activities, primarily as a result of the poor documentation.

Unfortunately, this is equally true of the financial accounting. Project records are very clear on how and when finances were dispersed to each organization. However, there are few records to show what these finances actually purchased.

The end result is that the available written and physical records are inadequate to indicate the magnitude of impacts these projects apparently created. These were important initiatives, and produced meaningful results in terms of creating new ideas, enriching the information base from which strategies could be built, decisions made more ambitious efforts mobilized. The records are not readily available to support this fact, however, and more thorough accounting is warranted for future pilot project activities.

The indication from these results is that LAC/DR/E did an effective job mobilizing and initiating pilot projects. They performed poorly as the pilot project managers, however, and received little support from Missions in managing these pilot efforts.

4.4.2 The authorization process and disbursement of funds was cumbersome and poorly understood by both USAID and participating NGOs.

NGOs must produce several supportive documents and respond to numerous information requests before pilot project grants are authorized and funds dispersed. Several NGO groups contacted reported that this process was very demanding and time consuming. The extensive paperwork involved in complying with agency requirements slowed down the anticipated work schedule of the NGO. Organizations needed to devote a considerable amount of time preparing responses to information requests, and incurred unanticipated expenses in completing the tasks. Some organizations also asserted that the information provided to help complete the information requirements was inadequate and often conflicting. The preparation for completing financial disbursement and project implementation procedures provided through LAC/DR/E was poor, and constrained several NGOs.

It is not unreasonable to ask NGOs to comply with agency standards in order to obtain agency financing. However, there is some concern that these added time requirements, personnel efforts, and expenditures could detract from the pilot project accomplishments. It is also possible to avoid these kinds of bureaucratic constraints through more standardized procedures for grant recipients to follow, or by contracting out the entire granting component of ESP.

4.4.3 Requiring NGOs to demonstrate matching funds before disbursement of USAID finances slowed or constrained some smaller NGOs participating in the project.

Most of the NGOs participating in DEMS and ESP-financed pilot project initiatives are dependent upon outside funding to implement any field activities. Many of the foundations and other funding sources for these activities require the NGOs to demonstrate available finances or a commitment for financing before they disperse any requested funds. The DEMS and ESP requirements that NGOs demonstrate matching funds before USAID funds are dispersed can place the recipient organization in a double bind, and can actually make it more difficult to leverage some outside funding. For the smaller NGOs, principally those based in other countries, this requirement could potentially prevent them from mounting the necessary support to enable them to participate in the DEMS and ESP pilot activities.

It is equally true that many NGOs can satisfy the matching funds requirement through provision of in-kind materials or supplies. While they may not be able to supply the full matching requirement through in-kind matches, NGOs can often supply a significant portion of the funding requirements with this mechanism.

Nevertheless, the matching funds constraint could be easily solved by producing a letter of commitment for every NGO whose project is approved for pilot project financing. With this letter of commitment in hand, the NGO should be able to demonstrate the certainty of 50 percent financing to any outside funding source.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The DEMS and ESP projects have resulted in a variety of lessons learned which will be important guides in future LAC/DR/E environmental interventions. In general, the outputs from the projects can be largely viewed as positive. The projects have significantly contributed to a greater regional and country-specific understanding of environmental issues, and Congressionally mandated responsibilities of USAID. Missions have greatly benefitted from having a central office in D.C. which can provide up-to-date interpretations of complex environmental concerns, and from regional advisors to respond to pressing issues. The output from many of the financed pilot projects have served as important foundations for more ambitious environmental interventions implemented by USAID Missions or other donors. These cutting edge pilot projects have demonstrated important paths to pursue or avoid as we search out practical environmental solutions.

The principal limitations of the projects were based on having a greater demand for the services offered than could be satisfied by the personnel involved or financial resources available. This prevented the projects from fully achieving their full potentials. The ambitions of the project are constrained by the limited number of specialists assigned to respond to the needs of more than 20 missions, while maintaining on-going communication with Congressional and other governmental and NGO entities in the U.S. At the same time, the projects have provided poor documentation of results, and have rarely been able to provide the depth of assistance and training which is strongly needed by regional and country mission personnel. This has severely limited the learning process which should result from such an ambitious endeavor as DEMS and ESP.

A synthesis of the key lessons learned from the implementation of DEMS and ESP, and suggestions for actions which could enhance the outputs from ESP in its remaining years, or other similar environmental initiatives which may be mobilized in the LAC region in years to come is presented in Table 6. What follows is a more detailed discussion of these recommendations and suggestions for how they might be pursued.

Table 6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned from DEMS/ESP

1. **The number of advisors supported through the LAC/DR/E office in Washington, D.C. should be maintained or increased. Administrative assistants should be provided.**

2. **The LAC/DR/E office should increase the visibility and understanding of its role and services.**

3. **A standardized monitoring and reporting methodology should be instituted by LAC/DR/E for services provided.**

4. **The REA positions should increasingly emphasize project design support, regional environmental strategies, communications between LAC/DR/E and Missions, and liaisons with host countries and other donors.**

5. **REAs should begin to direct a greater percentage of their efforts to training Mission personnel in environmental assessment and monitoring procedures.**

6. **REAs should be converted from a status of Personal Services Contract (PSC) to one of a Direct-Hire staff. REA personnel should continue to emphasize individuals with extensive training in the biophysical aspects of environmental management, and with experience in environmental policy and economic issues.**

7. **A minimum of three REAs should be retained, including representatives for Central America, South America and the Caribbean regions. The REAs should continue to be stationed in a USAID Mission office that provides the most conducive location for regional travel and communication.**

8. **Technical assistance should increase the attention provided to urban and industrial pollution, coastal zone degradation, water resource management needs, and other such "brown" concerns.**

9. **The financing of pilot projects designed to demonstrate creative solutions to persistent environmental problems should be continued along the original project themes, but also to include urban environmental problems and to increase local NGO self-reliance, and enhance government/NGO communication. LAC/DR/E should strive to mobilize 3-5 pilot projects each year through the life the ESP project.**

10. **The financing and accounting mechanisms for supported pilot projects could be simplified and improved by allowing a single contractor to implement the activity.**

11. **Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans should be updated and strengthened in some locations as a response to changing legal, political, and environmental conditions.**

5.1 Technical Advisors - LAC/DR/E

5.1.1 The advisors supported through the LAC/DR/E office in Washington, D.C. should be maintained or increased.

The LAC/DR/E advisors provide an essential source of technical information, project assistance, and communication between other U.S. governmental offices, particularly Congressional and Executive branches, and USAID Missions. USAID Missions receive both direct and indirect benefits from having a centralized environmental unit available in Washington, D.C. Direct benefits include access to technical and policy information, and assistance in the design, review, and evaluation of proposed or on-going activities. Indirect benefits include representation and communication between other U.S. government branches, particularly Congressional and Executive offices, as environmental policies and mandates evolve.

However, as described in Section 4.1 1, the present staff commitment of the LAC/DR/E office cannot meet the demands being placed upon it by other U.S. government branches, and USAID Mission offices. An important consequence of this limitation is that many environmental needs are being only superficially addressed. The most significant weakness evident is the lack of follow-up accorded to environmental assessments. Few efforts are made by the LAC/DR/E officers, REAs, or country Mission environment officers to monitor and enforce mitigative measures defined in project or program environmental assessments. In essence, this limits the value of the EA, and largely circumvents its purpose.

The most significant weakness evident is the lack of follow-up accorded to environmental assessments. Few efforts are made by the LAC/DR/E officers, REAs, or country Mission environment officers to monitor and enforce mitigative measures defined in project or program environmental assessments. In essence, this limits the value of the EA, and largely circumvents its purpose.

In order to provide more effective technical and institutional support for improved environmental management in the LAC region it will be necessary to increase the human resources available to the LAC/DR/E office in both Washington, D.C. and the field. There are currently five vacancies in the LAC/DR/E staff, which, if filled, could provide much of the additional technical support needed to accomplish the monitoring and mitigation tasks currently being overlooked. The advisors should continue to include environmental specialists capable of responding to technical science issues, as well as policy concerns. However, there is an increasing need for specialists who are also capable of addressing economic and legal issues. It will also be important to ensure that advisors bring with them a diverse and extensive array of professional experience in sustainable development, as well as training and education.

Given the declining resources within USAID, it is uncertain as to how any new positions can be filled at the present time. It may be more appropriate to consider providing extensive training in environmental management for existing employees, and then reassignment to meet existing needs. At a minimum, USAID should develop a five year strategic approach to

filling the personnel and institutional needs for improved environmental management. Additionally administrative assistants would help relieve some of the current paperwork problems.

If any new advisors are added through ESP to continue and expand the project objectives, then the majority of new positions should be based in Washington, D.C. The demand to respond to consistent project environmental reviews, communications with Congressional or inter-agency staff, relations with NGOs, universities and other groups warrants an increased presence in the LAC/DR/E office. While the presence of advisors in the region is unquestionably an asset in terms of local recognition, the DEMS and ESP projects have already mobilized a considerable number of professionals working in the field in Puerto Rico, Mexico, Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Barbados. It is assumed that this will meet many of the regional technical assistance needs. In addition, USAID Missions need to continue hiring their own environmental specialists to respond to in-country needs. Several Mission have already taken this step, including Honduras, El Salvador, Ecuador, and Bolivia, Jamaica, Costa Rica, Mexico, Paraguay, and Brazil.

5.1.2 The LAC/DR/E office should increase the visibility and understanding of its role and services.

LAC/DR/E should make an effort through concise publications distributed throughout the LAC region to enhance the understanding of the kinds of services which can be provided by technical advisors stationed in Washington, D.C. or as REAs in the region. The purpose here should not necessarily be to increase the responsibilities of these advisors, but instead to enhance the kinds of services they provide.

At present, the USAID/W technical advisors are concentrating their work efforts on the completion of IEES, EAs, project reviews, and liaisons among Congressional staff, other government and NGO entities, and USAID Missions. The incentive should be to enable these advisors to provide increased services in cross-sectoral environmental program and project developments, and well as contribute to more regional environmental initiatives. A related incentive would be to instruct Mission personnel, other donors, and NGOs that the regulatory functions of LAC/DR/E are only one of several purposes for this office. The advisors supported through ESP are also available to serve as sources of technical and policy guidance as USAID develops its environmental agenda.

5.1.3 A standardized monitoring and reporting methodology should be instituted for IEEs, EAs, project reviews, and technical assistance services provided.

A weakness evident in both DEMS and ESP results is the poor follow-up actions and monitoring efforts undertaken for EAs, project design and evaluation, and demonstration pilot projects. All activities financed through ESP should include measures that will monitor the recommendations and results of technical assistance provided and pilot project initiatives financed. The information which results from this monitoring will be essential in order to guide project development; identify and control any unanticipated or predicted adverse

impacts; and guide future initiatives with similar objectives. The monitoring could also provide the most meaningful record and summary of lessons learned from the project efforts. In some cases, the monitoring should be done on a regular basis, such as on-going research studies. In other cases, the monitoring could be the result of periodic project reviews, such as mid-term evaluations. It would be appropriate and effective to include the monitoring of EA mitigative measures in the SOW for all project mid-term evaluations. However, in all cases there may be benefits to establishing standardized monitoring methodologies or procedures, particular for follow-up analyses of EAs or other project and program reviews.

A very effective mechanism for both encouraging better monitoring of EAs, projects, and other ESP initiatives would be to carry out regular conferences or workshops on environmental management themes. Participants would produce documented support for accomplishments or lessons learned for these gatherings, and the information can then be compiled into a set of published proceedings. Such endeavors would promote greater cross-fertilization among projects, and would greatly enhance the communication among the technical advisors and USAID personnel in general in the region.

A standardized monitoring procedure would define the factors which should be measured, the frequency of the measurements to be taken, and the preferred reporting methods. Standardized procedures can also define the format and content of mid-term and final project evaluations. Applying more standardized monitoring procedures could allow LAC/DR/E to maintain some consistency in its project evaluation methods, and should simplify and facilitate its own internal reviews of on-going projects. Standardized monitoring will also be helpful to project and program implementing entities. With standardized formats to follow, these entities should have a very clear understanding of the information they will need to provide on a regular basis to ensure compliance with legislative and policy mandates.

The monitoring format, and the factors identified for measurement, should remain somewhat flexible. Technical advisors should maintain the ability to modify monitoring requirements on a project by project basis. However, a standardized methodology will allow the technical staff to develop project monitoring requirements very quickly and confidently for each approved project.

A very effective mechanism for both encouraging better monitoring of EAs, projects, and other ESP initiatives would be to carry out regular conferences or workshops on environmental management themes. Participants would include LAC/DR/E technical advisors (including REAs), other relevant USAID/W and Mission personnel, NGOs, host country representatives and others involved in pilot projects or other ESP-related concerns. Participants would be required to produce documented support for accomplishments or lessons learned for these gatherings, and the information can then be compiled into a set of published proceedings. Such endeavors would promote greater cross-fertilization among projects, and would greatly enhance the communication among the technical advisors and USAID personnel in general in the region.

5.2 Regional Environmental Advisors

5.2.1 A minimum of three REAs should be retained, including representatives for Central America, South America and the Caribbean regions. The REAs should continue to be stationed in a USAID Mission office that provides the most conducive location for regional travel and communication.

The demand being placed for the services of the REAs is sufficient to demonstrate that these positions fulfill an important role in USAID regional actions. It is doubtful that USAID can accomplish the technical objectives of these REAs with less than three full-time positions. These positions are adequately situated at present, with advisors serving the needs of the Caribbean, Central America and South America.

It is also important for REAs to be based in the field, rather than located in Washington, D.C. and responding to field requests as needed. Maintaining a full-time presence in the region increases the local and regional confidence in the advice provided through these individuals. The majority of personnel contacted indicated that they would probably rely on REA assistance far less if those individuals were based outside of the region in which they worked. By taking the REAs out of the region they would lose valuable exposure to the on-going issues and events occurring in-country. This could limit the credibility given to their advice by people working with on-the-ground issues.

The same consequences could be anticipated if the REA services were offered instead through short-term consultant services. These consultants would be unable to offer the consistency and depth of local expertise provided by a full-time REA stationed in the field. It is also unlikely that the use of short-term consultants provided through U.S.-based firms would result in any financial savings, unless a fixed-fee contract was arranged for the service.

There may be some financial savings incurred by stationing REAs in a U.S. location, although the savings may not be significant over the longer term. It is almost certain that the current travel budget for these specialists would need to be increased to account for greater travel distances to be covered, if they maintained a U.S. base. It is assumed that an average REA would complete at least one regional visit for a period of one full business week each month of the year. The added costs of routing these excursions from a U.S. base would offset some of the gain from removing in-country subsistence expenditures. It is estimated that the added travel costs could amount to greater than $12,000 per REA each year. Added to these financial costs would be the physical demands of the much greater travel distances required, and possible reduced productivity as a consequence.

However, the more significant factors would appear to be that the REAs stationed in Washington, D.C., or even in Miami, Florida are seen to be less accessible, and less relevant to Mission or Regional needs. In order to effectively respond to the stated requirements voiced by Mission personnel, these individuals should continue to be based in locations which permit them to have regular contact with the people, institutions and issues which will pervade their work.

Some suggestions have been raised as to the feasibility of employing intermittent consultants to provide the services now offered through the REAs. It is unlikely that such actions would result in any significant financial savings. Perhaps more important, consultants would not be able to provide the depth of experience and local confidence that is offered through the REAs.

5.2.2 REAs should begin to direct a greater percentage of their efforts to training Mission personnel in environmental impact assessment procedures, monitoring, and interpretation of USAID mandates.

Much like their counterparts in LAC/DR/E in Washington, D.C., the REAs cannot meet the demands being made for their services by USAID Missions, other donors, or regional and country-specific NGOs. It is obvious that a great need exists within USAID Missions, other donors, and NGOs for training and periodic advice on U.S. environmental regulations, procedures, and policies. Few Mission employees in the region admitted to having a strong understanding of these regulations and policies, and virtually all individuals consulted indicated that they consistently seek outside assistance in defining and interpreting these U.S. environmental mandates. The majority of the services presently being provided by the REAs must increasingly become a capability held by one or more individuals in each USAID Mission.

The contributions of the REAs will still be a valuable asset in the regions for years to come, and the purpose of the positions has in no way been resolved. Few other USAID positions afford the opportunity to provide a *regional* perspective to environmental concerns, as just one important benefit from the REA. However, the persistent REA tasks of supervising or preparing environmental assessments, and monitoring proposed project and program activities to ensure compliance with regulations and policies must clearly become the work done by in-house Mission environmental specialists. At a minimum, this "internalization" of regulatory and monitoring responsibilities would enable the REAs to take on some more challenging, and perhaps appropriate tasks of advancing inter-country and regional environmental objectives.

The REAs should develop and provide training opportunities for regional Mission personnel in USAID environmental legislation and policy mandates; IEE and EA structure, content and procedures; and monitoring strategies to ensure compliance with EA recommendations and legislation. Through this training, they should gradually ensure that Mission personnel have the capacity and authority to carry out these responsibilities, with oversight and guidance from the REA. In this way, the REA can begin devoting a greater amount of time to regional environmental issues.

5.2.3 While the REA positions will continue to serve an important role in USAID environmental responses, and should be retained in the foreseeable future, the positions should increasingly emphasize project design support, regional environmental strategies, communications between LAC/DR/E and Missions, and liaisons with host countries and other donors.

The REAs, with a primary responsibility of maintaining the most updated knowledge of U.S. environmental legislation and policies affecting USAID, are still a critical link in ensuring that USAID Missions, in particular, understand and respond to legal and policy mandates. The REAs also enhance the environmental management knowledge and experience available to USAID Missions, other donors, and NGOs. These skills represent an important resource for Mission personnel to apply in identifying strategies and mechanisms for integrating environmental concerns and mandates into Mission activities.

There is no question that USAID Missions throughout the region have significantly increased the environmental focus and accountability in on-going or proposed projects and programs. However, this does not mean that all of these activities are producing the preferred or necessary outputs. The limited experience and training in environmental science and ecosystem management held by most USAID personnel has led to project designs and implementation which are experimental, at best. The training and experience of the REAs represents an important resource for USAID Missions, as well as other donors and NGOs, to access in order to guide these experiments in the most promising direction. The REAs represent the most immediately accessible technical resource to support project and program designs, reviews, and evaluations throughout the region.

Responses to environmental issues will be increasingly cross-sectoral, and will likely include bilateral or multilateral donor participation. National or multi-national NGOs can be expected to play a strong role in the implementation of these activities. USAID will need the presence of one or more individuals with the technical and policy training and experience to participate in, or facilitate, the development of these kinds of strategies. The REAs, with backstop support from LAC/DR/E, represent the ideal mechanism for providing this kind of support.

5.2.4 REAs should be converted from a status of Personal Services Contract (PSC) to one of a Direct-Hire staff. REA personnel should continue to emphasize individuals with extensive training in the biophysical aspects of environmental management, and with experience in environmental policy and economic issues.

An REA serving as a Direct-Hire responsible to the LAC/DR/E Chief could command greater response from Mission personnel, and leverage more effective authority in ensuring compliance with legislation and policies. There is certainly some value to retaining the REAs as personal service contractors (PSC). The position benefits from the autonomy and flexibility provided by the PSC framework. REAs maintain a regional focus, and emphasize legislative and policy compliance in their working relationships with other USAID personnel. As a PSC, they are viewed by USAID direct-hire staff as an independent enough entity to voice a wide range of perspectives without impunity. Unfortunately, the authority carried in their directives is far less than could be assigned to a direct-hire staff member.

There is some question as to whether establishing the positions as permanent, direct-hires would actually reduce some of the authority and liberties of these individuals. As direct-hires, the REA may need to be accountable to someone in the Mission housing them, and this could constrain some of their present flexibility. This may be resolved by continuing to have

the REAs responsible to the Chief of LAC/DR/E, and assigned on permanent detail to the particular housing Mission.

It is also uncertain, and perhaps unlikely to anticipate that a permanent direct-hire position can be created for these REAs, given the current financial constraints being experienced throughout USAID. However, despite these limitations, the potential values of establishing permanent, direct-hire REAs in the LAC region does appear to warrant the investment, and should be pursued as an important objective.

5.2.5 Technical assistance provided through both the LAC/DR/E office and the REAs should increase the attention provided to urban and industrial pollution, coastal zone degradation, water resource management needs, and other such concerns.

DEMS and ESP technical advisors have demonstrated a strong effort to include a comprehensive array of environmental concerns in the assistance and analyses provided through the LAC/DR/E office. The Environmental Strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean produced in 1993 clearly indicated that urbanization, industrialization, pollution, and poverty represent key factors influencing environmental degradation in the region. The Jamaica Environmental Strategy for USAID/Kingston reflected similar observations. However, the conservation of biological diversity and tropical forests continue to dominate the issues and agendas which emerge from the ESP advisory, pilot project and research efforts. There is no need to downgrade these issues, especially given the accelerating rate of forest degradation and species loss in the LAC region. LAC/DR/E initiatives and responses should continue to provide biodiversity and conservation issues the significant attention they require. However, there is a need to elevate the "brown" issues to a more prominent position in sector activities, particularly since these issues are often the leading factors contributing to a breakdown in ecological and biological systems.

One of the original objectives of the FSP project was to provide technical assistance and pilot project initiatives that would diversify the focus of USAID's LAC environmental program. In fact, several early regional studies and grant projects financed through DEMS did provide this breadth. A 1980 DEMS project carried out by the Organization of American States supported the formulation of an Oil Spill control plan for the smaller islands of the Eastern Caribbean. A 1983 DEMS project carried out by the U.S. Coast Guard was designed to enhance national oil and hazardous substance pollution capabilities throughout the Caribbean region. However, these projects were unusual among the pilot project initiatives and studies financed through both DEMS and ESP. Of the 58 projects and studies financed, more than 95 percent emphasize biodiversity and conservation concerns.

The present task for ESP is not to slow down its conservation efforts, but to accelerate the analysis and response given to urban, industrial, and coastal zone environmental problems. Environmental reviews, project and program assistance, demonstration projects, and studies financed through ESP should ensure that these issues are given the attention needed to mobilize meaningful responses. Actions should attempt to identify technical, institutional, education, and policy measures which will reduce the strain human populations are placing on

hydrologic, climatic, and biological systems, and improve the quality of life for people who see few alternatives to environmentally degrading practices.

5.3 Pilot Projects

5.3.1 The financing of pilot projects designed to demonstrate creative solutions to persistent environmental problems should be continued along the original project themes, but also to include urban environmental problems and to increase local NGO self-reliance, and enhance government/NGO communication. LAC/DR/E should strive to mobilize 3-5 pilot projects each year through the life the ESP project.

We have not yet learned everything we need to know in order to carry out our human endeavors in a manner that is ecologically and socially sustainable. One could wonder if we would ever arrive at such a point. As a result, the need for cutting edge research and demonstration of alternatives is still very much present. Much of this information can be gleaned from a continuation of the pilot project granting mechanisms that were initiated under DEMS and ESP. These grants provide an essential opportunity for NGOs to mobilize small projects to experiment with potential solutions to environmental problems. The experience and information generated by these pilot projects is the key to future programmatic successes in the environmental arena.

We have not yet learned everything we need to know in order to carry out our human endeavors in a manner that is ecologically and socially sustainable. One could wonder if we would ever arrive at such a point. As a result, the need for cutting edge research and demonstration of alternatives is still very much present. Much of this information can be gleaned from a continuation of the pilot project granting mechanisms that were initiated under DEMS and ESP.

At the same time, it is important to recognize the role these pilot projects play in defining and stimulating more ambitious projects which yield much greater results. The emergence of the SUBIR project in Ecuador partially as a consequence of lessons learned from earlier DEMS pilot projects is a good case in point. The output from the SUBIR project could be very significant for protected area management and buffer zone income-generating strategies in Ecuador. The technical information which is accumulated during the course of this project will likely influence tropical forest management initiatives throughout the region. USAID and other donors are already looking at the SUBIR results as a possible model from which to stimulate similar environmental management responses in other areas worldwide. The same point could be made for the Sustainable Forest Management project in Bolivia, which was influenced by research and demonstration pilot projects financed through DEMS and ESP, the MAYAREMA Project in Guatemala, BOSCOSA in Costa Rica, and several others in the LAC region.

Identifying the finances to support these initiatives will not be easy, but may be manageable. The matching funds requirement for pilot projects should be retained. It may also be

appropriate to establish a less ambitious base of funds than the original DEMS or ESP strategy, and to have these finances available to support smaller initiatives, but with the same focus: demonstration actions that indicate practical solutions to pressing local environmental problems.

The alternative to continuing this pilot project component through ESP would be to find some financial mechanism to establish pilot project funding within the LAC Missions. One example of this sort of program is evident in the Fundación VIDA established in Honduras. Fundación VIDA has received financial support from the government of Honduras, USAID, the United Nations and other donors, and provides grants to both Honduran and U.S. NGOs to carry out pilot projects designed to improve environmental and natural resource management efforts. The organization has a unique opportunity to provide the essential financial and technical assistance to mobilize significant responses to environmental concerns in Honduras. Perhaps the most important element in VIDA's mission is its commitment to empowering Honduran national non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to carry out these responses.

Other USAID Missions in the region have begun to participate in similar granting mechanisms that would assist local, regional, or U.S./international NGOs to develop and carry out environmental pilot project initiatives. The Enterprise for the Americas initiative is the most obvious of these mechanisms. Financing opportunities for local NGOs are now or will soon be available in Mexico, El Salvador, Colombia, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Jamaica. However, no such mechanisms are in effect or on the horizon for Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Belize, Ecuador, Peru, the Dominican Republic or Haiti. Without some sort of grant mechanism such as this, there is considerable doubt that pilot projects will occur with the frequency and the intensity that is needed at the present time.

The original program areas emphasized for pilot projects should be continued, including: (1) biological resource inventory/survey, (2) sustainable management of forest (including non-timber) and water resources, (3) protected area development and management, (4) education/training and institution building. However, project proposals should increasingly encourage stronger roles and greater self-reliance on the part of host country NGOs. In addition, pilot projects should include mechanisms to enhance the relationships between NGOs and host country or regional agencies charged with E/NR management, and strengthen the capabilities of these institutions to carry out their charge.

For example, pilot projects designed to increase the data or knowledge base of a specific location should also include activities designed to ensure that host country institutions, both governmental and NGO, will benefit from this information. Financing of pilot projects should also include measures that will enhance the administrative and management capacities of NGOs, including planning and decision-making skills. NGOs should become more adept at budgeting, record-keeping, and the leveraging of additional finances as a result of pilot project initiatives. They should also develop confidence in project management abilities, and recognize opportunities to expand their efforts into new initiatives. The end result of financed pilot projects should be the presence of local NGO entities fully capable of defining, developing, financing, and managing practical and successful environmental actions.

5.3.2 The financing and accounting mechanisms for supporting pilot projects could be simplified and improved by allowing a single contractor to implement the activity.

The current procedures for stimulating pilot project proposals and selecting the activities is adequate. USAID Mission offices should continue to serve as the lead in reviewing and endorsing activities which will have a country-specific focus. LAC/DR/E personnel should continue to participate as the final authorization point for proposed activities, although they could conserve some of their limited time resources by soliciting the services of independent advisors outside of USAID to review and comment on proposals.

However, the actual disbursement of funds and pilot project oversight should be assig ied to an independent contractor. Management and monitoring of approved projects would then become the responsibility of the contracted organization. Disbursement of funds and overall project accountability would be carried out by this contractor. The USAID Mission would assume responsibility for monitoring the progress of in-country activities, and would then make this information available to the contractor. The contractor, would, however, carry out mid-term and final reviews of all financed projects. This approach could greatly improve the accountability for these pilot project investments, and enrich the knowledge base and documentation of these projects.

The Biodiversity Support Project (BSP), a consortium of the World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy, and the World Resources Institute, carried out similar functions for the pilot project component during the transition period from DEMS to ESP. By all reports, this period of BSP supervision was extremely effective, and resulted in very successful record-keeping and project monitoring. Grant recipients reported few difficulties in financial arrangements and information transfer during this transition period, and BSP found the pilot projects very manageable.

Providing independent management of these pilot project grants could also simplify the rituals required of grant recipients, and facilitate the disbursement of funds and implementation of projects. A contracted agency could prepare a very clear set of procedures for grant recipients to follow in order to meet USAID requirements, and then assist the recipients in complying with these routines. This process could be completed much more rapidly in the hands of a contracted entity than is presently possible, given USAID procedural requirements. The final cost to participating NGOs in terms of time, effort, and finances invested would be reduced, and the return on USAID investments would be accelerated.

5.3.3 Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans should be updated and strengthened in some locations as a response to changing legal, political, and environmental conditions.

The DEMS and ESP projects have included financing for the preparation of country-specific and regional Environmental Profiles throughout the LAC region. As described in Section 4.3.3, these profiles included detailed descriptions of existing biophysical conditions; principal environmental concerns; practical management strategies to respond to these concerns; socio-

economic characteristics relevant to environmental planning and decision-making; and the legal and political framework for addressing environmental needs. Profiles were financed for reports on Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Belize, Guatemala, Panama, Haiti, Jamaica, and Peru.

All of the original country and regional environmental profiles financed through DEMS and ESP research grants are being actively used by USAID, other donors, NGOs and other governments to plan, design, implement, and evaluate environment and natural resource projects and programs. The information contained in this reports includes some of the more useful data available on biological, physical, social and economic conditions pertaining to E/NR issues and management needs. However, considerable changes have occurred in terms of legal, political, social, and ecological conditions since the publication of most of these reports. For example, the expansion of agricultural frontiers has accelerated deforestation rates and increased the total area of forests lost in many locations. The list of threatened and endangered species has increased, as has knowledge of the population status of many species. Conversely, many new statutes designed to strengthen environmental accountability and enforcement of stricter environmental protection measures have been established in most countries.

The original profiles were clearly of great use to planners and decision-makers. As a result, the ESP project or subsequent initiatives should consider mechanisms which would enable local NGOs working in association with other contracted assistance to update the information in the original profiles. This research can also include a synthesis of current information which can identify practical project and program initiatives relevant to current USAID financing objectives.

5.4 Conclusions

The DEMS and ESP projects have contributed significantly to an increase in environmental awareness and responsibility within USAID centrally and throughout the LAC region. The technical assistance provided through the projects has improved the ability of USAID to evaluate the environmental implications of projects across all sectors, and to plan measures which can mitigate or avoid potentially adverse impacts. While the projects have not provided the degree of monitoring that is needed to ensure USAID compliance with Congressional mandates, and with USAID's own policy statements, they have at least set the framework for developing this monitoring capability. Technical assistance provided through LAC/DR/E AAAS and RSSA advisors has also helped develop and implement several dozen E/NR projects throughout the LAC region which have provided important responses to environmental management needs.

The constraints experienced during the course of these two projects did not significantly detract from the results produced, and can be easily corrected through some financial enhancement and administrative modifications. At a minimum, the benefits realized as a result of the project investments far outweigh the costs incurred.

Through grant financing of NGO managed pilot projects, DEMS and ESP have helped mobilize some meaningful and influential demonstrations of potential solutions to environmental problems. The lessons learned from these demonstration efforts have shown the weaknesses and strengths of various environmental action strategies. The information gathered through field research and biological inventory efforts has provided an important baseline for subsequent detailed investigations, and serves as an important guide for local and regional environmental planning. Many of these pilot projects have helped chart a course for more ambitious E/NR projects undertaken by USAID or other donors. Environmental profiles and studies financed through DEMS and ESP have been used extensively as sources of important technical, social, and legal information by USAID, other donors, other governments, NGOs, universities, and other individuals analyzing environmental planning options.

The constraints experienced during the course of these two projects did not significantly detract from the results produced, and can be easily corrected through some financial enhancement and administrative modifications. At a minimum, the benefits realized as a result of the project investments far outweigh the costs incurred.

The DEMS and ESP projects represent important models which could be applicable for all other USAID regions and sectors. The investments in technical advisors to guide the adoption of environmental management standards produced very promising responses from USAID/W and Mission personnel. Compliance with environmental legislation and policy dictates has significantly increased during the life of the projects. Awareness of environmental concerns, and development of appropriate project and program responses has been significantly accelerated, both within E/NR sectors and cross-sectorally. Virtually every USAID Mission in the LAC region has experimented with creative solutions to environmental problems through investment in DEMS and ESP pilot project demonstrations. The two projects have contributed at least partly to all of these developments within USAID.

However, the project has reached a cross-roads. While all of these environmental actions need to be continued and expanded, most should become internalized mechanisms of each USAID Mission in the LAC region. The ESP project should increasingly emphasize the transfer of skills to enable Missions to accomplish this task, and the development of regionally-based responses to environmental problems. These regional responses should include the participation of a multitude of donors, NGOs, and the alliance of several countries acting in tandem to meet the needs of more ecologically and economically sustainable environmental management.

ANNEX A

SCOPE OF WORK

Article IV - Scope of Work

A. **Preliminary Research:** Contractor shall review DEMS/ESP files in the LAC/DR/E office to familiarize her/himself with the project components, activities, and deliverables. Documents, information, and deliverables that may be lacking from the files should be recorded. Using the file information, outputs and indicators from the PP, interviews with LAC/DR/E personnel, and the evaluation criteria delineated below, contractor shall develop a Work Plan, including method of addressing evaluation criteria and proposed schedule. This Work Plan shall be approved by LAC/DR/E prior to implementation. Following the preliminary research and debriefing on the Work Plan, LAC/DR/E may decide that certain activities will require a more in-depth evaluation than other activities.

B. **Evaluation**

1. Technical Assistance

Each technical advisor position shall be evaluated. This component of the evaluation will involve file searches and interviews with A.I.D. personnel in Washington and Missions.

Evaluation Criteria

1) Technical effectiveness of technical advisors

Have the advisors contributed to:

-Program/project compliance with environmental regulations
-E/NR concerns incorporated cross-sectorally into A.I.D.'s programs and projects.
-E/NR projects designed, evaluated, and monitored
-Development and monitoring of environmental mitigation measures

2) Value to Missions of technical advisors

-Utility of services
-Impact on Mission programs

3) Cost-effectiveness of technical advisors

-Long-term advisors vs. potential short-term consultants
-Basing in AID/W vs. in the field

2. Biodiversity Pilot Projects

For biodiversity pilot projects, contractor should determine if each pilot project was completed and if deliverables were received by LAC/DR/E and Missions. Contractor should also evaluate whether the pilot project resulted in follow-on activities, in the target area or other area, by Mission, other donors, NGOs, or host country government, or in some other way made a valuable contribution to the conservation of biodiversity. Contractor should assess whether Mission judged the pilot activities useful in achieving Mission strategic objectives, and whether the management method (Mission and LAC/DR/E roles) for the pilot projects is cost-effective. This component of the evaluation will involve file searches and interviews with A.I.D. personnel in Washington and Missions, U.S. and local NGOs, and host country government personnel. The following are some of the areas of interest that should guide Work Plan development.

Category 1) Biological Resource Inventory/Survey:

Evaluation Criteria

-Significance of findings
-Dissemination of findings
-Effect on country environmental policy
-Effect on conservation of natural resources in the target area; beyond target area
-Incorporation of local people, communities, and NGOs

Category 2) Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Evaluation Criteria

-Dissemination of findings
-Effect on country environmental policy
-Effect on conservation of natural resources in the target area; beyond target area
-Improved/increased sustainable practices in target area; beyond target area
-Management Plans developed
-Additional products discovered/developed for sustainable harvest
-Incorporation of local people, communities, and NGOs
-Sustainability of activity

Category 3) Protected Areas

Evaluation Criteria

-Dissemination of findings
-Effect on country environmental policy
-Effect on conservation of natural resources in the target area; beyond target area
-Biological significance of protected area
-Incorporation of local people, communities, and NGOS
-Sustainability of activity

Category 4) Education/ Training (including institution strengthening)

Evaluation Criteria

-Effectiveness of training methods (field vs. classroom/in-country vs. U.S.-based training/short-term vs. long-term)
-Retention of students in E/NR fields
-Methods of choosing students
-Effect of training on public and government awareness of E/NR issues
-Effect on conservation of natural resources
-Effect on community participation in E/NR

3. Environmental Profiles and Studies/Resource Management Plans

Contractor will evaluate the effectiveness of these activities using the methods discussed above for biodiversity pilot projects.

Evaluation Criteria

-Dissemination of findings
-Effect on country environmental, economic, and development policy
-Effect on conservation of natural resources
-Follow-on use by Mission, governments, NGOs, other donors (i.e., follow-on environmental action plans)

4. Congressional Mandates

Contractor will review the requirements and intent of Congressional mandates, and through review of files and interviews with AID/W and Missions, determine the responsiveness and effectiveness of using ESP program funding to support mandates.

C. **Site Visits:** Depending on the results of the evaluation, site visits may be conducted to pilot projects for a more in-depth evaluation. Contractor shall brief LAC/DR/E on initial findings of the evaluation, and together, will determine if site vists are appropriate, and which sites would be most beneficialto visit. Among other factors, determination will depend on the presence of follow-on activities and potential benefit derived from a site visit.

D. **Recommendations/Lessons Learned:** Based on the preliminary research, evaluation, and site visits, contractor shall develop recommendations and lessons learned for: 1) provision of technical assistance; 2) biodiversity pilot projects; 3) environmental profiles and studies and resource management plans; and 4) Congressional mandate responsiveness.

E. **Methods and Procedures:** Evaluation will be accomplished through file searches and in-person and telephone interviews with AID/W and Mission personnel, U.S., local NGOs, and host country governments. If appropriate, site visits will be conducted. LAC/DR/E will assist in arranging in-person interviews with Mission personnel who may be on TDY in Washington.

Following the preliminary research (Section IV.A.) and prior to beginning the evaluation, contractor will brief LAC/DR/E personnel on the Work Plan, which will include methods of addressing the evaluation criteria in Section IV.B. and a proposed schedule. LAC/DR/E must approve the Work Plan prior to beginning the evaluation.

Following the U.S.-based portion of the evaluation, contractor will brief LAC/DR/E personnel on the findings, and determine if site visits may be appropriate.

Upon completion of the evaluation (preliminary research, evaluation, and site visits), contractor will debrief LAC/DR/E on findings, lessons learned, and proposed recommendations. Recommendations should include suggestions for follow-up site visits for projects that may require additional monitoring by LAC/DR/E staff or a potential follow-on evaluation.

F. **Evaluation Team Composition:** The evaluation will require a team of two consultants. Team members should be familiar with A.I.D. environmental projects and programs, especially in the LAC region. Team leader should have expertise in evaluating environmental projects. Both team members should have a background in an environmental field, such as ecology, forestry, or environmental sciences. At least one team member should be fluent in Spanish.

ANNEX B

EVALUATION TEAM

Jim Tolisano, M.S., Ecologist/Environmental Impact Specialist
Roberta Warren, Senior MSI Associate and Evaluation Specialist

ANNEX C

ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT PROJECT COMPONENTS

The Environmental Support Project provides financing for the following components:

1. **Technical Assistance** Long-term support for strategy development and project or program design through the following professionals:

   A. Regional Environmental Advisors (one each in the Caribbean, Central American, and South American regions). Responsibilities include:

   - Assist countries and LAC in providing assistance in the areas of environmental impact assessment and mitigation, monitoring and environmental and natural resource management program development.
   - Assist host country institutions and USAID missions to adequately assess and meet environmental regulations as defined under 22 CFR, Section 216.
   - Collect and disseminate technical information regarding host country and regional environmental issues, and assist in training host country and USAID personnel in environmental management.

   B. Caribbean Regional Forestry Expert (one based in Puerto Rico). Responsibilities include:

   - Coordinates and assists in the implementation of forestry training programs for host country and USAID personnel.
   - Assists and monitors the design and implementation of forestry research activities.
   - Provides technical information on forestry issues for host country and USAID personnel.
   - Facilitates forestry technology transfer within the region.

   C. Regional Pest and Pesticide Manager (one based in Washington, D.C.). Responsibilities include:

   - Identify major pest/pesticide management issues, and appropriate host country/USAID coordinated responses to pesticide concerns.
   - Disseminate technical information on pesticide use and management to host country and USAID personnel.
   - Assist in the development of methodologies and assessments for environmentally sound pesticide management.

- Provide technical backstopping on pesticide issues for USAID/Washington, D.C. and regional Missions.
- Assist in the pest/pesticide management components of USAID program and project designs in LAC region.
- Identify appropriate personnel and prepare scopes of work (SOW) for pesticide studies.
- Advise LAC Bureau staff on opportunities to coordinate pesticide concerns with USDA personnel.

D. American Academy for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Fellows (two based in Washington, D.C.). Responsibilities include:

- Provide technical backstopping on all environmental and natural resource management issues for LAC Bureau in Washington, D.C. and REAs.
- Assist in the environmental management components of USAID program and project designs in LAC region.
- Assist USAID missions to adequately assess and meet environmental regulations as defined under 22 CFR, Section 216.

E. Bilateral Environmental and Natural Resource Management Advisors (two based in Washington, D.C.). Responsibilities include:

- Provide technical backstopping for LAC Bureau in Washington, D.C. and REAs for all issues relating to tropical forests, conservation of biodiversity, environmental health, education, and urban and industrial environmental concerns.
- Provide technical training in environmental management for host country institutions and USAID personnel.
- Identify issues and opportunities for increased USAID involvement in environmental and natural resource management issues.
- Assist in the identification and conceptualization of new project and program opportunities.

2. **Grant Funding for Pilot Projects** The DEMS and ESP projects have provided partial financing for more than 50 pilot projects addressing biodiversity conservation, country-specific environmental issues, national and regional environmental profiles and studies, and training and educational programs. Project proposals, generally involving an alliance between host country and U.S. non-governmental organizations, are presented by USAID country Missions to LAC/DR/E for authorization. USAID grant financing requires the recipient NGO(s) to leverage matching funds before financial dispursement is carried out. Implementation of the proposed pilot project is then carried out by the recipient NGO(s), with oversight provided by USAID Mission project officers. The objectives of these pilot projects are to:

A. Increase local and regional awareness and knowledge of environmental and natural resource management issues.

B. Demonstrate viable solutions for problems.

C. Provide an opportunity for NGOs to leverage the financial and technical resources for environmental management projects through the provision of seed money.

D. Encourage innovative approaches to environmental problems common throughout the region.

E. Focus the attention of host country institutions and USAID Missions on environmental issues of national or regional concern.

F. Provide an opportunity to strengthen local governmental or non-governmental institutions in order to improve local and regional capabilities in environmental management.

ANNEX D

PILOT PROJECT SUMMARY PROFILES

Since 1979, the DEMS and ESP projects have provided partial financing for more than 50 pilot projects addressing biodiversity conservation, country-specific environmental issues, national and regional environmental profiles and studies, and training and educational programs. Project proposals, generally involving an alliance between host country and U.S. non-governmental organizations, are presented by USAID country Missions to LAC/DR/E for authorization.

Determination of the success of these project projects in promoting environmental conservation and sustainable use of natural resources is, of course, contingent upon having a reliable and timely source of data that can be used to gauge whether project interventions and activities are contributing to the larger scale objectives of USAID. The following summary profiles are an attempt to provide a concise record of the available data to evaluate these interventions.

FINAL REPORTS or PROFILES

Belize: Holchan Marine Reserve
Belize: Ethnobotany Project
Bolivia/Panama: Training in Biodiversity
Bolivia: Sustainable Logging
C.Am. and Panama Reg. Env. Profile
Caribbean: Crab Mariculture
Columbia: Env. Profile
Costa Rica: Brodiversity Survey
Costa Rica: Env. Mgt. Systems
DEMS/ESP Evaluation
Development of Env. Mgt. for Oil Spills
Eastern Car Env. Profile
Ecuador: Study Economic Botany
Ecuador: Extractive Reserves
Green Guidance
Guatemala: Biotype Consolidation
Guatemala: Protected Areas
Haiti: Les Arcadias
Haiti: Env. Profile
Jamaica: Country Profile
Peru: Evn. Info. ARDN/SDA
Peru: Cons. of Biol. Diversity the Manu Biosphere
OTS: Decision Makers I
Central America: Zoo Training

NO FINAL REPORTS

Bolivia: Prootocals - Flora/Facina
Bolivia: Trels - Pilon Lajas
*Bolivia: S.Am. Wetlands
Bolivia: Botanical Inventory
Columbia: Chaco Sustainable Use
Costa Rica: Corcovado National Park
*Costa Rica: Tortuguero
Costa Rica: Decision Makers II
Costa Rica: Span Trans.
Costa Rica: Education/Training
Dominican Republic: Biodiv. Wildlands
Ecuador: NGO workshop
*Ecuador: Tagua II
Ecuador: Darwin Station
*Ecuador: Plants of Amazon
*Guatemala: Minerva Zoo
Guatemala: Mayafor/Renarm
Honduras: Env. Education
Honduras: Mosquitia
*Nicaragua: Miskito Coast
*Mexico: Conservation Fund
*Mexico: Casas Grande
*Mexico: Sonoran Conserv.
Peru: Ynachacu National Park
St. Lucia: Biodiversity Env. Mgmt.

Caribbean Oil Spill Control Plan Deobligated
C.Am. and Panama Workshop
Barbados: Env. Ed. Program
Climatic Impact Assessment and Crop Model test and Evaluations/C.Am.
Agroforestry Grant
ROCAP Technical Support Proj.
C. American Biodiversity Legal Proj.
Peru-Tambopta-Candamo
Caribbean: NGO Support - funds transferred to PVC

* = In progress

f:\wpdata\wpcorts\1707-006\006-003.w51
(11/93)

Name: Dr. Gene Wilken **Date of Employment:** 02/91 - 09/95 **Amount:** 1993 - $167,476
1992 - $155,000
1991 - $192,000

Location: RDO/C Barbados **Purpose:** REA Caribbean ***22 CRF** 16 ✓
117 ✓

NOTE: Separate File for Each Year

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
To authorize negotiation of services for Regional Advisor (RDA) for the Caribbean Region, which includes RDO/C countries, USAID/Haiti, USAID/DR, USAID/Jamaica, USAID/Belize, Guyana and other Regional Missions.	SOW estimated budget Wilkens CV, file 1993 - TRIP REPORTS: Santo Domingo 07/93 Trinidad 07/93 Corpus Christi, TX 04/93 (OECS/WB Workshop) Barbados 05/93 St. Kitts 05/93 Jamaica 02/93, 03/93 DC 01/93, 03/93 Belize 07/92 Miami 12/91 Annual Report: 07/92 - 06/93 Quarterly Report: 01/93 - 03/93 - Future Caribbean Donor Landscapes: A geographic Interpretation of Contemporary Trends - Wilken 1992 1992 - TRIP REPORT Jamaica 11/92 DR 09/92 Trinidad 08/92 Quarterly Report 07/92 - 09/92 Trinidad/Tobago 05/92 04/92 - 06/92 Miami 12/91 01/92 - 03/92 Dominican/St. Lucia 01/92

Name: Angel Chiri **Date of Employment:** 04/89 - 08/93 **Amount:** 1989 - $95,000
1990 - $123,000
1991 - $139,082
1992 - $148,000
1994 - $115,000

Location: LAC/DR/AID/Washington **Purpose:** Pest/Pesticide Management Specialist

NOTE: Separate file for each year Current: Alex Segarra

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
Perform a cross-cutting assessment to identify and prioritize the most important pest/pesticide management problems facing the LAC countries. In collaboration with the Missions, identify the most significant constraints to the development of environmentally sound and economically viable pest management for each country and develop alternative strategies for dealing with these constraints.	SOW illustrative budget financial status report 1991 - TRIP REPORTS: Managua, Nicaragua 04/91 La Paz, Bolivia 05/91 San Salvador, El Salvador 03/91 1993 - Paper: Assessment of Pest/Pesticide Management Issues 1993 - TRIP REPORTS: Guatemala City 11/92 Bogota 09/92 La Paz 09/92 Managua 12/91 (RENARM) San Salvador 11/91

Name: Loren Ford **Date of Employment:** 09/85 **Amount:** _____

Location: Puerto Rico **Purpose:** USDA Forest Service
Caribbean Regional Forester

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
* NO FILE	- Application for the position of Forestry Agriculture Coordinator with the USDA Forest Service Forestry Support Program

Name: Frank Zadroga **Date of Employment:** 07/90 - 07/92 **Amount:** $175,000

Location: Mexico **Purpose:** GCC Advisor Mexico

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
Global climate change advisor will provide guidance and technological expertise in end-use energy efficiency, energy conservation and renewable energy. The advisor will assist in analyzing sound methods of reducing forestry and industrial sector emissions of greenhouse gases, especially CO_2, and in developing projects and programs to implement these recommendations	CV - Mr. Zadroga SFf-171 Budget Allowance (ESP one year then picked up by Environmental/Global Climate Change Project FY91-FY94)

Name: Eric Stoner **Date of Employment:** 09/90 - 09/92 **Amount:** $110,000

Location: Brazil **Purpose:** GCC Advisor Brazil

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
- Global Climate Change advisor will provide guidance and technical expertise in end-use energy, efficiency, energy conservation and renewable energy. The advisor will assist in analyzing sound methods of reducing forestry and industrial sector emissions of greenhouse gases, especially CO_2 and in developing projects and programs to implement these recommendations.	TRIP REPORT 06/92 - Trip Report to Rio de Janeiro Budget Outline SOW (ESP FY90 then picked up by Environmental/Global Climate Change Project in Brazil)

Name: Karen Menczer, Dr. Cynthia Jensen, Jeff Brokaw **Date of Employment:** 06/90 - 06/95 **Amount:** $100,000 (J. Brokaw)

Location: USAID/Washington **Purpose:** Environmental Natural Resource Advisor

NOTE: Separate file for each year

Congressional Mandate
117, 118, 119, 22CFR 216

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
- to provide the LAC Bureau with expert technical assistance in the design and implementation of environment/Natural Resource Management projects/programs, advise Bureau Management on issues related to biodiversity, coastal resources management, forestry and global climate change and assist AID/Washington and missions in development of strategies for environment and natural resource management	SOW Budget Analysis

Name: Bruce Bayle, Carlene Yocum (Oct. 1993) **Date of Employment:** 06/89 - 09/90 Extended **Amount:** $85,000

Location: Puerto Rico **Purpose:** Caribbean Regional Forester

NOTE: Separate file for each year

Congressional Mandates
117, 118, 119

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
- to continue the services of a professional forester for the Caribbean region for one year to contribute to an environmental education workshop for Caribbean Forest Department Staff - expand liaison with LAC, IF/FSP OICDs, Technical Assistance, Missions and with local/international agencies, private groups active in NR management in Caribbean - provide technical support to Missions and host countries in project concepts, design implementation, monitoring, evaluation seek opportunities for forestry project development	TRIP REPORT: 07/90 Haiti to participate in USDA/OICD sponsored agroforestry short course and to meet with USAID personnel in Port-au-Prince Activity Report 03/90 - 06/90 - Bruce Bayle Illustrative Budget SOW TRIP REPORTS Dominican Republic 1990 Belize 1990 Antigua 1990 Jamaica 1990 Trinidad 1990 Mexico 1990 TRIP REPORT 07/92 Martinique/Dominica 01/92 Bridgetown 01/92 Dominica -- ENCORE 02/92 St. Lucia -- ENCORE 06/91 Panama City -- ENCORE 05/92 Jamaica 08/92 Dominican Republic

Name: Dr. Richard Nicholson - Executive Officer AAAS **Date of Employment:** 08/82 - 08/90 Ext. 12/94 **Amount:** $1,427,350

Location: AID/Washington **Purpose:** AAAS Fellows

NOTE: Separate File for Each Year 22 CFF 216

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
- to take part in the American Association for the Advancement of Science Diplomacy Fellows Program with AID and to assist the LAC Chief Environmental Officer and his deputy in the areas of energy, environment and natural resource management Technical Areas: Forestry, Agroforestry, coastal resources management, renewable and conventional energy, biological diversity and project review	SOW for fellows illustrative budget NO FINAL REPORTS - ON GOING Eric Fajer - Uruguay Environmental Strategy, paper 06/93 Howard Clark - Charles Darwin Foundation USAID/Ecuador evaluation 80-88 John Wilson (R&D/ENR) Marty Fujita 88-90 Meg Symington (WWF/BSP) Greg Miller (TNC) 90-92 Tom Hoorigan (USAID PPC/DP)

Name: Wayne Williams
598-0780-S-0808

Date of Employment: 01/91 - 12/94

Amount: 1991 - $152,723
1992 - $130,726
1993 - $240,000

Location: ROCAP/USAID/Guatemala

Purpose: REA - Central America

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
- to assist ROCAP, the seven CA Missions, regional and international organizations and AID/Washington by providing specialized technical assistance in the area of E/NR Management, environmental impact assessment and mitigation, monitoring and program development	budget analysis SOW IEE synopsis (ROCAP) work plan Oct - Jan 1992 -- Wayne Williams TRIP REPORT 10/91 - 12/91 08/91 - El Salvador 07/91 - Belize 02/91 - Guatemala TRIP REPORT 09/92 - Guatemala 01/92 - 07/92 Semiannual Report 04/92 - El Salvador 04/92 - Belize 02/92 - Panama Action Plan - several workplans, quarterly and semi-annual TRIP REPORT workplan 07/93 - 12/93 semi-annual report - 06/93 Panama City

Name: Howard Clark **Date of Employment:** 09/83 - 09/94 **Amount:**

Location: Ecuador **Purpose:** Regional Environmental Advisor South America

NOTE: Separate File For Each Year

LDNA-92-25518-K612

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
- to assist the Missions in South America, regional and international organizations and AID/Washington by providing specialized technical assistance in the area of E/NR management, environmental impact assessment and mitigation, monitoring and program development	SOW budget analysis contract modification - Howard Clark's evaluation

Name: Henry Tshinkel **Date of Employment:** 05/89 - 09/91 **Amount:** $73,000

Location: Guatemala **Purpose:** Regional Forestry Advisor

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
	TRIP REPORTS: - Guatemala, 01/90 - Seattle, WA, 11/89 - Washington, DC, 12/89

Name: James Talbot **Date of Employment:** 10/84 - 09/86 **Amount:** $125,000

Location: CEAP (Barbados) **Purpose:** Regional Environmental Management Specialist/CAR

NOTE: No Mention on Sheet

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
RARE/WWF	FINAL REPORT

Name: Paul Andre DeGeorges **Date of Employment:** Extended from James Talbot **Amount:** $212,951

Location: Barbados **Purpose:** PSC Caribbean Regional Environment Management Specialist

OBJECTIVE	DELIVERABLES PROVIDED TO Missions/LAC
	SOW Work Requirements Reports

PROJECT NAME/#: Bolivia/Panama Training in Biodiversity LAC-0605-G-SS-6049 | RECIPIENTS: TNC | AMOUNT: $123,000 | INITIATION DATE: 06/86 | COMPLETION DATE: 12/89 extended to:

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Conservation Data Centers - to expand and strengthen a LA regional network of Conservation Data Centers and provide for training and transfer of tech. to and among the centers - CDC will efficiently provide the biological data on species and habitat distribution which are necessary to properly design development and conservation projects with respect to protection of biological diversity.	- 6 new CDCs were established, regional workshops were held, and both short-term and long-term training was provided for CDC staff. **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** TNC	negotiations for a CDC in Jamaica **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP SOW Technical Workshop Plan - Nature Conservance Newsletter - Financial Report 07/86 - 12/88 - Progress Report 09/87 - 06/88; 07/88 - 12/88 (Activities by Country) - Final Report	PP SOW - Trip Report - 10/87 International Data Center Coordinators Meeting Peoria, IL - List of Natural Heritage Programs - List of Participants Key Contacts: Hardy Weiting Jr. Bruce Stein Richard Warner TNC	117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ____

62

WPDATA\REPORTS\1707-006\006.002 =51 (11/93)

PROJECT NAME/#: Costa Rica Education/Training
LAC-0605-6-SS-5110

RECIPIENTS: RARE/WWF

AMOUNT: $20,000

INITIATION DATE: 86
84

COMPLETION DATE: extended

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- Revise and improve the teaching techniques and materials - Provide additional training to teachers in at least 110 schools each year - Train new teachers and ensure the continuation of RMEP - Develop follow-up plans of action which allow for continued training of teachers	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Ministry of Education (CEMEC) CCA RARE WWF	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP progress report - 9/86 description of workshops quarterly report - Jan. - March 1984	Key Contacts: Kenneth Berlin Chairman of the Board, RARE	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Honduras: Environmental Education 546-65-598-00-69-51 RECIPIENTS: Honduran Ecological Association AMOUNT: $36,750 INITIATION DATE: 01/83 COMPLETION DATE: 12/87

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to promote and make possible research and scientific study of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and the environment as a whole - to conserve plant/animal species threatened with extinction, through the development of lists of endangered species and implementation of activities to protect them - promote educational programs regarding ecological themes, NR use and the environment in Honduras and the world - assist the government through publications and the development and implementation of laws	- public info. and environmental education program - institutional development program - wildlife, wildplants and ecosystem research program - national protected wildland system program - applied research in environmentally sound food production		SOW	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: AHE AID/Honduras RARE el gobierno USAID/Tegucigalpa	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW budget analysis - flyers from (AHE)	**Key Contacts:** Jorge Betancourt Presidente de la Junta Directive de AHE	

WPDATA\REPORTS\1707 [illegible] 002 =51 (11/93)

PROJECT NAME/#: Ecuador: Plants of Amazon
518-0023-6-00-4110-00-0605

RECIPIENTS: NY/MO Botanical Gardens

AMOUNT: $145,000

INITIATION DATE: 04/84

COMPLETION DATE: Two Years

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- Identify the vegetation of several poorly understood regions of lowland Ecuador
- ID and distribute representative botanical material from these regions and international herbaria to increase interest in, and knowledge of, these important ecosystems
- To assess the plant species native to this region with regard to their actual and potential economic importance and possible roles in the development of cultivation systems for sustained management of the lands in this area
- Strengthen the capacity of professional foresters and botanists in Ecuador to study and manage the Ecuadorean humid tropical forest by means of a taxonomic and economic study of the plants in selected sites in the forest of the Amazon region of NE Ecuador

Outputs

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

NYBG
MOBG
USAID/Quito
other botanists
DINAF
Universities
PRONAF

Follow-on Activities:

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

PP
Quarterly report:
Feb. - April 1985
May - July 1985

Project Report:
- March - Nov. 1986
- Aug. - Dec. 1985
- Feb. 86 - Feb. 87
- Feb. 85 - Feb. 86

Monitoring Provided:

PP
SOW
CVs of participants
maps
reports from students in project

Key Contacts:

Chilean Prance -- NYBG
Michael Balick -- NYBG

Marshall Crosby -- MOBG
Calaway Dodson -- MOBG

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Spanish Trans. Costa Rica
LAC-0605-C-00-6050

RECIPIENTS: U.S. NPS AMOUNT: $25,000 INITIATION DATE: 07/86 COMPLETION DATE: 08/87

CATEGORY: Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To make available in Spanish, copies of the guidelines for, Sustainable Development in the Humid Tropics to development planners decision makers, educators and researchers in LAC. these guidelines will be used as training materials in a workshop on sustainable development in Costa Rica, in January 1986, to be executed by National Park Service	Print 1575 copies of the publication entitled, Coastal Resources Management Guidelines **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** - NPS - Centro Agronomico Tropical de Investigacion y enseñanza (CATIE) - UNESCO - WWF	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW	Key Contacts: Charles Wendt - National Park Service 343-7063	117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ____ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Dev. of Env. Management Oil Spill
598-605-1-652133

RECIPIENTS: U.S. Coast Guard

AMOUNT: $60,000

INITIATION DATE: 07/83

COMPLETION DATE: 05/84

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- To promote the development/improvement of national and subregional oil spill contingency plans for the states of the convention area of the wider Car. region, with special emphasis on the smaller, lesser-developed independent island states of the eastern Caribbean: Barbados, Antigua, St. Lucia, Dominica
- To promote the enhancement of national [illegible] and hazardous substance pollution capabilities
- To promote the early ratification and implementation of the Cartagena Protocol concerning co-operation in combatting oil spills in the Wider Caribbean Region (1983)

Outputs

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

IMO
OAS
USCG
SIDA

Follow-on Activities:

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

Final Report on workshop in San Juan: October 1982

PP
SOW

Monitoring Provided:

PP
SOW

Key Contacts:

David Black, Deputy Director of Scientific and Technical Affairs

Congressional Mandates:

117 ✓
118 ____
119 ____
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Caribbean: Crab Mariculture
543-65-598-00-69-51/LAC-0065-6-SS-3070

RECIPIENTS: Smithsonian

AMOUNT: DEMS 84 - $403,000
DEMS 85 - $1 million
DEMS 86 - $66,000

INITIATION DATE: 10/83 COMPLETION DATE: 09/86

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to be a self-sufficient association - to establish a revolving low interest loan fund from a percent of each fisherman's profits after harvest for the purpose of bringing the next generation of crab mariculturists into the operation - to propagate and distribute 100 day old crabs which will ensure that a constant supply of stock is always available - to transfer all information available from Marine Systems Laboratory, Peace Corps, and Agroaquaculture, concerning the king crab mariculture to the fisherman - to be a possible central source of supplies and materials	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Bluewaters Inc. Smithsonian	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP SOW Paper - Who Will Control the Blue Revolution? Dec. 1988 Econ./Soc. feasibility of Caribbean Crab Mariculture	PP SOW Illustrative budget Plan of Operations Key Contacts: William Bernard Katherine Bernard Directors Smithsonian King Crab Project - DR David Short 357-2667 Walter Adey 357-1860	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Darwin Station Ecuador RECIPIENTS: Darwin Station Galapagos Islands AMOUNT: $25,000 INITIATION DATE: 3/86 COMPLETION DATE: _____

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- Define/ID most aggressive introduced plants species their distribution and strategies for their control - Obtain knowledge and experience on methods & techniques of control and eradication of plants - Provide advising and help to farmers in order to control plant-plagues inside the ag. areas which will permit to have better/more efficient use of land	Change present ag. pattern - provide assessment of knowledge of Galapagos vegetation **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Mission/Ecuador Nature Conservancy SPNG CDRS Congressional members	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP SOW - speech of President Leon Febres Cordero of Ecuador in the Smithsonian January 1986	Illustrative budget SOW PP - letters to Congressmen Key Contacts: Mission/Ecuador	117 _____ 118 _____ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ____

PROJECT NAME/#: Biodiversity - Environmental Mgmt. 598-0605.17 RECIPIENTS: St. Lucia Ntl. Trust AMOUNT: $75,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/88 COMPLETION DATE: 09/91

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- formulation of a systems plan for parks and protected areas
- Strengthening institutional capabilities of the Trust/Government of St. Lucia to plan/manage parks and protected areas
- Activities to improve existing protected areas
- Development of programs to up public awareness activities in St. Lucia

Site Activities:

Maria Islands Nature Reserve (ecotourism), Frigate Islands, Marigot Bay, Nature Reserve, Dennery Knob, La Sorcier and Grand Amse, Savannes Bay, Moule a Chique

Outputs

- Direct result of project, institutional capability of the Trust has increased, administration of project was excellent
- Trust choice of sites = good, but overly ambitious
- Community participation activities = exemplary

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

Central Planning Visit
Forestry Division
Fisheries Management Unit
Tourist Board
National Trust/Eastern Caribbean Nature Area Management Programs (ECNAMP)

Follow-on Activities:

RDO/C favorable impressed with proposal and agrees to undertake management responsibility for project

- contribute in a systematic way to the preservation of St. Lucia's biodiversity and to promote the sustainable utilization of natural resources for socio-econ. development especially tourism

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

- statement of St. Lucia trust, background sent to AID
- only minimal Mission time required, AID appreciates Mission assistance and interest

Monitoring Provided:

thorough evaluation, progress reports to AID, SOW budget reports discussion of activities background at sites

Key Contacts:

Peter Espent -- AID
Thomas Hourigan -- AID

Congressional Mandates:

117 ____
118 ____
119 ____
22 CRF 216 ____

PROJECT NAME/#: Caribbean NGO Support 597-0035 RECIPIENTS: IRF (PVO) (Island Resources Foundation) AMOUNT: $335,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/01/89 COMPLETION DATE: 08/31/94

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To support IRF's field program to improve the capacity of states in the Eastern Caribbean to implement sustainable economic development strategies in their uniquely fragile tropical island ecosystems, while preserving biodiversity In addition, to strengthen the ability of NGOs with a major stake in E/NR management to assess and monitor significant national environmental impacts resulting from growth and economic development	No FINAL REPORTS **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** WWF Rockefeller Brothers Fund The Ministry of Agriculture	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Matching Grant Application Year One Annual Report	SOW, list of program activities, NGO news for the Eastern Caribbean June 1989, August 1992 Key Contacts: Judith Towle, IRF 202-265-9712	117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ____ 22 CRF 216 ____

PROJECT NAME/#: Costa Rica - Decision Makers
596-0605-A-00-9822

RECIPIENTS: OTS
(Organization For Tropical Studies)

AMOUNT: $91,000

INITIATION DATE: Sept. 1989

COMPLETION DATE: June 1992
Extended to Dec. 92

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Provide support for a three-year program of annual courses for LA decision makers on the principles of ecology and natural resources management To stimulate the formulation of policies that promote the sustainable use of natural resources as part of the economic development of the countries in the region	NO FINAL REPORT **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Duke University, OTS	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** - Duke University Center for Tronical Management booklet - International Commission for C.A. recovery and development progress report 1988 - OTS program and aspirations	illustrative budget course curriculum Key Contacts: Lucinda McDade OTS (Duke)	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Bolivia Botanical Inventory LDNA-90-25511-K612 RECIPIENTS: NYBG AMOUNT: $74,550 INITIATION DATE: 05/91 COMPLETION DATE: 12/93

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Explore two national parks to document the floristic diversity of vascular plants by means of herbarium collections and from this information to produce a flora of the parks for use in future studies	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** WWF NYBG	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Interim technical report: Sept. 1991 Mission response to proposal - supports	proposal March 1990 estimate budget Key Contacts: Michael Nee - 718-817-8643 William Wayt Thomas - 718-817-8268	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Ecuador Extractive Reserves
LDNA-90-25518-K612

RECIPIENTS: NYBG AMOUNT: $108,680 INITIATION DATE: 04/88 COMPLETION DATE: 04/91

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities: Possible	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To study the abundance and economic potential of useful plants found within permanent one-hectare plots in Amazon Ecuador	- Collect and voucher useful plants from permanent study sites in lowland Ecuador - Assess the economical potential of individual species in the permanent plots - Quantify the long-term value of intensively managed forest plots - Compare the economical potential of forest managed for sustainable extraction vs. consumptive forest uses in Amazon - provide field and lab training for scientists/students - promote collaborative research between Ecuadoria/foreign scientists	- An ethnobiological field station in Ecuador - Use Ecuadors plant resources in sustainable ways	Project proposal - very thorough	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216

PROJECT NAME/#: Conservation of Biological Diversity the Manu Biosphere Reserve Peru RECIPIENTS: WWF (World Wildlife Foundation) AMOUNT: $100,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/88 COMPLETION DATE: 07/92

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs

Establish applied research program for the Manu Biosphere reserve where Peruvian and foreign scientists will develop technologies for the sustainable use of aquatic and terrestrial biological resources of the Amazon (by professors and Peruvian students)

- study on population of the side-necked river turtle
- the boquichico fish
- forest dynamics of Cedrela

Outputs

Mission claims program adds significantly to the ongoing bio-diversity work of WWF/FOPCN in Peru.

- Manu National Park Book published

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

Peruvian GOs, NGOs, universities, Cosha Cashu research team
FPCN
WWF

Follow-on Activities:

Development of new technology for the management of biotic resources in Amazonia such as timber species, fish stocks, land due to slash and burn agriculture

- program has gathered future support from the British Aid agency, ODA, and served as a catalyst to integrate other programs at Manu

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

- Mission has considered management implications and is willing to accept primary technology monitoring responsibility
- Final Reports submitted by WWF
- Description of the Peruvian Amazon
- Progress Reports (semi-annual)
- financial status reports
- trip report (Aug> 1988)

Monitoring Provided:

- was decided that individual permits for research are a better strategy for working with the Peruvian Park Bureaucracy instead of permits for the entire program

Key Contacts:

Michael Kiernan

Jennifer Martinez

Carlos Saavedra - WWF Coordinator
293-4800

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Central America Zoo Training LDNA-90-25596-K612 RECIPIENTS: WPTI AMOUNT: $49,100 INITIATION DATE: 09/90 COMPLETION DATE: 12/92

CATEGORY: Guatemala Education/Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Provide the participants with techniques and knowledge to show them how to work in teams and to help them to design a preliminary Master Plan that they can continue to develop for their own zoo - 14 participants from seven zoos in Central America - conserve genetic diversity uniquely represented by feral animal populations for the benefit of science, medicine, agriculture an other human interests	- Course was good, and very useful to all the zoos according to participants. **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** zoo members of Central America - ROCAP	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Copies of the designs of Master Plans the students - Report on workshop May 18-22, 1992	budget analysis course outline PP Lorena Calvo - WPTI, ITC Regional Coordinator	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Nicaragua Miskito Coast
LDNA-91-25511-K612

RECIPIENTS: CCC
Caribbean Conservation Corps

AMOUNT: $150,000

INITIATION DATE: 1/93

COMPLETION DATE: 04/96
Extended by Mission 1/93-04/96 by 1 million USD of Mission Funds.

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To protect productive coastal environments, conserve biological diversity and improve Miskito economic and social conditions. Activities funded under this cooperative agreement will assist national and regional governments and local communities with the planning and establishment of a functional Miskito Coast Protected Area (MCPA) - natural and cultural resource inventories - technical assistance for protected area development - environmental education, training - community development	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** IRENA RAAN MIKUSKUKA University of California - Berkeley Wildlife Conservation International ROCAP/RENARM Indian Law Resource Center WWF WB NPR	extended **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** financial status report proposal, maps - 6 month summary Oct. 91 - Mar. 92) Trip Report: Sept. 92 Carlos Espinosa CCC Newsletter	SOW budget (revised) Key Contacts: Charles Luthin - director of programs ccc with Light Hawk Carlos Espinosa	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Bolivia-Sustainable Logging LDNA-91-25511-K612 | RECIPIENTS: Wilderness Society | AMOUNT: $141,000 | INITIATION DATE: 08/92 03/92 | COMPLETION DATE: 12/94

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Develop an ecological basis for the long-term sustainable harvest of mahogany. Examine the degree to which current timber pricing policies in Bolivia encourage unsustainable logging Suggesting viable alternative pricing systems that will increase government revenues and reduce environmental damage to the forest Create a computer software program to help managers evaluate the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of alternative forest management plans	Package of educational materials based on the study will be developed for use in training LA conservation professionals in conjunction with the Smithsonian Institutions annual conservation training workshop in Bolivia		PP Workplan Registration w/AID (PVO Status) info. **Key Contacts:** Dr. Richard Rice Conservation International Jeff Vincent HID Harvard University	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: WS NGO's Bolivia	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** No progress reports trip reports		

PROJECT NAME/#: Colombia Choco Sustainable Use
LDNA-92-35598-K612

RECIPIENTS: WWF

AMOUNT: $145,295

INITIATION DATE: 09/92

COMPLETION DATE: 09/93

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- development of a regional diagnostic of project sites examining forest cover and condition of vegetation through an analysis of satellite imagery and ground truthing in full collaboration with local communities - development of alternative options for resource management and income generation that are less destructive environmentally - further consolidation of three field initiatives in the Central and Central northern Choco through strengthened collaboration with local communities, environmental education and training	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** WWF Pereas del Pacifico PROMESA ASPROVAL Padres de Familia Grupo Ecologico Fundacion Natura	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Proposal	budget analysis PP standard provisions for grantees (NGOs) Key Contacts: Mary Louise Higgins - Senior Program Officer for the Northern Andes (202) 778-9759	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Mexican SONORAN Conservation LDNA-92-25523-K612 RECIPIENTS: Centro Ecologico De Sonoro (CES) AMOUNT: $126,700 INITIATION DATE: 8/92 COMPLETION DATE: 8/95

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- determine criteria for the selection of high priority sites/protected areas in the state of Senora
- conduct a screening of 70 field sites and select the 10 highest ranking areas
- Survey and develop preliminary management plans for each priority site
- Establiish a state protected areas system
- determine state/federal agency administrative responsibilities and develop collaborative management plans
- Strengthen the grantee's conservation data center
- develop an education and outreach campaign using media on the importance of protecting critical habitats in Sonora

Outputs

- initiate planning for the first system of protected areas within Sonora and one of the first state protected areas systems in Mexico
- the Sonoran Conservation Data Center will provide the state with environmental info which will be useful in planning other conservation and development activities

Follow-on Activities:

Monitoring Provided:

budget analysis
SOW

Key Contacts:

Dr. Samuel Ocana Director General

Centro Ecologico de Sonora

Frank Zadroga
USAID/Mexico 525-211-0042

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ___
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Ecuador Tagua II
518-0780-6-00-2216

RECIPIENTS: Conservation Int'l.

AMOUNT: $150,000

INITIATION DATE: 09/92

COMPLETION DATE: 09/94

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- Improve the trade in Tagua palm nuts (vegetable ivory) and create economic alternatives to cutting timber in biologically sensitive areas of the tropics
- Intense community development and training to build local capacity for sustainable rain forest management

Outputs

merge environmental education, sustainable development, conservation and human empowerment

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

CI
USAID/Ecuador

Follow-on Activities:

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

SOW
Project Background

- "The Tagua Initiative" by Laura Tangley (31 page booklet)

Monitoring Provided:

SOW
Illustrative budget

Key Contacts:

Fausto Maldonado
ANRO
Project Officer

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ___
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Mexico Conservation Fund RECIPIENTS: AID/Mexico WWF AMOUNT: $75,000 INITIATION DATE: 08/93 COMPLETION DATE: 1 year estimated

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To establish a Mexico Conservation fund to provide long-term, sustained financing for the conservation of biological diversity - series of meetings to seek recommendations from a broad cross section of people and organizations involved in conservation activity - travel by Conservation Fund coordinators to the U.S. and to LA countries where similar conservation funds have been established - printing and publication of a brochure and display material about the Mexico Conservation Fund - slide-based video of the challenges related to the conservation of Mexico's biodiversity	- complement and add to, rather than duplicate or replace existing Mexican government and external assistance programs **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** WWF USAID/Mexico SEDESOL Nacional Financiera Treasury Secreatariat Private Volunteers	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** WWF Proposal Workplan	SOW Workplan Illustrative budget	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Casas Grande Chihuahua-Mexico 598-0780-23-523-3023 RECIPIENTS: Centro de Ecologia UNAM AMOUNT: $56,000 INITIATION DATE: 08/93 COMPLETION DATE: 09/95

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Provide support for the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico's Centro de Ecología for the establishment of a functional bio-reserve in the Chihuahuan desert that will protect native ecosystem types, conserve biodiversity in natural patterns of abundance and distribution, maintain ecological and evolutionary processes and improve local economic/social conditions	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** SEDESOL CRC National Zoological Park Smithsonian	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** - Quarterly financial reports to USAID/Mexico - Proposal	financial plan budget proposal	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Tambopata-Candamo Land-Use Classification RECIPIENTS: FADEMAD AMOUNT: $108,859 INITIATION DATE: 06/93 COMPLETION DATE: 3 Years estimated

CATEGORY: Protected Areas and Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to offer small producers alternative economic activities to their current ecologically destructive land use practices - via participatory land use, conduct a classification of human impacted areas of the reserve and later implementation of pilot projects concentrating on ecologically and economically sustainable production systems.	Institutional strengthening of FADEMAD (Federacion Agraria de Madre de Pros) **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** FADEMAD Ministry of Ag. Areas Protegidas Conservation International McCarthur Foundation USAID/Peru	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Proposal Budget Workplan	budget proposal workplan Key Contacts: Dr. Robin Foster (C.I.) A. Richard Piland Carlos Ayaia USAID/Peru	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Honduras: Mosquitia RECIPIENTS: AID/Honduras Light Hawk The Environmental Air Force AMOUNT: $140,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/93 COMPLETION DATE: 08/95

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To help build a regional conservation campaign on the Atlantic coast of Honduras and eventually, Nicaragua to promote creation of a biological corridor through establishment of protected areas and promotion of appropriate resource management plans and activities in La Mosquitia - preliminary conservation planning in association with Miskito communities, regional NGOs and federal government agencies - technical training - environmental education	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Nature Conservancy WWF IVCN Indian Law Resource Center Cultural Survival MOPAW 1 SEDA Honduran Tourism Institute AID-Honduras	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW Project Description Implementation Plan LightHawk- newsletter	SOW Key Contacts: Charles Luthin Director LA programs Light Hawk Eric Fajer Karen Menczer	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Bolivia - S. American Wetlands RECIPIENTS: Wetlands for the Americas AMOUNT: $150,000 INITIATION DATE: 12-1-93 COMPLETION DATE: 9-30-95

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
To compile and publish the first comprehensive biological assessment and policy review directed at setting a conservation agenda for South America's vast and diverse wetlands. Inform and stimulate the formulation of policies and programs by national/international development and conservation institutions whose activities currently have or could have significant impacts on South America's wetlands.	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Wetlands for the Americas	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP Publications CV of Dr. Castro	Key Contacts: Dr. Gonzalo Castro, Executive Director Wetlands for the Americas (508) 224-6521 Mike Yates USAID/Bolivia	117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ____

PROJECT NAME/#: MAYAFOR/RENARM RECIPIENTS: The Nature Conservancy/CCC/WES/CARE AMOUNT: $179,476 (of a total budget of 1,174,476) INITIATION DATE: 09/93 COMPLETION DATE: 09/95

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- Create the conditions for public and private institutions to generate, transfer and apply the information and technology essential for the sustained use of natural resources in Central America
- technical assistance and a small grants program for local communities will promote co-op approaches for the conservation and sustained management of the humid tropical forests found in Belize, the Petín of Guatemala and the Southern States of Mexico

Outputs

- inventory of current conservation and sustainable development activities in the Selva Maya region and the dissemination of this info. to conservation NGOs, GOs and local communities

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

Nature Conservancy
NGOs in S. Mexico
CARE
USAID/Guatemala
U.S. Man & Biosphere

Follow-on Activities:

Forests for the Future initiation

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

PP
Project analysis
budget
- MAYAFOR-meeting agenda October 20, 1993
- The Maya Forest: Key Issues and Recommendations for Action (a workshop report) Guatemala, February 8-9, 1993

Monitoring Provided:

Proposal
Project Analysis
Budget
Maps

Key Contacts:

Brian Houseal
Brad Northrup

Senior Project Advisors TNC
Leslie Lannon USAID/Guatemala
John Wilson R&D/ENR

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Minerva Zoological Park, Guatemala Amigos del Bosque RECIPIENTS: City of Quetzultenango AMOUNT: $65,000 INITIATION DATE: 06/93 COMPLETION DATE: 06/94

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Improve the infrastructure of the Minerva Zoological Park to implement an environmental education program which will protect a key population of CITES endangered species	increased attendance, better environmental education opportunities and new awareness		PP Key Contacts: - Lucy Guzman Minerva Zoological Park (502) 061-6936 - Wayne Williams REA USAID/Guatemala	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: - City of Quetzultenango - Private Sector - Philadelphia Chapter of the American Zookeepers Association - Meso American Zoo Association	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP feedback from Wayne Williams		

PROJECT NAME/#: DEMS/ESP Evaluation
LDVA 93-36698-EG12

RECIPIENTS: MSI

AMOUNT: $47,826

INITIATION DATE: 07/93
09/93 - 12/93

COMPLETION DATE: 09/95

CATEGORY: Evaluation

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
improve the delivery of technical assistance and the quality of responses to Congressional mandates by LAC/DR/E, helping to ensure that funding provided for biodiversity pilot projects and environmental studies is valuable to Missions	Oral Presentation and Final Report **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** MSI	 **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW Illustrative budget Workplan Questionnaire samples Draft Report Final Report	SOW Illustrative budget Workplan Key Contacts: Jeff Brokaw Eric Fajer Roberta Warren - MSI (202) 484-7170 Jim Tolisano	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Green Guidance
LAC-5517-A-00-5077

RECIPIENTS: WRI
World Resources Institute

AMOUNT: $26,044

INITIATION DATE: 08/93

COMPLETION DATE: 09/93

CATEGORY: Education/Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs

The Green guidance augments the LAC Environmental Strategy by providing and making more explicit links between environment and development in a "use-friendly" way and by assisting LAC missions in better incorporating environmental considerations into all aspects of their sectors and programs both English/Spanish.

Outputs

Increased exposure and awareness

Printed 1000 English copies

Translated into Spanish print 1000 copies

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

CIDE

Follow-on Activities:

Buy-in to R&D/ENR Environmental Planning & Mgt. (EPM) Project

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

50 copies to each LAC Mission 20 copies to each AID representative and the remainder to LAC regional offices, E/NR staff etc.

Monitoring Provided:

SOW
Illustrative budget

Key Contacts:

Ann Thrupp - (WRI)
(202) 638-6300

Eric Fajer - 647-8085

Congressional Mandates:

117 ✓
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: The Central American Biodiversity Legal Project RECIPIENTS: CDEARENA IDEADS Univ. of FL AMOUNT: $76,525 INITIATION DATE: 11/93 COMPLETION DATE: 06/94

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs

Builds on the institutional objectives of the Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD) to ensure biodiversity in Central America through regional approaches to conservation.

Assisting in the development of the legal and administrative tools to establish a regional system of protected areas as a means of protecting and restoring the Central American Biological Corridor

- applied legal research, institutional strengthening, training and networking to build a non-governmental framework for legal support to regional and local conservation biology initiatives in Central America
- conferences bringing together attorneys and policy makers from the region

Outputs

- Small grants for NGOs
- assistance of new law and policy organizations that have demonstrated a commitment to the goals of biodiversity conservation in the region, and add-on projects for additional applied research in the region

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

- University of Florida College of Law Center for Governmental Responsibility
- CEDARENA (Costa Rica)
- IDEADS (Guatemala)

University of Miami
Ford Foundation
MacArthur foundation
CARE
Nature Conservancy
Wildlife Conservation Society
CCC

Follow-on Activities:

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

Proposal
CVs
Agenda de Trabajo
Project Newsletter
Activity Report, Summer 1993

Monitoring Provide

Proposal

- other appendices available upon request project newsletter summary 1993 (summer) conference objectives

Key Contacts:

Richard Hamann
Thomas Ankersen
- UF College of Law
  904-392-2237

Rodrigo Barahona
Steven Mack
- CEDARENA
  Costa Rica
  506-25-1019

Alejandra Sobenes
IDEADS
- Guatemala City
  502-2-531987

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Colombia Environmental Profile Profile #598-0605-G-00-7003 RECIPIENTS: Fundación para la segunda expedición botanica AMOUNT: $85,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/87 COMPLETION DATE: 08/89

CATEGORY: Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- Create basis of overall strategy which shall integrate the management of renewable natural resources and environment with the economic/social development of country-defined and propose a series of priority actions for implementing the strategy in the different sectors, regions and activity areas within the country, thereby creating the basis for a clear definition of investment and action programs for short-term; medium-/long-term periods
- examine the actual conditions/ tendencies relating the use/management of natural resources/environment

Outputs

- Compile database as a source of information for use/analysis by institutions, organizations and other interested parties which will serve to assure wide dissemination and subsequent developing educational programs at the local, region/national levels concerning environmental resource problems, solutions and awareness

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

- Fundación para la segunda expecición botanica
- several colombian institutions, public/private, IIED, USAID

Follow-on Activities:

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

SOW
budget analysis
profiles

Monitoring Provided:

SOW
Budget analysis
trip report - 11/88
INDERENA conference

- Agenda for workshops
- progress reports (profile)

Key Contacts:

Dr. Jaime Ayola Ramirez,
Executive director

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Belize Ethnobotany Project 505-0035-6-OPG-8001 RECIPIENTS: NY Botanical Garden AMOUNT: $100,000 INITIATION DATE: 04/88 COMPLETION DATE: 04/89

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- develop a field project to integrate research on biological diversity with management of natural resources and to be consistent with FAA 119
- collection/identification of plant specimens from Belizean forests that are known to be utilized for medicine, food, fiber, fuel
- analysis of these species for useful pharmaceutical properties
- preparation of a database of useful/medicinal native plants and a guidebook to identify these species and their useful properties

Outputs

- collect the diversity of plants found in Belizean forests that are known to be utilized for medicine, food, fiber, fuel
- provide the National Cancer Institute, private industry and to academic pharmaceutical labs samples of these plants for pharmaceutical testing . . . data returned to Belize for their use

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

NY Botanical Garden
NCI

Follow-on Activities:

- prepare manuscript for publication on Mayan medical systems, including documentation of the plants utilized in herbal medicine, effectiveness of plants in their cultural context, as well as results from pharmaceutical screening programs

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

Mission concurs in management/monitoring responsibilities

Monitoring Provided:

budget analysis, progress report to AID 2nd annual progress report
PP
CV of Balick

Key Contacts:

Michael Balick
(212) 220-8763
NYBG

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ___
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Biotype Consolidation RECIPIENTS: WWF AMOUNT: $65,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/90 COMPLETION DATE: 09/91 extended 12/91

CATEGORY: Guatemala Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to build/strengthen infrastructure meet immediate training needs and develop fundamental education, research and management programs in five important established wildlands administered by the Center for Conservation Studies (CECON) of the University of San Carlos - address immediate/long-term needs for five reserves - improving the administrative capacity of the NGOs 1) Mario Dary Rivera Quetzal Biotope 2) Chocon-Machacas 3) Cerro Cahui 4) San Miguel-La Palotada 5) Manabique	- wetlands will be better managed and protected - threatened and endangered species to benefit include manatees, American crocodiles, spotted cats, Harpy eagles, spider monkeys, Central American tapir, marine turtles **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** WWF NGOs in Central America CECON local involvement Mission Supports-recommendation for courses	initial phase of multi-year commitment to consolidating the Biotope Reserve System WWF will continue to support - CECON hopes to assist other Guatemalan institutions **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** FINAL REPORT - progress technical report 09/90 - 05/91	Budget review PP SOW Background of Guatemala and Biotopes final report Key Contacts: Curtis Freese - WWF Natalie Waugh - WWF	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: ROCAP Technical Support Project 597-0035-04 RECIPIENTS: ROCAP AMOUNT: $389,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/88 COMPLETION DATE: 09/90

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- to assist ROCAP Mission, the Central American/Panama Missions and AID/Washington by providing specialized technical assistance in forestry and natural resource management Regional Forestry Advisor may provide assistance to USAIDs and IO outside Central America
- Develop and Support indigenous environmental NGOs to provide grass roots environmental education and to enhance local capability PVO sustainable management of natural resources
  - specialized training materials
  - a more aware general public
  - recognition by government officials to incorporate environment in policy
  - NGO/AID Mission ties stronger
  - increase source of local, NH funding

Outputs

- IO National Conservation NGOs moving effectively towards self-sufficiency
- regular communication among the NGOs
- NGO institutional profiles for each country, listing names/addresses of NGOs

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

ROCAP
WWF

Follow-on Activities:

NONE

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

Monitoring Provided:

- Contact Information/Rules
- Budget analysis
- SOW
- Background
- Role of NGOs
- Project Analysis
- Procedures for PVOs on OPGs

Key Contacts:

Diane Wood
Director, NGO Program
(WWF)

Congressional Mandates:

117 ✓
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Costa Rica: Biodiversity Survey LAC-0035-G-55-8025 RECIPIENTS: Fundación Neotropica AMOUNT: _____ INITIATION DATE: _____ COMPLETION DATE: _____

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- To address the Congressional mandate to protect biological diversity in developing countries by establishing biological diversity survey centers in five Costa Rican National Parks - equipping and training park guards as professionally competent field parataxonomists in each National Park and generating critically needed baseline biodiversity data for the sustainable management of these national parks

SITES
- Corcorado
- Armistad
- Braulio Carrillo
- Tortuguero
- Palo Verde

Outputs

- will increase technical expertise of park guards and the working and survey facilities within each National Park considered
- Enable Costa Rican National Park Service to conduct future courses via biodiversity survey work and beyond
- Provide database for park management

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

- Stroud Foundation
- construction of Training Laboratory Facility
- GOCR facilities/salaries
- AAAS

Follow-on Activities:

Training of para taxonomists. (Can separate into basic types of species) Idea for SUBIR and other Projects. Merck is paying the INBIO (NGO) to come up with possible medicinal plants.

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

Book - "Gunacaste National Park"

- progress report: 12/10/87
- final evaluation

Monitoring Provided:

SOW
PP
Budget outline
Course Structure
Programa del curso articles

Key Contacts:

Daniel Janzen
University of Pennsylvania
FAX: 215-898-8780

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ___
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Trees-Pilon Lajas - Bolivia G-55-8027 RECIPIENTS: MBG AMOUNT: $100,000 INITIATION DATE: 1989 COMPLETION DATE: 9/30/92

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- Develop a field project which will integrate research on biodiversity with management of Natural Resources and will be consistent with the Congressional Mandate to protect biodiversity in Developing Countries
- Collection/identification of tree species found 200-1200 m. elevation along the eastern slope of the Seerania de Pilon, Lajas, Bolivia
- assessment of silvicultural or other economic uses of native tree species in region
- provision/supervision and training in field collection and ID techniques for Bolivian foresters and botanists in Bolivia/U.S.
- preparation of a botanical database and illustrated field guide for Andean trees

Outputs

- provide numerous well trained botany and forestry students in the history and identification of native Bolivian tree species
- complete botanical survey of the Pilon Lajas area
- Spanish language tree ID guide
- preliminary work towards sustainable utilization of tree species

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

- Herbario Nacional de Bolivia
- Herbario Forestal Naciónal de Bolivia

LIDEMA
TRODEWA
CDC-Bolivia
National Geographic Society
National Science Foundation

Follow-on Activities:

NO FINAL REPORT

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

- Mission Supports PP enthusiastically, however, can't do contracting with MBG AID contract directly USAID/Bolivia wishes to manage the project

Monitoring Provided:

Budget information
SOW
mid-term reports
PP
trip report - 05/91

Key Contacts:

Enrique Forero
(314) 577-9596 (Fax)

Missouri Botanical Garden

Peter Raven

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Conservation and Development of Tortuguero National Park #515-0249-6-112-9001 RECIPIENTS: CCC AMOUNT: $125,000 INITIATION DATE: 03/89 COMPLETION DATE: 03/93 extended Until 03/94

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- To preserve the wildlands and the wildlife of the Tortuguero region of the Northern Caribbean Coast of Costa Rica in a manner which is economically/ecologically appropriate to its development in order to control the development brought by electrification, tourism/ improvement of local infrastructure--as a major natural history tourism attraction, to ensure the perpetuity of the sea turtle rookery and to support management in the protected areas.
- Create a corridor extension between the Tortuguero National Park and Barra del Colorado Wildlife Refuge that will protect wet tropical lowland biota and the region's biodiversity
- Develop an environmental education program for both the buffer zone and the middle watershed area affecting Tortuguero
- Support research on conservation and on the endangered green sea turtle

Outputs

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

Sen. Graham (Florida)
David Carr (Executive Director of CCC)
EFA
Foundations
Mission Costa Rica

Follow-on Activities:

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

- Masters Thesis by Jessica Brown of Atlantic Center for the Environment (508) 356-0038 (1/91)

Monitoring Provided:

PPs
Budget Plans, quarterly reports, maps
semi-annual report newsletter, VELADOR (CCC)
Financial reports
Flyers
Trip Report - 4/90

Key Contacts:

David Carr
Executive Director of CCC

- Mission/Costa Rica

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Guatemala Protected Areas LDNA-90-25520-K612 RECIPIENTS: Conservation International AMOUNT: $45,000 INITIATION DATE: 10/90 COMPLETION DATE: 07/91

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
Describe and propose legal boundaries and conservation management categories for eight high priority biological diversity and tropical forest areas in Guatemala. Will advance the conservation of a significant portion of Guatemala's biological diversity. 1. Cerro San Gil 2. Punda de Manabique 3. Sierra Santa Cruz 4. Sierra Coral 5. Río Sarstún 6. Sierra Espíritu Santo 7. Cumbre Alta 8. Rio Polochic	- passed by a majority vote, each of the eight "special protection areas" will become legally recognized national parks, ecological reserves, according to the project teams technical studies		Proposal Maps Budget analysis Key Contacts:	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: CONAP (National Council on Protected Areas) Nature Conservancy CONAMA CECON University of San Carlos	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Final Report on Sierra de Santa Cruz	Conrad Reining (202) 429-5660	

PROJECT NAME/#: Les Arcadins National Marine Park #LAC-0605-G-SS-7041 - Haiti RECIPIENTS: WWF/Wilcox Assoc. AMOUNT: $65,000 INITIATION DATE: 08/87 COMPLETION DATE: 09/90

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- Clarifying the legal status of Les Arcadins Islands, conducting a study of the biological diversity of the region, considering the cultural and socio-economic impacts of a marine park on tourism and local fisheries and by developing a management plan for Les Arcadins Marine Park	- suspended funding due to coup d'etat - Les Arcadins has a potential as a park to contribute to tourism in Haiti		PP SOW Illustrative budget Key Contacts:	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: USAID/Haiti	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PP - Semiannual Report: 07/90 - 09/90, 02/88 - 08/88 - Proposed work plans: 08/87 - 10/89 - FINAL REPORT - booklet of ACTION PLAN for project	Evelyn Wilcox - project leader	

PROJECT NAME/#: Holchan Marine Reserve Management - Belize RECIPIENTS: WWF AMOUNT: $60,000 INITIATION DATE: 11/87 COMPLETION DATE: 09/90

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- conserve biodiversity in three coastal ecosystem habitats, providing opportunities for recreation economy, and enhancing the value of adjacent areas for sustainable utilization of fisheries/resources and providing opportunities for marine research and education - maintain a sample coral reef and associated multihabitat ecosystem in its natural state as a preserve to ensure maximal biological diversity	- popularity has increased, therefore more income to the park **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Belize Fisheries Department WWF Mission/Belize Tropical Research and Development Incorporated	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Semi-Annual Reports PP SOW FINAL REPORT	PP SOW Illustrative budget Key Contacts: Stephen Cornelius Program Officer WWF James Azheta Reserve Manager	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Corcovado National Park - Costa Rica #LDNA-87-35598-K612 RECIPIENTS: WWF AMOUNT: $75,000 INITIATION DATE: 05/87 COMPLETION DATE: 9/24/91

CATEGORY: Sustainable Management of Forest and Water Resources

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- to implement and demonstrate economically viable and environmentally sound forest management techniques in the buffer zone around Corcovado National Park in Costa Rica, BOSCOSA
- reduce the rate of deforestation around national parks, providing alternative means of subsistence for local populations and thus protecting the biological diversity within the park

Outputs

- Evident in the monthly, quarterly and periodic reports

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

Fundación Neotrópica
Conservation Foundation
USAID/San Jose
WWF
IDA
SPN
Tropical Science Center

Follow-on Activities:

Extended into a mission project called BOSCOSA with other Funding Sources

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

PP
SOW

Monthly Report
Dec. 1987
Jan. 1988
March 1988
April 1988
May 1988
July 1988
September 1988
January 1989

Periodic Reports
Quarterly Reports
January - March 1991
April - June 1991
October - December 1991
January - March 1992

Monitoring Provided:

Key Contacts:

Jeffrey Leonard
The Conservation Foundation

Alvaro Ugalde
Fundación Neotrópica

Richard Donovan
BOSCOSA Coordinator

Meg Symington at WWF as part of BSP

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Agroforestry Grant - RDOC LAC-0628-6-3029 RECIPIENTS: _____ AMOUNT: _____ INITIATION DATE: 06/83 COMPLETION DATE: 03/85

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to teach small farmers to plant and harvest fastgrowing trees on land with limited fertility - to extend the pilot effort to other Caribbean Basin countries within - country tree species trial capability	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Pan American Development Foundation PROGRESSIO Dominican Development Foundation (DDF)	NOTE: No File **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** - workshop on cash - cropping approach to tree planting	Key Contacts: Edward Marasciulo Executive Vice President, PADF	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Climatic Impact Assessment and Crop Model Test and Evaluation for South and Central Americas RECIPIENTS: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration AMOUNT: _____ INITIATION DATE: 03/82 COMPLETION DATE: 11/83

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
	N/A			
- a no-cost extension of climate/crop assessment activities in South/Central Americas		N/A		117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ____ 22 CRF 216 ____
NOTE: Derived from agreement No. CC/OFDA-011-6-80			Key Contacts:	
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:**		
	N/A	N/A		

PROJECT NAME/#: Environmental Education Program
LAC-0605-G-SS-3016

RECIPIENTS: RARE

AMOUNT: $125,000

INITIATION DATE: 08/83

COMPLETION DATE: 12/85

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- to develop a program for environmental education and public awareness which will be consistent with the UN Environmental Program's Caribbean Action Plan

PARTICIPANTS

Antigua
Barbados
Belize
Dominica
Jamaica
Monserrat
St. Kitts/Nevis
St. Lucia
St. Vincent

Outputs

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

RARE
Caribbean Conservation Association

Now called CCC

Follow-on Activities:

NOTE: No File

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

budget
program description

Monitoring Provided:

budget
index of standard provisions

Key Contacts:

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 _____
119 _____
22 CRF 216 ___

106

PROJECT NAME/#: Central America and Panama Workshop #LDA-485-35-596-0661 RECIPIENTS: U.S. Geological Survey AMOUNT: $100,000 ROCAP/PD & S Funds INITIATION DATE: 02/85 COMPLETION DATE: 12/85

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- Central American workshop on the development of mineral energy and water resources and the mitigation of geologic hazards - Workshop would examine questions of the development of basic geological information critical to resource development training of Central American geoscientists and application of new or recently developed technology to the needs of Central America	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Instituto Centroamericano de Investigacion y Technologica Industrial (ICAITI)	*Note: No File **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Summary of Workshop	Illustrative Budget SOW Key Contacts: Robert Hamilton Chief Geologist U.S. Department of Interior	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Jamaica Country Profile #DAN-5517-A-00-2066 RECIPIENTS: IIED AMOUNT: $54,000 INITIATION DATE: 08/84 COMPLETION DATE: 04/86

CATEGORY: Environmen al Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to prepare an authoritative reference work that documents Jamaica's natural resource base and the conditions of the natural environment - to describe and analyze the existing institutional framework as it affects resource sectors and areas of environmental concern - identify key governmental policies programmes, and investment priorities affecting resource and environmental management	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Jamaican Natural Resources Conservation Department (NRCD) (Now called NRCA)	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW - Scoping study for Jamaica Country Environmental Profile August 1984 - list of responsibilities and qualifications - profile	SOW Illustrative Budget Key Contacts: Ralph M. Field Dennis McCaffrey TNC	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Central America and Panama Regional Environmental Profile #LDAA-84-35598-D6-12 RECIPIENTS: WRI World Resources Institute AMOUNT: $1,836,152 INITIATION DATE: 09/82 COMPLETION DATE: _____

CATEGORY: Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to prepare a regional environmental assessment covering Central America, Belize and Panama - identify major existing and potential problems and areas of concern for natural resources and environmental management both at a national and regional level; to conduct an analysis of the impact of these problems on the population and economy of the region and to provide an assessment for the national and regional institutions upon which new policies and resources can be based and assigned to activities relating to natural resource conservation and environmental management	Areas Assessed deforestation wildlife and wildlands soil depletion and erosion environmental contamination coastal zones and marine resources demographic and social factors economic factors administrative institutional and legal factors **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** IIED	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW Profiles	SOW Key Contacts: Walter Armsberg	117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ____ 22 CRF 216 ____

PROJECT NAME/#: Environmental Management Systems 598-0605-6-00-2001 RECIPIENTS: CATIE AMOUNT: $150,000 INITIATION DATE: 12/81 COMPLETION DATE: _____

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- the contracting of a watershed management specialist to compliment current staff of the Renewable Natural Resources Program (PRNR) - to fortify CATIE's ability to determine appropriate policies, plans and actions to better manage the watershed resources of Central America and Panama	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** The Tropical Agricultural Center for Research and Training (CATIE) ROCAP	NOTE: No file **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW	SOW Illustrative budget ANNEXES Key Contacts: Gerardo Budowski, Jefe del Programa de Recursos naturales Removables	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

110

PROJECT NAME/#: Caribbean Oil Spill Control Plan
598-0605-01-6507308

RECIPIENTS: OAS

AMOUNT: $60,000

INITIATION DATE: 01/80

COMPLETION DATE: 12/80

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to support the formulation of a Caribbean Oil Spill control Plan for the smaller islands of the Eastern Caribbean - provide participating countries with the necessary administrative and technical framework to combat small- and medium-scale oil spills in coastal waters	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** OAS UNCEP	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** Program Description	Budget analysis Key Contacts: Dr. Michael Greene, OAS	117 ____ 118 ____ 119 ____ 22 CRF 216 ____

PROJECT NAME/#: Haiti: Environmental Profile RECIPIENTS: IIED (WRI) AMOUNT: $50,000 INITIATION DATE: 09/82 COMPLETION DATE: _

CATEGORY: Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to define environmental problems and trends especially those that relate to the farm sector (small-, medium-, large-scale) such as land capability, agricultural production potential and land suitability - to develop an analytic framework for better understanding and taking actions on environmental problems - make recommendations on future public and private sector actions for environmental improvement - prepare a document that will stimulate greater public and private sector debate on environmental problems	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** NOAA IIED	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW Profile	SOW Key Contacts:	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ___

112

PROJECT NAME/#: Ecuador NGO Workshop
546-65-548-00-69-51

RECIPIENTS: Fundación Natura

AMOUNT: $6,000
$40,000

INITIATION DATE: 04/85
/87

COMPLETION DATE: 11/85

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs

To hold an Andean workshop on environmental education and sustained development, to include PVOs from all over the region

- Promote public awareness of the need for environmental management and stimulate policies that encourage sustainable use of Natural Resources in Latin America

Outputs

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

Environmental PVOs - from Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Venezuela

- NGOs
- ARDN

Follow-on Activities:

*Another proposal in 1987

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

Background PP

- Manual para el diseño de proyectos de educación ambiental (enero 88)

Monitoring Provided:

program description
PP

Key Contacts:

Yolanda Kakabadse
Directora Ejectutiva (FN)

Howard Clark
REA-SA

Congressional Mandates:

117 ____
118 ____
119 ____
22 CRF 216 ____

113

PROJECT NAME/#: Biodiversity Wildlands Conservation & Management RECIPIENTS: WWF AMOUNT: $65,000 INITIATION DATE: 07/88 COMPLETION DATE: 12/91

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- inventory remaining wildland areas of the Dominican Republic and develop a national conservation strategy, which will be implemented by the Dominican Republic National Park Service
- Janagua National Park will be developed as a model protected area to test management and education programs for park personnel
- training design and management of wildland ares for park personnel
- NGO training in rural education techniques
- identify 150 community leaders near Janagua and provide training in environmental awareness

Outputs

- receipt of proposals for trainng activities, field inventories
- no evidence of training syllabi or model park management plan
- no evidence of results from proposed inventory

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

- Wildlife Department of Dominican Republic
- Dominican Republic National Park Service
- Dominican Federation of Ecologists
- San Jose Foundation

Follow-on Activities:

None Evident

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

None Evident

Monitoring Provided:

Trip Report: 05/17/89

Project Update: 01/17/89

Key Contacts:

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

114

PROJECT NAME/#: Protocols - Flora/Fauna #7021-00 RECIPIENTS: MAB/Smithsonian (Man & Biosphere) AMOUNT: $53,000 INITIATION DATE: 06/87 COMPLETION DATE: 06/88

CATEGORY: Biological Resource Inventory/Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- improve the collection/management of biological diversity data through the training of Latin American scientists in newly developed, standardized protocols for inventorying tropical fauna/flora. The collection and processing of these data will provide essential information to biologists, Natural Resource managers and development planners for the conservation and management of biodiversity in Latin America.	- training of students (surveying, identification of trees/vegetation, mapping) most students applied to participate in workshops in DC	- Also 5-8 research proposals in preparation by Peruvians Smithsonian scientists to establish long-term research programs to enhance technology transfer	Executive Summary workshops (schedule of events) PP Biosphere Reserves - characteristics, charts, maps, summary of training in Peru Itinerary evaluations from students Key Contacts: John Wilson	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: DINAF Parks/Reserves Dept., AID/Ecuador, Fundacion Natura, Universidad Católica, CONACYT, Museo de Ciencias Naturales, Escuela Politécnica Nacional, Missouri Botanical Garden, Fundación Ciencia	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** PDFs and a blanket PIO/P for trainees submitted to the AID missions prior to leaving Peru/Bolivia - feedback from conductors of workshops		

PROJECT NAME/#: Eastern Caribbean Environmental Profiles LDNA-89-25538-K613 RECIPIENTS: CCA Now CCC AMOUNT: $99,964 INITIATION DATE: Aug. 89 is extension COMPLETION DATE: Dec. 90

CATEGORY:

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
to document the major issues in resource management and environmental planning in order to incorporate environmental considerations in to development planning and policies in the OECs region.			SOW	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CFR 216 ___
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:**	Key Contacts: David Carr	

PROJECT NAME/#: YANACHAGA National Park - Peru
#LDNA-87-35598-K612

RECIPIENTS: TNC

AMOUNT: $200,000

INITIATION DATE: 04/87

COMPLETION DATE: 06/90
Extension

CATEGORY: Protected Areas Development

Objectives/Expected Outputs

- setting up the Yanachaga - Chemillen national Park and San Matias - San Carlos Protection Forest, promoting integral use of natural resources in the border areas, training Peruvians in park management, conservation of biological diversity and natural resource management and institutional strengthening of a Peruvian Conservation NGO and a conservation data center in Peru

Outputs

NO FINAL REPORT

Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:

AID/Peru
FPCN

Follow-on Activities:

Is site for parks in Peril

Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:

SOW
Semi-annual Report
02/88 - 11/88
01/88 - 07/88

Quarterly Report
09/87 - 12/87

Trip Report
Peru - 11/87

Book: Plan Maestro

Monitoring Provided:

PP
SOW
Illustrative Budget

Key Contacts:

Daniel Quinn
Director, Peru Country Program

Congressional Mandates:

117 ___
118 ✓
119 ✓
22 CRF 216 ___

117

PROJECT NAME/#: Organization for Organic Tropical Studies RECIPIENTS: OTS AMOUNT: $63,000 ARDN additional $91,000 INITIATION DATE: 04/87 COMPLETION DATE: 12/92

CATEGORY: Education and Training

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- "Ecological Principles for Decision-Making and the Management of Natural Resources in Latin America," a course for Latin American policy makers, to be conducted annually - provide LA policy makers involved in Natural Resource use with the technical tools for informed decision-making leading to sustainable natural resource use.	- influence of program on Natural Resource Management **Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** Duke University OTS	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** FINAL REPORT - in Spanish and English - Course syllabus - itinerary - letters, feedback from students	SOW PP Key Contacts:	117 ___ 118 ✓ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

118

PROJECT NAME/#: Study Econ. Botany - Ecuador LAC-0605-6-00-7037 RECIPIENTS: NY Botanical Garden AMOUNT: $100,000 INITIATION DATE: 04/87 COMPLETION DATE: 03/90

CATEGORY: Biological Resource/Inventory Survey

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- develop a field project which will integrate research on biological diversity with management of natural resources and will be consistent the Congressional mandate to protect biological diversity in developing countries - collection and identification of plants of lowland Eastern Ecuador - assessment of the current and potential economic importance of native plant species in the region - provision of supervision and training in botanical methods for Ecuadorean scientists and expansion of professional ties between Ecuadorean foresters and botanists - preparation of a database and a guide to the forest tree and other plant species of current and potential use	**Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups:** NYBG	New funds for more collecting funded by ESP **Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** SOW PP Project Report 04/89 - 10/89 10/88 - 04/89 03/86 - 11/86 11/90 - 05/91 FINAL REPORTS	Key Contacts: Michael Balick 718-817-8705	117 ___ 118 ___ 119 ✓ 22 CRF 216 ___

PROJECT NAME/#: Environmental Information ARDN/SDA #LAC-0605-6-SS-8050 RECIPIENTS: EIS/Conservation Foundation AMOUNT: $112,000 INITIATION DATE: 04/86 COMPLETION DATE: 1989 - extended

CATEGORY: Environmental Profiles and Natural Resource Management Plans

Objectives/Expected Outputs	Outputs	Follow-on Activities:	Monitoring Provided:	Congressional Mandates:
- to provide information to LDC governments and NGOs on environmental policy, legislation, research and standards related to hazardous wastes and toxic substances	- use of methodology that can be replicated for the analysis of other rivers in Peru (pollution industrial waste) - the growth and expansion of EIS	- progress made in creating a strong environmental information delivery system for developing countries	illustrative budget SOW *2 files of information Key Contacts: Carlos Linares Director EIS (Now WRI)	117 ✓ 118 ___ 119 ___ 22 CRF 216 ✓
	Links with other Donors/Host Country Groups: Environmental Information Service WWF Conservation Foundation Mission/Peru ONERN	**Deliverables Provided to Missions/LAC:** FINAL REPORT Progress Reports 10/88 - 03/89 10/89 - 03/90		

ANNEX E

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

USAID/W

Dr. Jeff Brokaw, Chief, LAC/DR/E, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Eric Fajer, E/NR Advisor, LAC/DR/E, Washington, D.C.
James Hestor, Agency Environmental Coordinator, USAID LAC/DR, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Karen Menczer, E/NR Advisor, LAC/DR/E, Washington, D.C.
John Wilson, USAID LAC/DR, Washington, D.C.
Eric Zallman, Director LAC/DR, Washington, D.C.

USAID MISSIONS

Dr. Angel Chiri, Project Officer, USAID/Guatemala
Dr. Howard Clark, Regional Environmental Advisor - South America, USAID/Ecuador
Dr. Mario Funes, Energy Advisor, USAID/Guatemala
Dr. Margaret Harritt, Environmental Specialist, USAID/Honduras
Michael Jordan, Deputy Director, USAID/Ecuador
Keith Kline, Project Officer, USAID/Guatemala
Leslie Lannon, Regional NGO Coordinator, USAID/Guatemala
Dr. Fausto Maldonado, Agriculture and Natural Resource Office, USAID/Ecuador
Richard Owens, Environmental Officer, RDO/C, Barbados
Edgar Piñeda, Environmental Officer, USAID/Guatemala
Steve Reeves, Environmental Specialist, USAID/Jamaica
Ron Ruybal, Environmental Officer, USAID/Ecuador
Don Lee Smith, Trade and Development Officer, USAID/Barbados
Bill Sugrue, Environmental Officer, USAID/Guatemala
Dr. Henry Tschinkel, Central America Regional Forestry Advisor, USAID/Guatemala
Dr. Kenneth Weigand, ANR, USAID/Ecuador
Dr. Gene Wilken, former Regional Environmental Advisor - Caribbean, USAID/Barbados
Dr. Wayne Williams, Regional Environmental Advisor - Central America, USAID/Guatemala

PVO/NGO

Dr. Michael Balick, New York Botanical Gardens
Rodrigo Calero, CIDESA/Ecuador
Dennis Glick, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Bozeman, Montana
Lucy Guzman, Director of Minerva Zoological Gardens, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala
Charles Luthin, Project Lighthawk, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Juan Skinner, Project Manager, Amigos del Lago de Atitlan, Guatemala
Jody Stalings, Research Coordinator: SUBIR Project/Ecuador
Dr. Margaret Symington, Biodiversity Support Program, Washington, D.C.

Judith Towles, Island Resource Foundation
Roberto Ulloa, Conservation International

OTHER GROUPS

Scott Lampman, Forestry Advisor, Forestry Support Program, U.S. Forest Service, Washington, D.C.
Laura McPherson, consultant to USAID/Barbados
Dr. Ken Newcombe, Global Environment Facility
Dr. Douglas Southgate, Economist, consultant to USAID/Ecuador

ANNEX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

1. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USAID/WASHINGTON

Name:

Title:

1. Describe the role you feel environmental management and environmental concerns now play in USAID's policies and projects in the LAC region.

   How do you feel this role has changed in recent years? How do you foresee it changing in the near future?

2. What sort of adaptations do you feel USAID may need to make, in terms of type of personnel, training, policy, etc. in order to meet this changing role?

3. Are you familiar with the Congressional mandates requiring USAID to respond to environmental concerns? (If not, then review them briefly for the person) What are some of the more effective mechanisms that you see available for USAID to respond to these mandates? (e.g., redesign old projects, develop new projects, more stringent environmental review, bring in more outside TA, training for agency personnel, etc.)

4. What role do you feel that the NGO community, both international and host country NGOs, should play in assisting USAID to respond to these mandates? How do you feel that USAID can best involve these NGO groups?

5. If you needed to address an environmental concern in relation to a USAID project or other task right now where would you go for assistance? What are some examples of experiences you had with this need so far? What have been the results of these requests for assistance?

6. In what ways have you worked with or benefitted from the technical advisors in the LAC/DR/E office, or any of the regional LAC Environmental Advisors?

   How do you feel that USAID could enhance the utility or applicability of this LAC/DR/E office for you or other people or divisions with which you work?

7. Are you familiar with the Development of Environmental Management Systems (DEMS) or Environmental Support Project (ESP)? In what ways have you worked with this project in the past?

(If interviewee unfamiliar with project, then give brief background and frame subsequent questions more theoretically)

a) Describe some ways in which you feel this project has been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

b) Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

c) A considerable percentage of project funding goes to providing small grants for PVOs to carry out research, planning, and design projects. Describe the results you would foresee resulting from this sort of granting mechanism. Describe the constraints you would foresee this sort of granting mechanism creating.

2. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USAID/W/LAC/DR/E

Name:

Title:

1. Describe the role you feel environmental management and environmental concerns now play in USAID's policies and projects in the LAC region.

   How do you feel this role has changed in recent years? How do you foresee it changing in the near future?

2. What sort of adaptations do you feel USAID may need to make, in terms of type of personnel, training, policy, etc. in order to meet this changing role?

3. What are some of the more effective mechanisms that you see available for USAID to respond to the Congressional mandates emphasizing increased attention to environmental concerns? (e.g., redesign old projects, develop new projects, more stringent environmental review, bring in more outside TA, training for agency personnel, etc.)

   What specific plans do you have in the works at this time that address these concerns?

4. What role do you feel that the NGO community, both international and host country NGOs, should play in assisting USAID to respond to these mandates? How do you feel that USAID can best involve these NGO groups?

   a) A considerable percentage of project funding goes to providing small grants for PVOs to carry out research, planning, and design projects.

What evidence have you seen to show how this mechanism is working thus far? What sort of results would you expect to see from this sort of granting mechanism? Describe the constraints you would foresee this sort of granting mechanism creating.

b) Given the trend of diminishing USAID resources, in what ways do you feel it is worthwhile/not worthwhile for USAID to continue with this sort of granting mechanism for PVO groups?

5. Describe the functions you perform in your role as _____.

a) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by USAID/W personnel to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

What were some of the results from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

b) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by USAID Mission personnel to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide. (Field trips, substantive faxes or reports, cables, phone calls)

What were some of the consequences you saw resulting from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

c) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by Host Country government personnel or private groups to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

What were some of the consequences you saw resulting from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

d) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by local or international NGO personnel or groups to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

What were some of the consequences you saw resulting from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

e) What projects, either USAID, HC, or other donor, do you feel have improved their environmental responsiveness, or shifted there focus to

address environmental concerns more directly, as a result of your interventions?

6. What are some other environmental services which you feel could and should be provided by your office, but which are not being made available now for one reason or another? What prevents you from providing these services right now? Is there any mechanism you see immediately available to begin to incorporate these services into the current LAC/DR/E section activities?

7. In what ways has your physical location been an effective/ineffective work base for carrying out your responsibilities?

8. Describe some ways in which you feel the DEMS or ESP projects have been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

   Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

9. How many Environmental Assessments have you initiated or overseen in the past two years? What were some of the projects or programs being assessed? What have been the consequences from carrying out these EAs within the Missions? the Host Country governments?

   To what extent are the potentially adverse environmental impacts identified in EAs addressed in project implementation? To what extent are mitigative measures described in EAs carried out?

   What role have you played in monitoring environmental impacts identified in EAs? What records do you have of this monitoring?

10. What role have you played in the design, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation of any of the pilot projects financed through DEMS or the ESP projects?

    a) What were/are some of the project objectives, purpose, inputs, outputs for projects you assisted?

    b) What have been some accomplishments to date from some of these projects?

    c) What mechanisms have you used to monitor project results?

       In what ways have monitoring or evaluation results been used to modify the project?

d) How often have you or other ESP personnel visited or reviewed pilot project activities? Specifically, who from visited?

e) What were some of the constraints you observed in carrying out the objectives of some of the pilot projects? In what ways did USAID contribute to any of these constraints?

g) In what ways do you feel you were particularly helpful or important in carrying out the objectives of pilot projects?

h) What what you do differently, if you could initiate and carry out some of these projects again?

3. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USAID/REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORS

Name:

Title:

1. Describe the role you feel environmental management and environmental concerns now play in USAID's policies and projects in the LAC region.

   How do you feel this role has changed in recent years? How do you foresee it changing in the near future?

2. What sort of adaptations do you feel USAID may need to make, in terms of type of personnel, training, policy, etc. in order to meet this changing role?

3. What are some of the more effective mechanisms that you see available for USAID to respond to the Congressional mandates requiring USAID to respond to environmental concerns? (e.g., redesign old projects, develop new projects, more stringent environmental review, bring in more outside TA, training for agency personnel, etc.)

4. What role do you feel that the NGO community, both international and host country NGOs, should play in assisting USAID to respond to these mandates? How do you feel that USAID can best involve these NGO groups?

   a) A considerable percentage of project funding goes to providing small grants for PVOs to carry out research, planning, and design projects. Describe the results you expect to see from this sort of granting mechanism. Describe the constraints you would foresee this sort of granting mechanism creating.

b) What role have you played in the design, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation of any of the pilot projects financed through DEMS or the ESP projects? In what ways do you think your role could be improved in assisting these projects?

c) Given the trend of diminishing USAID resources, in what ways do you feel it is worthwhile/not worthwhile for USAID to continue with this sort of granting mechanism for PVO groups?

5. Describe the functions you perform in your role as _____

a) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by USAID Mission personnel to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

What were some of the consequences you saw resulting from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

b) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by Host Country government personnel or private groups to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

What were some of the consequences you saw resulting from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

c) How often have you been contacted in the past six months by local or international NGO personnel or groups to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

What were some of the consequences you saw resulting from this assistance? What are some factors which could help you improve this TA service?

d) What projects, either USAID, HC, or other donor, do you feel have improved their environmental responsiveness, or shifted there focus to address environmental concerns more directly, as a result of your interventions?

6. What are some other environmental services which you feel could and should be provided by your office, but which are not being made available now for one reason or another? What prevents you from providing these services right now? Is there any mechanism you see immediately available to begin to incorporate these services into the current LAC/DR/E section activities?

7. In what ways has your physical location been an effective/ineffective work base for carrying out your responsibilities?

8. Describe some ways in which you feel the DEMS or ESP projects have been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

   Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

9. How many Environmental Assessments have you initiated or overseen in the past two years? What have been the consequences from carrying out these EAs within the Missions? the Host Country governments?

   To what extent are the potentially adverse environmental impacts identified in EAs addressed in project implementation? To what extent are mitigative measures described in EAs carried out?

   What role have you played in monitoring environmental impacts identified in EAs? What records do you have of this monitoring?

10. What role have you played in the design, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation of any of the pilot projects financed through DEMS or the ESP projects?

    a) What were/are some of the project objectives, purpose, inputs, outputs for projects you assisted?

    b) What have been some accomplishments to date from some of these projects?

    c) What mechanisms have you used to monitor project results?

       In what ways have monitoring or evaluation results been used to modify the project?

    d) How often have you or other ESP personnel visited or reviewed pilot project activities? Specifically, who from visited?

    e) What were some of the constraints you observed in carrying out the objectives of some of the pilot projects? In what ways did USAID contribute to any of these constraints?

    f) In what ways do you feel you were particularly helpful or important in carrying out the objectives of pilot projects?

g) What what you do differently, if you could initiate and carry out some of these projects again?

4. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOST COUNTRY AGENCIES/GROUPS

Name:

Title:

1. Describe the role you feel environmental management and environmental concerns now play in your policies and projects.

   How do you feel this role has changed in recent years? Why? How do you foresee it changing in the near future?

2. Describe the role you feel environmental management and environmental concerns now play in USAID's policies and projects.

   How do you feel this role has changed in recent years? Why? How do you foresee it changing in the near future?

3. What sort of adaptations do you feel your agency needs to make, in terms of type of personnel, training, policy, etc. in order to meet this changing role?

   What financial and technical resources do you see available to help you to meet these needs?

4. What sort of adaptations do you feel USAID needs to make, in terms of type of personnel, training, policy, etc. in order to meet this changing role?

5. What role do you feel that the NGO community, both international and host country NGOs, should play in assisting you or USAID to respond to these mandates? How do you feel that you or USAID can best involve these NGO groups?

6. Are you familiar with the Development of Environmental Management Systems (DEMS) or Environmental Support Project (ESP)? In what ways have you worked with this project in the past? (If person being interviewed is unfamiliar with project, then give brief background and frame subsequent questions more theoretically)

   a) Describe some ways in which you feel this project has been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

b) Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

c) A considerable percentage of project funding goes to providing small grants for PVOs to carry out research, planning, and design projects. Describe the results you have seen or would expect to see from this sort of granting mechanism. Describe the constraints you would foresee this sort of granting mechanism creating.

d) What role have you played in the design, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation of any of the pilot projects financed through DEMS or the ESP projects?

7. If you have worked with any specific DEMS or ESP financed projects, then:

a) Was the proposed pilot project financed and carried out?

b) What have been some of the accomplishments of this project which you have seen to date?

c) What were some of the constraints you observed in the carrying out of the objectives of your pilot project? In what ways did USAID contribute to any of these constraints?

d) What were/will be some of the final products produced by this project?

Have/will you receive(d) copies of these final products?

How are you or others using these products?

e) How did this pilot project influence other projects or policies carried out or planned by your agency?

8. Have you ever met with any of the USAID Washington D.C. or Regional Environmental advisors? Whom, in particular? How often?

a) What was the purpose of these meetings?

b) What was the result?

c) Do you consider the USAID environmental advisors to be a valuable technical resource available to you? In what ways do you see these advisors being helpful? How could they be more helpful?

d) What effect do you feel the USAID environmental advisors have had on your own policies or programs? (i.e. what has resulted from their participation?)

9. Describe some ways in which you feel the DEMS or ESP projects have been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

5. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NGOS/PVOS

Name:

Title:

Organization:

1. Describe the role you feel environmental management and environmental concerns now play in USAID's policies and projects in the LAC region.

How do you feel this role has changed in recent years? What led to these changes? How do you foresee it changing in the near future?

2. What sort of adaptations do you feel USAID needs to make, in terms of type of personnel, training, policy, etc. in order to meet this changing role?

3. What could USAID do to respond to the Congressional mandates requiring USAID to respond to environmental concerns? (e.g., redesign old projects, develop new projects, more stringent environmental review, bring in more outside TA, training for agency personnel, etc.)

4. What role do you feel that the NGO community, both international and host country NGOs, should play in assisting USAID to respond to these mandates? How do you feel that USAID can best involve these NGO groups?

   a) What percent of your organization's support comes from USAID?

5. Are you familiar with the Development of Environmental Management Systems (DEMS) or Environmental Support Project (ESP)? In what ways have you worked with this project in the past? (If person being interviewed is unfamiliar with project, then give brief background and frame subsequent questions more theoretically)

a) Describe some ways in which you feel this project has been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

b) Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

c) A considerable percentage of project funding goes to providing small grants for PVOs to carry out research, planning, and design projects. Describe the results you have seen or would expect to see from this granting mechanism. Describe the constraints you would foresee this sort of granting mechanism creating.

d) What role have you played in the design, implementation, monitoring, or evaluation of any of the pilot projects financed through DEMS or the ESP projects?

6. Describe some features of your specific pilot project, particularly:

a) Was your proposed pilot project financed and carried out?

b) What were/are your project's objectives? purpose, inputs, outputs (if a written statement is available, obtain a copy)

c) What have been your accomplishments to date?

d) What mechanisms have you used to monitor project results?

In what ways have monitoring or evaluation results been used to modify the project? (Give specific examples)

e) How often have USAID personnel visited or reviewed your project activities? Specifically, who from USAID visited?

f) What were some of the constraints you encountered in trying to carry out the objectives of your pilot project? In what ways did USAID contribute to any of these constraints?

g) Were there ways in which USAID personnel were particularly helpful or important in carrying out the objectives of your pilot project?

h) What would you do differently, if you could initiate and carry out your project again?

i) Would you apply for another grant from the ESP project, if given an opportunity?

j) What were/will be some of the final products produced by your project?

Have/will you delivered copies of these final products to USAID Missions? LAC/DR/E in Washington? Host country agencies?

What evidence have you seen that these products are being used?

k) How did this pilot project influence other projects or policies carried out or in the works by your organization?

7. Have you ever been contacted by USAID Mission personnel to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide. By Host Country government personnel or private groups to assist with environmental concerns? Describe some of the assistance you were asked to provide.

8. Describe some ways in which you feel the DEMS or ESP projects have been effective in meeting environmental mandates:

Describe some ways in which you feel this project has not been very effective, or could improve its approach or methodology:

9. Have you ever met any of the USAID Environmental Advisors for the Latin America/Caribbean region, either those working in Washington D.C., or the individuals stationed in either Guatemala City, Barbados, or Quito? Were they making a contribution to what you were working on? How did they affect your activity?

ANNEX G

DEMS ACTIVITY SUMMARY 1979-89

DEMS ACTIVITY SUMMARY 1979-1989

PASAs/RSSAs/PSCs/AAAS Fellows

Year	Mechanism	Implementing Organization	Amount	Description
1979	Coop. Agree.	Consort. for Int'l Crop Protection	275,000	Regional Pest Managemment Specialist (RPMS), CA/P
1981	PSC		95,000	Regional Environmental Management Specialist (REMS), CA/P
	Coop. Agree.	CICP	130,000	Regional Pest Management Specialist (RPMS), CA/P
	RSSA	USDA	39,600	Technical Assistance
1982	PSC		81,779	REMS/CA
	Coop. Agree.	CICP	140,000	RPMS/CA
	PSC		150,000	Watershed management specialist to develop program for CATIE
	PSC		105,000	REMS/SA
	PSC		110,000	REMS/CAR
	P.O.		978	Classified ads for Caribbean REMS
	P.O.		873	Classified ads for South American REMS
1983	Coop. Agree.	CICP	125,000	RPMS/CA
	PSC		90,000	REMS/CA
	PSC		73,000	REMS/SA
	PSC		95,000	REMS/CAR
	PASA	U.S. Coast Guard	125,000	Development of oil spill contingency plan
1984	Coop. Agr	CICP	140,000	RPMS/CA
	PSC		95,000	REMS/CA
	PSC		97,000	REMS/SA
	PSC		102,000	REMS/CAR
	Buy-in	AID/SCI	17,710	AAAS fellowship extension

PASAs/RSSAs/PSCs/AAAS Fellows (continued)

Year	Mechanism	Implementing Organization	Amount	Description
1985	PSC		103,000	REMS/SA
	PSC		104,000	REMS/CAR
	PASA	USDA - Forest Service	51,000	Caribbean Regional Forestry Advisor
	Buy-in	AID/SCI	59,000	AAAS Fellow and extension
1986	PSC		82,500	REMS/SA
	PSC		106,000	REMS/CAR
	PASA	USDA - Forest Service	52,000	Caribbean Regional Forestry Advisor
	Buy-in	AID/SCI	55,000	AAAS Fellow
	PASA	U.S. Coast Guard	145,000	Oil Spill Contingency TA
1987	PSC		89,000	REMS/SA
	PSC		120,000	REMS/CAR
	Buy-in	AID/SCI	110,000	AAAS Fellows (2)
	PASA	USDA - Forest Service	60,000	Caribbean Regional Forestry Advisor
1988	PSC		89,000	REMS/SA
	PSC		107,000	REMS/CAR
	Buy-in	AID/SCI	120,882	AAAS Fellows (2 + extension)
	PASA	USDA - Forest Service	85,000	Caribbean Regional Forestry Advisor
1989	PSC		166,000	REMS/SA (2 years)
	PSC		73,000	ROCAP Forester
	RSSA	USDA/OICD	95,000	Pest and Pesticide Management Advisor
	Buy-in	AID/SCI	110,764	AAAS Fellows (2)
	PASA	USDA - Forest Service	95,811	Caribbean Regional Forestry Advisor
TOTAL	1979-1989, 43 activities, $ 4,166,897			

Studies/Environmental Profiles/Assessments

Year	Mechanism	Implementing Organization	Amount	Description
1979	PASA	Department of Interior	192,600	Strategy for Natural Resource Training Program
1980		Policy Sciences Center	100,000	Pesticide management study
			7,441	Printing of Bolivia Country Environmental Profile (CEP)
1981		USAID/Santo Domingo	20,714	Dominican Republic CEP (supplemental)
		Peace Corps/Paraguay Forest Service	25,000	National Biological Inventory - Paraguay
		USAID/San Jose	35,000	Costa Rica CEP
			1,150	Panama CEP translation
		IICA	25,000	Central American Comprehensive Resource Inventory Evaluation
1982			8,000	Panama CEP printing
	Funding cites	USAID/Port-au-Prince	50,000	Haiti CEP
1983	RSSA	USDA - Forest Service	50,000	Wildlife component for watershed management activity with ITF
1984	Coop. agree.	IIED	95,000	Regional Environmental Profile for Central America
	Funding cites	USAID/Kingston	54,000	Jamaica Phase II CEP
	RSSA	USDA - OICD	26,000	Panama mangrove management
1985	PASA	NOAA	20,000	Caribbean Marine Profile
1986	8a contract		25,000	Spanish translation of new coastal zone management guidelines
	Grant	CCA & IRF	100,000	Caribbean Regional Environmental Profile
1987	Grant	Wilcox Associates & WWF	65,000	Development of management plan for Les Arcadins Marine Park, Haiti
	Grant	WWF & CF	75,000	Development of management plan for buffer zone, Corcovado NP, C.R.
	Grant	WWF	63,000	Study of the Economics of Nature Tourism
		2nd Botanical Expedition/IIED	60,000	Columbia CEP
1988	Grant	St. Lucia National Trust	75,000	Environmental Management Plan for St. Lucia
	Grant	Caribbean Conservation Corporation	125,000	Conservation and Development Plan for Tortuguero NP
1989		2nd Botanical Expedition/IIED	45,000	Completion of Columbia CEP

TOTAL 1979-1989, 24 activities, $1,342,905

Environmental Education/Training/NGO Support

Year	Mechanism	Implementing Organization	Amount	Description
1981		Rockefeller Foundation	2,100	TDY to Eastern Caribbean to investigate environmental education
1982	IQC	ISTI	19,997	Evaluation of Fundacion Natura, Ecuador
	RSSA	USDA - Forest Service	240,000	Watershed management and training with ITF
1983	OPG	Rare Animal Relief Effort (RARE)	125,000	Environmental Education in the Caribbean
1985	Grant	RARE	20,000	Environmental Education in Costa Rica
	Grant	Honduran Ecological Association	25,000	Support
1986	Grant	The Nature Conservancy	123,000	Establishment and maintenance of conservation data centers
	Grant	Charles Darwin Research Station	25,000	Support
1987	Grant	Organization for Tropical Studies	63,000	Natural resource management course in Spanish for policy-makers
1988	Grant	Conservation Foundation	218,118	Environmental Information Service
	Grant	Fundacion Neotropica	125,000	Training of park guards as parataxonomists
		ROCAP	750,000	Environmental NGO development and support in Central America
1989	Grant	Island Resources Foundation	335,000	Caribbean NGO development
	Grant	Organization for Tropical Studies	91,000	Decision-makers course
		ROCAP	389,000	Environmental NGO development and support in Central America
	Grant	Duke University	100,542	Environmental Fellowships

Conferences/Workshops/Symposia

1979		Smithsonian-MAB	22,000	Conference on environmental considerations for small islands
			30,000	Conference on Costa Rican forestry
1980		OAS	60,000	Oil spill contingency conference, I
		WWF	32,000	Conference on environmental training needs in LAC
1982		OAS	60,000	Oil spill contingency conference, II
1985		Fundacion Natura	6,000	Andean Workshop
1987		Fundacion Natura	42,000	Environmental considerations in project design for Andean USAIDs

TOTAL 1979-1989, 23 activities, $ 2,903,757

Research/Management/Implementation

Year	Mechanism	Implementing Organization	Amount	Description
1983	Grant	Smithsonian	350,000	Crab mariculture
1984	Grant	Smithsonian	403,000	Crab mariculture
	OPG	PADF	10,000	Tree farming in Dominican Republic
	Grant	New York Botanical Garden	145,000	Economic Botany in Ecuador
1985	Grant	Smithsonian	1,034,000	Crab mariculture
	Grant	PADF	35,000	Reforestation in the Dominican Republic
	Grant	MUDE	31,243	Reforestation in D.R. with women's group
1986	Grant	Smithsonian	66,500	Crab mariculture
1987	Grant	WWF	60,000	Implementation of management plan for Hol Chan, Belize
	Grant	Smithsonian-MAB	53,000	Development of protocols for floral and faunal inventory
	Grant	New York Botanical Garden	100,000	Economic botany in lowland Ecuador
	Grant	The Nature Conservancy	200,000	Implementation & management of Yanachaga Park, Peru
1988	Grant	WWF	100,000	Establishment of applied research program in Manu Park, Peru
	Grant	WWF	75,000	Wildlands conservation and management in the Dominican Republic
	Bud. All.	USAID/Belize, NYBG	100,000	Diversity and medicinal properties of Belizean plants
	Grant	Missouri Botanical Garden	100,000	Trees of the Serrania de Pilon Lajas, Bolivia
	Grant	World Wildlife Fund	65,000	Consolidation of the Guatemalan Biotope system
1989	Buy-in	AID/ST/FENR	500,000	Buy-in to Conservation of Biological Diversity Project

TOTAL 1979-1989, 18 activities, $ 3,427,743

GRAND TOTAL: 108 activities, $ 11,841,302

drafted:MSymington:ms:5659E:12/28/89