



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# EVALUATION OF THE USAID/SUDAN “SUDAN TRANSITIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM (STEP)” Implemented by International Resources Group (IRG)

June 30 to July 16, 2008

**10/05/2008**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Wayne McDonald, Environmental Specialist, Team Leader, Jennifer Karanian, Environmental Specialist and Edmund Yakani Berzilius, Communications Specialist, Management Systems International.

# EVALUATION OF THE USAID/SUDAN “SUDAN TRANSITIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM (STEP)”

Implemented by International Resources Group (IRG)

June 30 to July 16, 2008



A subsidiary of Coffey International, Ltd.

**Management Systems International**

**Corporate Offices**

600 Water Street, SW

Washington, DC 20024



Evaluation Conducted by Management Systems International (MSI)

Contracted under DFD-I-00-05-00251-00, Task Order #2

## **DISCLAIMER**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
ACRONYMS .....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	v
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....	4
III. OVERVIEW AND STATUS OF STEP PERFORMANCE MEASURES .....	5
Performance Measure 1: Establish a Framework for Environmental Institutions and Policy ..	5
Performance Measure 2: Revise the 2003 Sudan Threats and Opportunities Assessment (ETOA) .....	6
Performance Measure 3: Conduct Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Other Specialized Training .....	7
Performance Measure 4: Establish an Environmental Association .....	8
Performance Measure 5: Plan and Carry-out Several Study Tours .....	8
Performance Measure 6: Conduct a Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Road Rehabilitation in Southern Sudan .....	9
Performance Measure 7: Strengthen Forest Governance.....	9
Performance Measure 8: Provide Financial Assistance to the Boma Wildlife Training Center (BWTC) .....	10
Performance Measure 9: Develop Programmatic Environmental Assessment for petroleum Environmental Standards .....	11
Performance Measure 10: STEP Crisis Modifier Component.....	11
Performance Measure 11: Improve Solid Waste Management in Juba.....	11
Performance Measure 12: Establish Trans-boundary Peace Parks.....	12
IV. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS .....	13

## Evaluation of the Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP)

---

Question 1: How effective were/are the program objectives in accomplishing the USAID/Sudan strategy?.....	13
Question 2: Are there better ways to improve efficiency and invest the limited resources in this sector? .....	15
Question 3: How effective was the program approach in building the capacities of the GoSS Ministry of Environment Wildlife Conservation & Tourism (MEWC&T) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)?.....	18
Question 4: To what degree have these capacities been effective? .....	20
Question 5: To what degree have these capacities contributed to sustainable development and protection of natural and environmental resources in Southern Sudan?.....	21
Question 6: To what degree have program activities changed the policy environment? .....	22
IV. LESSONS LEARNED.....	23
ANNEX 1: The Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP) Evaluation Scope of Work .....	24
ANNEX 2: Key Informants Interviewed .....	32
ANNEX 3: Key Informant Interview Questions.....	33
ANNEX 4: Documents Reviewed .....	35
ANNEX 5: Timeline on Quarterly Progress of ‘STEP’ Performance Measures.....	39

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The evaluation team gives special thanks to the IRG team of Bruce Kernan, Sean White, Jane Kahata, and Tom Catterson for their valuable time and assistance in sharing information and documentation, and for arranging meetings with a wide range of STEP partners and government officials.

Government of Southern Sudan officials were very generous with their time and gracious in their hospitality, and the staff of the Kagelu Forestry Training Center went out of their way to give the evaluation team an excellent review of their program and operations.

The team is also thankful to the MSI staff of Ayalew Teshome and the drivers, Peter and Geoffrey, for their logistical support.

## ACRONYMS

BWTC	Boma Wildlife Training Center
COP	Chief of Party
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CTO	Chief Technical Officer
DEA	Directorate of Environmental Affairs
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ETOA	Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment
GoSS	Government of Southern Sudan
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IRG	International Resources Group
KFTC	Kagelu Forestry Training Center
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MEWC&T	Ministry of Environment, Wildlife, Conservation & Tourism
MSI	Management Systems International
MTR	Ministry of Transport and Roads
PEA	Programmatic Environmental Assessment
PM	Performance Measure
STEP	Sudan Transitional Environment Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VEGA	Volunteers for Economic Growth Alliance
WSC	Wildlife Conservation Society

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

USAID/Sudan initiated the ‘Sudan Environmental Transition Program’ (later changed to ‘Sudan Transitional Environment Program’) in August 2005 as an 18 month activity to “develop an initial base of skills and institution capacity for the environmental analysis and planning necessary for Southern Sudan to conserve its natural and environmental resources while embarking on future economic and social development program”. An initial set of six “performance measures” were to be achieved. A contract modification in September 2006 added four new performance measures, changed one of the original performance measures, extended the program completion date to September 2009, and increased the budget. Another modification in September 2007 added two new performance measures, modified the forestry governance performance measure, and increased the budget. A recent USAID decision to not increase the funding as provided for in the September 2007 modification has, as of the evaluation, not been formally communicated through a contract modification.

At the request of USAID/Sudan, Management Systems International (MSI) engaged a three-person team to conduct an evaluation of the Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP), as implemented by the International Resource Group, Inc. (IRG). An evaluation team planning meeting took place at MSI headquarters in Washington, DC between June 26-28, 2008, to examine the scope of work, refine the focus of the evaluation and prepare a work plan. The evaluation took place in Nairobi, Kenya and in Juba and Yei, Southern Sudan from June 30 to July 16, 2008. The evaluation examined progress and results and responded to six essential questions:

- (1) How effective were/are the program objectives in accomplishing USAID’s strategy?
- (2) Are there better ways to improve efficiency and invest the limited resources in this sector?
- (3) How effective was the program approach in building the capacities of the GOSS MOEWC&T and the Ministry of Ag and Forestry?
- (4) To what degree have these capacities been effective?
- (5) To what degree have these capacities contributed to sustainable development and protection of Southern Sudan natural and environmental resources?; and
- (6) To what degree have the program activities changed the policy environment?

The evaluation relied upon the program’s reporting documentation and interviews with USAID, IRG, and GoSS personnel, and a site visit to the forestry training center in Kagelu for the collection of information regarding implementation, progress and results.

The operational environment for STEP was difficult, beginning when the design could not precisely identify a host country counterpart for the program because the new government of Southern Sudan was in the very early stages of formation. During the early stages of the project the government relocated from Rumbek to Juba. Departments, particularly Environmental Affairs were slow to staff, and in the case of the Wildlife Department it was overstaffed due to a decision to employ approximately 14,000 wildlife guards. Currently office facilities for the Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Wildlife and Tourism are totally

## Evaluation of the Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP)

inadequate, with most line staff working out of bamboo huts. Operational costs are very high and cost efficient transport non-existent. Ministry administrative capacities were weak.

Overcoming difficult logistical, organizational and operational issues, good progress was made towards realization of the purpose and achievement of the performance measures. However, the government requires further assistance to develop skills and capacity to address the significant environmental issues that current development, as well as planned development, will pose for the country.

The performance measures, indicator measurements and status are as follows:

No.	Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Status as of July 16, 2008
1	Establish a Framework for Environmental Institutions and Policy	Framework for environmental policy and monitoring established; and, environmental policy statement legally approved	In progress
2	Revise the 2003 Threats and Opportunities Assessment (ETOA)	ETOA completed	Completed
3	Conduct Environmental Impact Assessment and Other Specialized Training	500 people trained with a women to men ratio of 50:50 (note: people trained defined as person weeks of training)	487
4	Establish an Environmental Association	South Sudan National Environmental Association established and operational	Completed
5	Plan and Carry-out Study Tours	Six study tours completed	4 completed (considered sufficient)
6	Conduct a Program Environmental Assessment for Road Rehabilitation in Southern Sudan	Roads PEA completed	Completed
7	Strengthen Forest Governance	(a) Timber resource utilization policies, laws and regulations enacted and operational; (b) Forestry Training Center graduating forestry technicians	(a) In progress; (b) Completed
8	Provide Financial Assistance to the Boma Wildlife Training Center	Training center training wildlife officers	Completed
9	Develop Programmatic Environmental Assessment for petroleum	Petroleum environmental exploration and production standards enacted and operational	In progress
10	Crisis Modifier Component	To be determined	No longer considered relevant
11	Improve Solid Waste Management in Juba	Improved mechanisms established to collect and dispose of solid wastes in Juba established (provisional)	Scaled back to a pilot activity due to funding cuts
12	Establish Trans-boundary Peace Parks	Parks on the Southern Sudan-Uganda border effectively protect wildlife (provisional)	Scaled back to actions already accomplished due to funding cuts

Performance measures directed at improving skills and capacity in the area of environmental policy and environmental impact assessment were faced with a weak institutional foundation in the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism (MEWC&T), which



could not expeditiously and efficiently move the policy issues forward. While the EIA training offered was a valuable contribution in terms of increasing environmental knowledge and awareness, a more professional environmental impact assessment training program, with a targeted audience, would have been more effective in strengthening the government's capacity. Policy review and development has been narrowed to an environmental policy, which is in draft stage and is not expected to meet the original target of legal approval prior to the project's end.

Government capacity was advanced in the area of forestry governance, where technical assistance improved the understanding of issues relating to the administration and management of teak plantations. The original performance measure of 'policies, rules and regulations enacted' has not yet been, and it is not believed that it can be met with the remaining time and resources available for the program. The assistance to the Kagelu Forestry Training Center contributed to the first ever graduation of forest certificate holders, an accomplishment which may constitute the basis for a USAID 'success story'. In addition, assistance provided through STEP to the Boma Wildlife Training Center in part facilitated the graduation of a class of 39 wildlife officers.

More should have been accomplished in advancing environmental regulations for the petroleum sector, but a breakdown in communications between USAID and IRG prevented substantive actions on this measure from progressing. A USAID-IRG-MEWC&T review on this topic is appropriate if any result is expected before the end of the current contract, and USAID has verbally expressed a desire to move forward.

Efforts associated with strengthening the capacity to manage solid waste in Juba led to a pilot plastic recycling project, which may inform larger-scale recycling projects in the future.

Significant progress on the trans-boundary peace parks could not have been expected during the remaining life of the project. Efforts related to this activity are expected to continue under funds allotted by Congress to the Wildlife Conservation Society.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **Background**

Sudan is the largest country in Africa, with a population of approximately 40 million people, an estimated 10-12 million of whom live in Southern Sudan. Prior to the signing of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), Southern Sudan was embroiled in a continual state of warfare, poverty, and famine for nearly half a century, broken up only by an 11 year ceasefire. The CPA led to the creation of the Government of National Unity and the Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS). The two governments collaborate in a number of areas, and the GoSS exercises considerable autonomy in the governing of the ten southern states.

Numerous challenges persist. The CPA brings high expectations from citizens for tangible peace dividends, honest power and wealth sharing, and an end to the insecurity. The reintegration and safe transition of displaced and other affected people, including ex-combatants and orphans, is essential. To ensure stability, communities where they reintegrate will need assistance developing water systems, health systems, schools, transportation routes, vocational training, and business and agricultural inputs. Implementation of the CPA is slow. Institutions and capacities are nascent throughout Southern Sudan, and the political and administrative infrastructure of the new governments remains weak. Joint integrated units of the SPLM and Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) have yet to be properly established.

Inter- and intra-ethnic tensions and conflict over power and natural resources (grazing lands, water, oil, teak, and food) remain at the heart of South-South tensions. The presence of other armed groups will continue to threaten stability until they are integrated into either the SPLA or SAF. Strains are likely to be exacerbated by the return of internally displaced persons and refugees to areas that have yet to develop the infrastructure and services necessary for them to reestablish their lives and livelihoods. Peace, reconciliation, access to accurate and reliable information, and dialogue between key groups—people to people, civil society organization to civil society organization, and political party to political party—will help to manage conflict within the South and ensure that the foundation for stability outlined in the CPA is not undermined.

The USAID strategy for Sudan is focused on ensuring the success of the CPA. Achieving this aim involves building capacity and infrastructure, strengthening institutions of governance, and providing stability and basic needs for Southern Sudan's impoverished and internally displaced people.

## The Development Problem and USAID's Response

With the signing of the CPA USAID/Sudan recognized, as stated in the original **Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP)** contract, that in the context of post-war reconstruction, "...it is vitally important that Southern Sudanese have a greater capacity to assess the impacts of reconstruction projects on the environment and a greater capability to prudently mitigate those impacts. This capacity can be considered to take two forms: (1) clarity and functionality in the GoSS institutional framework for environmental policymaking, legislation, and regulation; and (2) capacity of individuals and institutions to weave environmental impact assessment and monitoring into the regular business practices for all projects and investments that may have an impact on the environment".

Conflict over scarce resources throughout Southern Sudan, particularly near its border with the North, is a serious threat to continued peace in the region. There is a pressing need to improve natural resource management and environmental assessment capabilities in the South, thereby improving economic and social development opportunities and reducing the likelihood of future conflict.

STEP began as an 18-month, \$1.24 million interim program based on a need "*develop an initial base of skills and institution capacity for the environmental analysis and planning necessary for Southern Sudan to conserve its natural and environmental resources while embarking on future economic and social development program*". International Resources Group (IRG) was contracted by USAID to implement the program activities. An initial set of six performance measures were to be achieved.

To better align the program to a new USAID strategy USAID issued a modification in September 2006 that added approximately \$4.6 million and extended the contract to September 2009. It also added an additional four performance measures that further addressed the new USAID strategy. It also eliminated the performance measure "Assessment of options for a 3 to 5 year environment program completed", and replaced it with "Revise the 2003 Sudan Threats and Opportunities Assessment (ETOA)". In September 2007 a modification added \$2.46 million to the total estimated cost of the program and added two new performance measures and one new element to an existing performance measure. It was later decided that the funding for the last modification would not be provided, but as of the date of the evaluation this decision had not been communicated through issuance of a formal modification amendment. Nonetheless, the number Performance Measure for STEP totaled 12 and they include the following.

1. GoSS establishes an institutional framework for environmental policy and impact monitoring.
2. Revision of the 2003 *Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment* completed.
3. 500 people trained in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), while maintaining a 50:50 women-to-men ratio, and specialized training in other natural resource management practices.
4. An association of alumni of the environmental impact assessment course established and operational.

5. GoSS staff and EIA alumni learn about other approaches to EIA and policy through six study tours to sub-Saharan African countries.
6. *A Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Road Rehabilitation Activities in Southern Sudan* completed
7. Timber resource utilization policies, laws and regulations enacted and operational, support provided to the Kagelu Forestry Training Center, and community and government forestry staff trained in community forestry methodologies.
8. Boma Wildlife Training Center functions as a training center for wildlife officers
9. Environmental standards for petroleum exploration and production policies and standards established and operational
10. Crisis Modifier
11. Southern Sudan authorities, including local jurisdictions, develop their capacity to manage a growing volume of solid waste in a manner that safeguards public health.
12. Trans-boundary protected areas lying on the Southern Sudan-Uganda border contribute to the resolution of trans-boundary conflicts.

In addressing these objectives, STEP works primarily with the GOSS Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Conservation, and Tourism and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Juba. It also works with the Kagelu Forestry Training Center in Yei and the Boma Wildlife Training Center in Boma National Park.

The operational environment for STEP, as for USAID programs in general, was difficult, beginning when the design could not precisely identify a host country counterpart for the program because the new government of Southern Sudan was in the very early stages of formation. Program activities began in Rumbek, and had to be moved to Juba when the government re-located. A basic organizational and operational capacity also was lacking in the early years of the government and the development of that capacity continues. Currently the Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Wildlife and Tourism is lacking the most basic office working facilities, with many of the staff ‘boxed’ into bamboo huts.

## **Purpose of this Evaluation**

The USAID Mission in Sudan is the largest USAID program in Africa. It has grown to include a number of activities aimed at maintaining peace and security in the fragile region of Southern Sudan. As the Mission moves forward, it will aim to strengthen program focus on the delivery of ‘peace dividends’ in the country’s more fragile and conflict prone areas. This will entail several changes to current programming and the development of new program approaches.

As a result of these changes, USAID/Sudan is undertaking several program evaluations to address project-specific issues and to assist with corrective actions. This evaluation assesses the effectiveness, progress, achievements, results, and the strategic relevance of the STEP program.

At the request of USAID/Sudan, Management Systems International (MSI) engaged a three-person team to conduct an evaluation of the Sudan Transitional Environment Program

(STEP), as implemented by the International Resource Group, Inc. (IRG). Please see Annex 1 for the evaluation scope of work.

An evaluation team planning meeting (TPM) took place at MSI headquarters in Washington, DC from June 26 to June 28, 2008, to examine the scope of work, refine the focus of the evaluation and prepare a work plan. After reviewing the scope of work, and material provided on the STEP program, the team identified six core questions to be answered by the evaluation.

1. How effective were/are the program objectives in accomplishing USAID's strategy?
2. Are there better ways to improve efficiency and invest the limited resources in this sector?
3. How effective was the program approach in building the capacities of the GOSS MEWC&T and the Ministry of Ag and Forestry?
4. To what degree have these capacities been effective?
5. To what degree have these capacities contributed to sustainable development and protection of Southern Sudan natural and environmental resources?
6. To what degree have the program activities changed the policy environment?

The evaluation took place in Nairobi, Kenya and in Juba and Yei, Southern Sudan from June 30 to July 16, 2008.

## **II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

### ***Team Composition***

The Evaluation Team was comprised of three members. Two of the members, Mr. Wayne McDonald and Ms. Jennifer Karanian, are environmental policy experts familiar with wildlife and forestry conservation and environmental protection. Mr. McDonald was the Team Leader and ensured that the evaluation was rigorous and compliant with USAID's Automated Directive System (ADS) 203 and MSI's evaluation and special studies quality standards. The third member of the team, Mr. Edmund Yakani Berzilius, is a local Information/Communications specialist fluent in the local languages spoken in the project area.

Evaluation research relied upon document reviews, informant interviews and field observations. STEP provided extensive reports, which were relied upon for the documentation of activities and results.

Individual interviews were guided by a set of general and performance measure specific questions. The questions were only a guide and not necessarily posed verbatim to each individual interviewed. Persons interviewed are listed in Annex 2 and the set of questions are attached as Annex 3. Documents reviewed are contained in Annex 4.

To help assess the progress activities the team prepared a ‘quarterly report timeline’, which noted, for each performance measure, a summary statement on the progress of the measure at the time of the quarterly report. It is attached as Annex 5.

### ***Team Activities and Timing***

Prior to departure, the Evaluation Team spent three days with MSI staff in Washington, D.C. reviewing relevant documents and developing an evaluation plan. The evaluation was carried out over a period of two and a half weeks in Juba and Yei, South Sudan.

The Team arrived in Nairobi on June 29, 2008 for initial meetings with, the USAID/Sudan Program Officer; the USAID Senior Regional Environmental Officer; and the USAID Regional Environment Procedures & Policies Specialist. The Team arrived in Juba on July 2<sup>nd</sup> and met with, the USAID/Sudan activity manager/CTO for the STEP program. The Team then spent six days conducting interviews with the IRG staff, STEP clients and partners and reviewing the pertinent literature. On July 8<sup>th</sup> the Team departed for Yei where three days were spent interviewing the staff of the Kagelu Forestry Training Center and observing timber operations at the nearby teak plantations. The Team returned to Juba on July 11<sup>th</sup> and spent the remaining time with additional interviews, further review of documentation and preparing the USAID debriefing presentation and the draft evaluation report. The Team departed from Juba on July 17<sup>th</sup>.

STEP and MSI/SUPPORT staff arranged meetings for the Team, in conjunction with the USAID/Juba office. The STEP COP, Bruce Kernan and the Senior Forestry Advisor, Sean White accompanied the Team on interviews with high-level Ministry officials.

## **III. OVERVIEW AND STATUS OF STEP PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

### ***Performance Measure 1: Establish a Framework for Environmental Institutions and Policy (Performance Indicator Statement: Framework for environmental policy and monitoring established; and, Environmental policy statement legally approved)***

A high standard was set as an indicator measurement for this PM. As of the date of the evaluation this policy had not yet been legally established. A Policy Task Force was formed, stakeholders from each of the 10 states were interviewed by the Task Force regarding their needs, and a draft environmental policy attempting to incorporate these needs has been completed by IRG.

Discussions with IRG indicate that with the funding and time remaining in the program the policy can reach the level of the Council of Ministers for approval. USAID and IRG consider passage of this policy to be a top priority and IRG intends to prioritize resources towards this measure. IRG estimates that the largest remaining financial obligation in

advancing the policy towards legislation is a workshop in which environmental representatives from each state line ministry (key stakeholders) would be brought to Juba to discuss the draft and reach consensus on a final draft for submission to the Minister. In terms of timing, IRG and the Ministry predict that the most significant delay in reaching final legal approval will likely be with legal affairs as they are generally understaffed and overworked. The Policy Task Force has requested that IRG provide a legal consultant to attend the stakeholder workshops and be involved in the initial policy draft to facilitate passage through legal affairs.

The evaluation believes that once the IRG contract has ended, the remaining effort required for the policy to reach legal approval may be helped along by USAID or other donors. Once the environmental policy is passed, an “environmental action plan” will be put in place by the Ministry. The Ministry can then work to establish an environmental law that would allow them to implement and enforce environmental impact assessments.

Administrative strengthening was also included under this PM to respond to a need for better administrative skills in the MEWC&T and the MAF. The trainers assisted participants in developing public administration and finance skills. The first administrative course has been completed and the second one has commenced. Phase II was organized during the first 2 courses and will include more specialized training for certain participants of the first phase.

***Performance Measure 2: Revise the 2003 Sudan Threats and Opportunities Assessment (ETOA) (Performance Indicator Statement: ETOA completed)***

The objective of this PM was to revise the existing ETOA, and that was accomplished over a two year period. From the quarterly reports it is noted that a decision was made to replace the original PM2 with an update of ETOA (quarter ending December 2005). The quarter ending December 2007 states that the ETOA report had been finalized, and the quarter ending March 2008 indicated that copies of the ETOA were delivered.

This PM replaced the original, which was “Assessment of Options for a 3-5 year Environment Program”, whereby the contractor was to present options for USAID to consider for a longer term environmental program. However, USAID/Sudan was in the course of preparing a new strategy, which became effective shortly after the STEP program began. USAID asked that the implementer, IRG, replace the original performance measure with the ETOA in order to accomplish an update of this required assessment as per Sections 117, 118 and 119 of the Foreign Assistance Act. These sections mandate application of environmental review and an assessment of threats to tropical forests and biodiversity, and how USAID proposes to address these threats within the context of the Country Strategy. It is required that the assessment be conducted concurrently with the development of the Country Strategy.

***Performance Measure 3: Conduct Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Other Specialized Training (Performance Indicator Statement: 500 people trained with a women to men ration of 50:50)***

Under the STEP program, a total of 197 men and 69 women received EIA training. An additional 97 men and 67 women received training in other specialized courses (GIS, Ecotourism, Participatory EIA, environmental design of low-volume roads, and Wetlands Management), for a total of 294 men and 136 women trained. As agreed by USAID, IRG summed these courses in person-weeks, bringing the total to 487. The criteria for participation in the EIA training course was a degree for men, a diploma for women, fluency in English, and NGO or government employment. A few of these criteria were lowered (specifically the English requirement) for the course for all women in Rumbek. The total training effort was to have resulted in an equal number of men and women receiving training. This was not met, but all efforts possible were made to satisfy the gender ratio measure.

Prior to the initiation of STEP, the Sudan Field Office, with support from the Regional Environmental Office in Nairobi began ‘pilot’ EIA training sessions in Southern Sudan. Three training sessions were delivered in March 2004, October 2004 and in May 2005. About 100 people were trained. With the award of the STEP contract the EIA training was formally incorporated as a deliverable. Nine EIA training courses have been delivered under STEP, and as of the time of this evaluation no further training courses are planned. Each training session was documented, and participants were asked to rate the training. Overall the participant evaluations were positive and participants were highly appreciative of the training opportunity.

IRG plans to provide more training in the environmental review process as additional training in this area may allow for more use/application of EIA training and more effectiveness in getting measures through the process. Two people from the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) have been sent to Kenya’s National Environmental Management Agency for training. If funding is available, IRG may send all 12 employees of the DEA.

To properly assess the application of this training a more detailed evaluation is required, which is beyond the scope of this evaluation. Anecdotal evidence was obtained from five EIA trainees interviewed for the evaluation: one from the MEWC&T, one from MAF, one from the KFTC, and two people outside government. Everyone the Team spoke with stated that they found the training to be helpful and interesting, but not applicable. The training itself was thought to be too brief, and as there are no institutions utilizing the EIA process at this point, the trainees don’t have the opportunity to apply what they’ve learned. At the professional and government level, participants felt that additional, more advanced training would have been useful. One trainee also expressed concern that an environmental background should have been a requirement for course participation, and that without it the training served only as an environmental awareness course and not a professional tool.

Anecdotal evidence from the STEP tenth quarterly report made the following observations. “STEP’s short-term training courses are beginning to produce favorable outcomes and



results. One of the attendees at the International Wetlands Management Course, for example, has prepared a technically sound plan for managing the Sudd wetlands (note: while it doesn't detract from need for the training nor the person's accomplishment, this particular attendee told the evaluators that his plan was not used). Graduates of the EIA course have launched a clean-up campaign in Bor. One of the EIA trainees has given EIA training to the staff of the program where he works, the Nile Basin Initiative".

Further discussion on this PM with respect to government capacity is discussed under Section IV, Question 3 (effectiveness of building government capacity).

***Performance Measure 4: Establish an Environmental Association***  
**(Performance Indicator Statement: South Sudan National Environmental Association established and operational)**

This performance measure has been satisfied with the creation and legal establishment of the Association. Through interviews with IRG and members of the Southern Sudan National Environmental Association (SSNEA), it was ascertained that despite establishment, the sustainability of the organization is improbable. The fifth quarterly report (September 2006) states, "The question remains as to whether this voluntary professional organization can operate successfully during this very vibrant period of Southern Sudanese history when so many of its members are just getting involved with new jobs and an emerging economy". The sixth quarterly report (December 2006) states, "Having said all that, however, and as was reported last time, there has been very little other activity by the members and the only activity of the Executive Committee was to nominate participants for the Uganda Study Tour carried out this quarter. The question has now been raised with USAID as to whether the voluntary professional organization can operate successfully during this very vibrant period of Southern Sudanese history when so many of its member are just getting involved with new jobs and an emerging economy". This same theme is raised in quarterly reports seven (March 2007), eight (June 2007), and nine (September 2007).

The final action planned under this PM is a radio broadcast in association with the USAID supported Sudan Radio Service (SRS). In an effort to raise public awareness regarding the association and its activities, the radio station will provide 15 minutes of free air time. This effort was initiated by IRG and to date the SSNEA members have not responded. Beyond this activity, the association has made no plans for future action. Additionally, there is no identified source of funding for the association once STEP ends.

***Performance Measure 5: Plan and Carry-out Several Study Tours***  
**(Performance Indicator Statement: 6 study tours completed)**

Between March 2006 and October 2007, four study tours were taken: Kenya, March 2006; Ghana, October 2006; Uganda, January 2007; and Namibia, October 2007. The objective was "to provide an opportunity for GoSS staff and South Sudan National Environmental Association members to learn about the existing policy, legal, and institutional framework on environmental management and impact monitoring." The study tours were intended to

inform and guide participants' own thinking in developing environmental policies and establishing effective environmental institutions in the GoSS. The STEP COP indicated that a lack of funding may prohibit any future study tours.

***Performance Measure 6: Conduct a Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Road Rehabilitation in Southern Sudan (Performance Indicator Statement: Roads PEA completed)***

As defined, the indicator for the PM was met, and the Roads PEA was completed by IRG in June 2006. Interviews with personnel from the Ministry of Transport and Roads (MTR) and Louis Berger revealed that they acknowledged the PEA as a useful guideline for more detailed Environmental Assessments and guidelines. The evaluation was verbally informed by the environmental unit of the MTR that, with technical assistance from Louis Berger, it has prepared detailed, draft environmental guidelines on road construction, aviation, river transport, railroad transport, and road safety.

***Performance Measure 7: Strengthen Forest Governance (Performance Indicator Statement: Forest Governance – Timber resource utilization policies, laws and regulations enacted and operational); Kagalu Forestry Training Center – KFTC graduating forestry technicians)***

This PM was added to STEP through a contract modification in September 2006. The overall objective of this measure was to reduce conflict in Southern Sudan by improving governance and management of teak plantations and other forest resources – a key component of the USAID/Sudan strategy – and to provide technical and financial assistance to the Kagalu Forestry Training Center. A community forestry element was added to this component in September 2007 and was intended to reduce conflict over forest resources in rural areas and to promote agroforestry. The community forestry element was later removed from the program.

A number of forest inventory and training activities were completed under the STEP program, including an Inventory and Management Plan for the Kagalu Forest Reserve, which may be used by the MAF to guide future forest management planning; a workshop on forest concession procedures; forest inventory training for MAF staff; and repair of the water system.

Enough information has been gathered from teak plantation inventories to begin developing materials for use in wider supply and demand issues in Southern Sudan; however, the government is still lacking considerable information on natural forests in the region. There is considerable potential for economic contributions from forestry in the south, based not only on existing teak plantations, but on natural growth, and potential future plantations.

The KFTC, which provides two years of training in forestry and agri-business activities such as agroforestry, beekeeping, and carpentry, produced its first ever graduating class in

December 2007 with a total of 11 male and 6 female graduates. Each of these graduates has gone on to work for the MAF. Future donors, such as the Norwegian government, and a private timber company with concessions in the region have also expressed interest in KFTC graduates. A second class is expected to graduate in December 2008

Operating costs of KFTC are \$8,000 to \$12,000/month. The MAF took up some costs for the training center, including payment of salaries, in January 2007. MAF also pays a portion of each student's tuition. The Ministry is due to fully assume operational costs of the training center once STEP ends. However, the training staff expressed concern that there may be a lapse in funding for KFTC between the cessation of STEP funding in September '08 and assumption of MAF funding in December '08, leaving a gap of about \$25,000, which might disrupt the graduation of the next class of foresters in December '08. In addition, a great deal of rehabilitation is still required to make the training center fully operational. A contractor has estimated a need of \$2.3 million to cover the necessary construction and rehabilitation costs.

The Kagelu teak plantation, adjacent to the KFTC, is currently owned and operated by the MAF. There are plans to hand the plantation over to the training center for use as a training forest and to generate income for the school. However, the plantation is currently operating at a loss due to many years of mismanagement, and is not expected to generate income for another 2-3 years.

As of the date of the evaluation the indicator, policies, laws and regulations enacted and operational has not been achieved. Enacted and operational policies, laws and regulations with respect to timber resources, specifically the teak plantations are a detailed and complex requirement. Good progress in the form of studies and meetings on regulation requirements was made with respect to the technical assistance provided under the forestry component. Forestry staff spoke of existing conflict over the management of the plantations between state and regional government levels. Given the difficult operational environment the evaluation concludes that this indicator is too high of a standard to meet in the time remaining for the project. With continued technical assistance further progress towards this goal can be made.

***Performance Measure 8: Provide Financial Assistance to the Boma Wildlife Training Center (BWTC) (Performance Indicator Statement: BWTC training wildlife officers)***

The role of STEP under this PM was limited to a transfer of funds to WCS for technical assistance and to the BWTC for operational costs. While small, this assistance contributed to the graduation of a class of wildlife technicians. There were some initial delays in reaching agreements between STEP and WCS and between STEP and the training center, which were eventually resolved. Assistance for a water system was also halted when it was learned that an NGO had provided 3 borehole wells. The technical assistance and operational assistance contributed in part towards the successful graduation of 39 wildlife officers. Assistance to this school is expected to continue under a separate program by the WCS.

***Performance Measure 9: Develop Programmatic Environmental Assessment for petroleum Environmental Standards (Performance Indicator Statement: Petroleum environmental exploration and production standards enacted and operational)***

This PM was added to the STEP program in September 2006 in an attempt to address resource-based conflicts and environmental pollution concerns associated with the oil sector in Southern Sudan. IRG planned to conduct a Programmatic Environmental Assessment of oil exploration and production activities to “carry out a careful and selective analysis of the potential adverse impacts... and to develop a set of recommendations about measures to avoid, mitigate or compensate for these impacts.” A Scoping Statement for the PEA was completed in September 2007 and a conference on oil production contracts and the environmental impacts of oil exploration was held in June 2007. According to IRG quarterly reports, concerns were expressed by USAID/Sudan and the GoSS about the PEA going forward. Subsequent quarterly reports indicate that USAID had not communicated a decision regarding the initiation of the PEA. This breakdown in communication hindered progress on this issue. USAID told the evaluation team that they will be requesting IRG to move forward on hiring a consultant to develop guidelines and best practices for oil extraction, rather than a PEA. USAID has also requested that some employees from the DEA participate in an EIA to be conducted by Total to gain on-the-job training as a follow-up to their EIA training under the STEP program. If progress is resumed a different indicator statement will have to be agreed on.

***Performance Measure 10: STEP Crisis Modifier Component (Performance Indicator Statement: To be determined)***

The Evaluation Team did not find that activities had been conducted under this PM, nor had any funding ever been allocated to it.

***Performance Measure 11: Improve Solid Waste Management in Juba (Performance Indicator Statement: Improved mechanisms established to collect and dispose of solid waste in Juba established (provisional))***

This PM was added to the STEP program in September 2007 as a result of concerns on the part of IRG regarding the complete lack of solid waste management in Juba. The objective of the activity was to “assist the Juba County Council to establish policies and means to implement policies that will lead to the regular, orderly removal and technically sound disposal of solid waste.”

IRG activities under this PM began with detailed examinations of the topic, a suggested waste management planning efforts and consultation with various donors on approaches to the problem.

The twelfth quarterly report (June 2008) stated, “USAID/Sudan has verbally informed STEP that it would not obligate the funds for this component of Step. Consequently, STEP reduced the scope of this Performance Measure to include only a small pilot recycling activity”. This involved a feasibility study for micro-enterprise plastic recycling, followed by a pilot plastic recycling project in association with VEGA and a women-owned business in Juba: the Safi Cleaning Company, in which a manually-operated plastic compressor was ordered and shipped to Juba and arrangements were made to send the compressed plastic to Kampala for further processing. STEP and VEGA are hopeful that whether this enterprise proves lucrative or not, it will produce results that may inform future recycling programs in the region.

***Performance Measure 12: Establish Trans-boundary Peace Parks***  
**(Performance Indicator Statement: Parks on the Southern Sudan-Uganda border effectively protect wildlife (provisional))**

This PM was also added to STEP in the September 2007 contract modification to “use conservation practices as a means to manage conflicts in and around one or more of the four protected areas that are located on the Southern Sudan-Uganda border adjacent or close to Ugandan protected areas.”

The contractor was verbally informed by USAID/Sudan in the second quarter of 2008 that funding would not be available to implement this measure. Thus, implementation activities will be limited to those conducted thus far, which include scholarships for four students to the one year training program at the College of African Wildlife Management in Tanzania, the procurement of two vehicles for Sudan National Park use, and two coordinating meetings, one in Nimule and the second in Kampala.

Additional work in this area may be taken up by the Wildlife Conservation Society. The U.S. Congress has allowed funds for the WCS to support biodiversity efforts in Sudan, including the trans-boundary areas.

With the funding eliminated for this PM six months after it was agreed to, any significant progress towards meeting the indicator could not be met. However, the activities to date have been appropriate. To have fully satisfied the performance measure within the planned two year period (the time from the signing of the modification to the planned termination date in September 2009) would have been challenging.

## IV. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

### *Question 1: How effective were/are the program objectives in accomplishing the USAID/Sudan strategy?*

#### **Findings**

##### Overview of the USAID/Sudan Strategy

The USAID/Sudan strategy is based primarily on supporting the implementation of and reducing threats to the CPA. The five key threats to the CPA identified by USAID are:

- (1) Political Will to Implement the CPA – A poor record of participatory and inclusive governance exists. The transfer of oil revenue from the North to the South is of particular concern.
- (2) Potential for Resumption of Conflict in the Three Areas – As the three area states are part of the front line between North and South, renewed conflict in these areas could easily escalate between the north and south.
- (3) Weak Institutional Capability of the GoSS – The nascent GoSS lacks the institutional capacity and the core institutional structures required to respond to the needs of its citizens. The potential for mismanagement and corruption, together with the exploitation of other natural resources (such as teak), requires that systems of management and accountability be put in place immediately.
- (4) Continued South-South Tensions – Inter- and intra-ethnic tensions and conflict over power and natural resources are at the heart of South-South tensions.
- (5) High Expectations – Expectations for a visible peace dividend are extremely high, and USAID’s activities seek to buttress the CPA with tangible results.

The USAID/Sudan programming approach diverges significantly from traditional sector based programming by focusing on averting and resolving conflict and promoting stability, recovery, and democratic reform. Every activity, whatever its source of funding, will look to build institutional and human capacity, increase access to accurate and reliable information, and develop systems for participatory governance, accountability, transparency, and infrastructure development.

The original six STEP program objectives were:

- Government of Southern Sudan establishes its institutional framework for environmental policy and impact monitoring;
- Assessment of options for a 3-5 year environmental program completed (which was quickly replaced by the objective of revising the Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment);
- 120 participants trained in environmental impact assessment (later amended to 500 trainees in EIA and other specialized areas, with an equal representation of men and women in the EIA training);
- EIA alumni association established and operational;

- GoSS staff and EIA alumni learn about other approaches to environmental impact assessment, policy and regulations;
- Sudan road infrastructure program environmental assessment completed.

Subsequent modifications added the following objectives:

- Improved forestry governance in Southern Sudan through activities related to rational exploitation of the teak plantation resources, and in support to the Kagelu Forestry Training Center;
- Administrative Support to Wildlife Officer Training at the Boma Wildlife Training Center
- Ensure enactment and operationalization of GoSS Petroleum Exploration and Production policies and standards that incorporate environmental best practices used in other petroleum exporting countries.
- STEP Crisis Modifier
- Improved mechanisms established to collect and dispose of solid waste in Juba established
- Trans-boundary Parks lying on Southern Sudan-Uganda border effectively protect wildlife.

#### Program Relevance to the USAID/Sudan Strategy

The policy framework, the building of EIA capacity, improved forestry governance, support to the forestry training center, support to the wildlife training center, and the petroleum policies are in line with addressing the weak institutional capability of the GoSS, the south-south conflict, and high expectations. The objectives concerning the solid waste problem in Juba and the Trans-boundary parks address to some degree high expectations for basic services and south-south tensions over access to resources. The remaining PMs (the ETOA, the Association, the Study Tours, the roads PEA) were, in the opinion of the evaluators, less directly responsive to the strategy, or were more appropriately classified as approaches or tools for achieving the other objectives. The Association did not demonstrate that it could be sustained. The ETOA and roads PEA were primarily in response to USAID internal requirements (although also intended for informing others, including the government) and the study tours were in support of the PM on environmental policy. The crisis modifier performance measure is not considered.

## **Conclusions**

The USAID/Sudan strategy is based on supporting the comprehensive peace agreement by responding to the five key threats mentioned above. The STEP program measures are, in part, in line with the strategy with respect to addressing the weak institutional capacity, south-south tensions, and high expectations. An examination of the results of the performance measures leads to the conclusion that it is difficult to establish strong strategic relevance.

The indicators used for measuring the program measures for environment policy, improved forestry governance and petroleum policies have not yet been met, and in their current form not likely to be met before the planned termination date. While the indicator for the

environmental impact assessment training (an output indicator of number trained and gender equity) has been fully met, the relevant part to the strategy of this performance measure concerns increased government capacity. As noted elsewhere in this report (Question 3 below) it is clear that IRG also recognized the need for improving training to increase government capacity. The ‘break-down’ in communication between IRG and USAID over the petroleum PEA did not allow for sufficient follow-up on this issue. The forestry and wildlife training centers address weak institutional capacity due to the fact that STEP assistance played a role in achieving the realization of newly trained staff for the forestry and wildlife departments. Overall it cannot be said that strategic relevance was strong. Accomplishment of the established performance measure results, as measured by the indicator, leads to accomplishment of the strategy.

Performance in the implementation of STEP was good. But, given the overall operating environment (as noted above under ‘The Development Problem and USAID’s) the performance measures were highly ambitious. Policy and regulation development (environment and forestry) will, in light of government absorptive capacity, require additional time to fully approve and enact, not to mention implement. More advanced training is needed in both Ministries. The environmental issues and requirements in the petroleum industry will require skillful negotiation and additional time to develop. Given the current government capacity and the decision to reduce funding STEP brought these measures, as well as other measures, as far as it could.

## **Recommendations**

Regardless of whether the STEP program is continued beyond its currently slated end date of September 2009 or is terminated at that time, the focus of program activities, in order to strengthen relevance to the Mission strategy, should be on policy, professional development of environmental assessment capacity and improving capabilities to address environmental issues in the petroleum sector. In the preparation of the Annual Program Statement, USAID should examine the ETOA to determine if some of the recommendations may be incorporated into the final statement.

***Question 2: Are there better ways to improve efficiency and invest the limited resources in this sector?***

## **Findings**

The twelve PMs each called for numerous activities, all of which had to be developed, coordinated, and carried out over lengthy periods of time. A review of all quarterly reports of tasks accomplished found that several measures took considerable time to achieve. This was determined to be primarily due to significant organizational and logistical difficulties existing in Southern Sudan. Efficiency and resources were found to be affected throughout the project, largely as a result of these difficult circumstances.



For example, as noted from various quarterly reports, and in no particular order:

- the logistical support contractor did not deliver the expected services;
- the Association, while formally established, could not establish an effective functioning status;
- the need to focus on public administrative issues before tackling policy development;
- the difficulty in attaining an equal gender distribution for the EIA training;
- the unavailability of a full Ministry staff and a weak budget at the beginning of the project;
- the budgetary impact on the MEAW&T from the decision to take in 14,000 wildlife guards as a means to offer employment to the ex-soldiers;
- one year following the commencement of the project only 8 of 21 positions filled in Directorate of Environmental Affairs, and most with little experience;
- lengthy absences by key Ministry personnel;
- poor communication by Wildlife Training Center regarding water supply system planned by STEP, but eventually done by another contractor, unknown to STEP;
- indecisions regarding the petroleum issues;
- the addition of performance measures and subsequent cancellation of proposed additional funding.

All of the above were unforeseen events and certainly all projects have them. Never-the-less they impacted upon the efficiencies of overall project operations.

## **Conclusions**

While action was taken to later add objectives to the program one year after it began, it may have been prudent to undertake a more thorough portfolio review before a final decision was reached on the added objectives. If you have a nascent government, weak in administration and experience why continue with objectives calling for national policy and legal reform unless it can be more fully established what the exact requirements would be for such reform given the existing conditions?

Fewer objectives more focused on capacity building and south-south tensions would likely have been more effective, and may still be in the event the program is continued in one form or another. However, as it seems certain that the program will not be continued beyond its current ending date (September 2009), a very narrow set of priorities must be immediately and formally established, taking into account the remaining time and funds available.

## **Recommendations**

With the program terminating as of September 2009 and close outs of contracts likely starting approximately two months before the official termination date, priorities must be

established accordingly. The recommended priorities, in order of importance and based on funds and time remaining, are as follows:

1. Complete the environmental policy at the level of approval by the Council of Ministers. Submission and approval by the Legislative Assembly appears unlikely.
2. Develop an exhaustive plan for final approval of the policy by the legislative assembly, including associated responsibilities and identification of any other possible donor support.
3. A meeting between USAID, IRG and the MEWC&T regarding the direction and scope of environmental guidelines and best practices for the petroleum sector.
4. Determine the most appropriate areas for improving the professional environmental impact assessment capabilities of the Directorate of Environmental Affairs, taking into account the priorities of the Directorate. Additional training is proposed for Directorate staff in Kenya, and other suggested areas are environmental guidelines on petroleum exploration and production and on-the-job training for Directorate staff, which consist of detailing staff to environmental impact assessments being conducted either by donors or by the private sector in the oil industry. All of these are important, and Directorate priorities, funding, and time should dictate the final selection of the areas of focus.
5. Continue technical assistance to the Directorate of Forestry to work towards final approval of rules and regulations governing management and exploitation of teak plantations.
6. In the event that government funding is not forthcoming, provide a final ~~\$25,000~~ allowance to KFTC to ensure operating funds for the final quarter of the 2008 calendar year (October to December 2008) that will see them through to the December graduation of the current class.
7. Continue to engage Ministries, and possibly the Natural Resources Committee of the legislative assembly, to provide funding for directorates and/or offices responsible for environmental reviews so skills acquired through training may be applied.

The above may not be entirely possible in the time remaining and with the funds available. If a detailed assessment of the situation confirms this, and submission of the policy to the Legislative Assembly is deemed critical, USAID should consider the allocation of an additional \$500,000 to \$750,000 of FY2008 funds and an appropriate extension of time to attain these priorities.

With respect to increasing the capacity of the Directorate of Environmental Affairs in the area of environmental impact assessment and the petroleum industry, consideration should be given to seeking support from the funding currently allocated to the WCS for their landscape program in southern Sudan. This important biodiversity area is also of significant interest to the oil industry; therefore, enhanced capacity of the Ministry in environmental impact assessment of the oil sector should also be a priority of the WCS program.

***Question 3: How effective was the program approach in building the capacities of the GoSS Ministry of Environment Wildlife Conservation & Tourism (MEWC&T) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)?***

**Findings**

Under STEP, the primary approach for building capacity within MEWC&T was through the PMs of environmental policy and EIA training, with the environmental association and the study tours supporting these measures-

An ambitious target was established for the policy PM. Due to the operational and organizational difficulties within the government it was recognized early in the project that extensive discussions, reviews and technical support (including the study tours) would be required before demonstrable progress could be made towards the development of a nationally approved environmental policy. From the seventh quarterly report (March 2007), “Although STEP’s activities in this regard are expected to focus on operationalizing environmental policy and impact monitoring procedures, it is becoming plain that certain more immediate and basic achievements in the area of public administration will first be required. The Senior Environmental Policy Advisor (the Team Leader) has thus concentrated on the nature of the Directorate, its staffing pattern, and staff assignments and responsibilities. Efforts in this regard, however, remain very much of a challenge and a work in progress but will be continued...”

Recognizing these difficulties it would have been appropriate to reevaluate the objectives and indicators of the performance measure.

Based on the USAID precedent in EIA training prior to STEP, individuals working in the environmental sector were not specifically targeted to receive training. Rather, the training was targeted to “Sudanese public sector and NGO managers, staff of implementing partners, and USAID staff, at a gender equity ratio of 50:50, using a tailored ENCAP curriculum”. The EIA training performance measure and indicators was successfully met. The value of the EIA training provided, as a broad approach to increase environmental knowledge and awareness is acknowledged.

The original contract for STEP, dated 8/11/2005, states under A.2 ‘Objective/Purpose’, “The purposes of the services provided under this task order is to develop an initial base of skills and institutional capacity for the environmental analyses and planning necessary for Southern Sudan to conserve its natural and environmental resources while embarking on future economic and social development programs”. The subsequent change in USAID strategy (as outlined above under Question 1, above) called for a stronger emphasis on strengthening the capacity of the GoSS. Based on this change in strategy, the EIA training as originally conceived was found by the evaluation not to support the more advanced type of training that would have been useful in addressing specific capacity needs of the GoSS. The overall target audience was inappropriate for strengthening the capacity of GoSS (although several trainees were from the government), both in terms of the criteria for participation as well as the

attempt to attain an even gender distribution. No evidence was found to suggest the training, particularly in the Directorate of Environmental Affairs, was being applied.

The STEP program concurs that additional steps beyond basic EIA training is needed. The ninth quarterly report (September 2007) states, “It is important, however, that STEP takes measures to ensure that after it ends in mid 2009, a capacity to apply EIA principals remains entrenched within the national and state institutions of Southern Sudan. During the next quarter, therefore, the DEA (Department of Environmental Affairs) and STEP propose to design a program for reinforcing and upgrading the capacity of the staff of national and state level Southern Sudan institutions to utilize EIA in their planning and implementation”. That statement succinctly summarizes the thrust of the identified need for further professional development of the government in this area. An effort has begun on this with the sending of two staff to the Kenya National Environmental Management Agency for further training.

The approach to improving capacity within the MAF, was through the PM of forestry governance with the target on the development of rules and regulations for management of the teak plantations. Technical assistance, meetings and reviews were successful in their purpose to understand the issues and requirements to consider in developing appropriate rules and regulations. It will, however, require additional time and assistance to see the actions through to actual formulation of rules and regulations.

The administrative training provided to both Ministries is fulfilling a critical need in the area of public administration. This is a priority for the entire government and STEP has provided important assistance to make this happen. How the ministries will apply it remains to be seen.

## **Conclusions**

Although the EIA training seemed to have more of an emphasis on numbers trained and gender equity, the objective of reaching as broad an audience as possible and exposing a variety of government and non-government personnel to the importance of environmental impact assessment and its role in sustainable development is valid and the work done under the EIA training is an important achievement. However, it was not a sufficient approach for fulfilling the objective of increasing the capacity of the GoSS, and institutionalizing the practice of environmental impact assessments within the Directorate of Environmental Affairs.

## **Recommendations**

The value of the EIA training provided, as a broad approach to increasing environmental knowledge and awareness, is not in dispute. However, a more professional type of environmental impact assessment training was, and continues to be required. The training target should be the Directorate of Environmental Affairs and other Ministries where EIA implementation is necessary, such as the Ministry of Transport and Roads, where they currently have only a one-person environmental unit.

Additional recommendations regarding environmental impact assessment training are detailed under question 2 above.

***Question 4: To what degree have these capacities been effective?***

**Findings**

Given the near total absence of training for mid- and lower-level personnel within the MEWC&T before the project, the type of capacity development provided was found to be of use in terms of increasing basic, technical knowledge. In this regard the training evaluations were overwhelmingly in favor of the training received. At the government level, however, trainees returned to departments and divisions that have little or no support for implementing the subjects of focus in the training.

**Conclusions**

Within the context of the strategy and the program, the measurement of effectiveness is increased capacity to apply the knowledge gained from the training. The knowledge gained was determined not to be professional enough for use at the government level, principally in the Directorate of Environmental Affairs. However, it is recognized that even the most extensive and professional training is not a guarantee that it will be put to use.

Capacity development in the MAF proved more effective, although much remains to be done. This was concluded to be primarily the result of a more analytical approach to helping the MAF improve their understanding of the management issues. In addition, the technical assistant for the forestry measure had a specific counterpart and office, with a better defined set of functions. The needs under this measure were more narrowly defined and more within manageable interests.

The contractual obligations to deliver training was met. However, determinations of what the recipient did, or does, with the training would require a longer period of assistance in order to shore up Ministry management and the conduct of its mandate.

**Recommendations**

In the time remaining USAID and IRG should consider assessing the feasibility of assisting the Directorate of Environmental Affairs with a development plan that the Directorate could use in lobbying for additional government funds or seeking other donor assistance. This can be expected to assist the Directorate beyond the end of the STEP project to become more pro-active on its own in securing the funding either from within the government or from other donors. This funding would be important to supporting the Directorate's training and capacity building activities.

***Question 5: To what degree have these capacities contributed to sustainable development and protection of natural and environmental resources in Southern Sudan?***

**Findings**

Support provided through the STEP program has enabled the Kagelu Forestry Training Center to graduate the first ever class of foresters at a certificate level, and assistance to KFTC has enabled the development of plans to upgrade the forestry training to the diploma level. The STEP program has also played a role in re-starting the Boma Wildlife Training Center, which recently graduated a class of 39 wildlife officers.

With the right follow-up on the part of the Directorate of Forestry, the foundation has been provided through STEP to enable the Directorate to embark on re-establishing an effective management program for the country's estimated 15,000 hectares of teak plantations.

Although it has been a lengthy and difficult process and much remains to be done, the development of an environmental policy for Southern Sudan has moved forward. With the time remaining the policy may be completed, and with a relatively small amount of additional support from USAID or an alternate source it is realistic to expect that it may be presented to the Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly by late 2009.

Though small, STEP assistance to the Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Wildlife and Tourism in support of the Trans-boundary Peace-parks as well as support for the wildlife school can be regarded as part of the first steps towards ensuring improved conservation of the country's biodiversity resources.

**Conclusions**

Local training of forestry and wildlife personnel is a direct contribution to the development and protection of the country's natural resources.

Strengthening the capacity of the Directorate of Forestry to effectively manage the teak plantations and natural forests in Southern Sudan will, in the long-term, aid in job creation, lessen south-south tensions, and contribute income to localized economies. This in turn will serve to protect and conserve a valuable lumber producing resource.

More accomplishments were expected from the STEP program than were achieved. However, too many objectives were expected to be completed in an unusual and very taxing work environment. With regard to facilitating the country's development, some accomplishments of the STEP program have played an important role. Sustainable development and protection of natural and environmental resources is a long term and continuous effort, and may be too substantial a goal for a four year program.

## **Recommendations**

The graduation from KFTC of the first ever class of foresters at a certificate level is a significant accomplishment in terms of strengthening the capacity of the GoSS to effectively manage its timber resources, and should be considered as a USAID success story.

As no further assistance is planned for this program, USAID should consider the following two options:

1. As mentioned above, USAID should review with the Wildlife Conservation Society how that program can work effectively with the Directorate of Environmental Affairs to build EIA capacity. Environmental impact assessment capacity is certainly relevant to biodiversity protection. Such capacity will be essential for the infrastructural and economic goals of Southern Sudan to succeed;
2. USAID can better manage its own environmental review process and take on staff of the Directorate as ‘assistants’ (covering their costs for services – per-diem, not salary supplements) to USAID staff or contractors that are conducting environmental reviews of USAID activities. This should be viewed as a training opportunity for Directorate staff.

### ***Question 6: To what degree have program activities changed the policy environment?***

## **Findings**

At the time of this evaluation the policy environment had not been enacted. IRG recognized early in the program that the institutional capabilities of the MEWC&T would pose a difficult challenge in all areas of the program. A practically non-existent Ministry at the beginning of the program, a move to Juba when the Ministry was formed with the implementer establishing its base in Rumbek, a Ministry-wide lack of general and/or specialized administrative and management capability, Ministry finances and overall operations being smothered with the absorption of several thousand ex-soldiers as wildlife guards, consultants not being granted visas in a timely manner, and a host of other issues hindered policy development throughout the STEP program.

## **Conclusions**

The evaluation has concluded that it will not be possible to attain approval of the environmental policy by the legislative assembly within the remaining life of the project.

## **Recommendations**

Following a thorough assessment of remaining steps, the measurement of achievement should be lowered to approval by the Council of Ministers. Additionally, a good roadmap

could be prepared for the requirements to get the policy presented to the national assembly for approval.

Refer to the additional recommendations listed under question 2 above.

#### **IV. LESSONS LEARNED**

The evaluation doesn't presume to tell others what lessons may or may not have been learned from this project. The following are observations to be taken into account, or not, as each reader sees appropriate.

Capacity building is a difficult issue in any context. Southern Sudan poses its own problems in this area. As the country moves towards greater autonomy, a more rigorous review of training and the relationship to capacity building in the context of Southern Sudan is appropriate for any development activity that USAID/Sudan may undertake.

From the point when a policy, legal or regulatory action is first proposed to the point when it is legally enacted is a long, complex process. Procedural requirements at all necessary organizational levels should be analyzed and understood before beginning policy, legal, or regulatory reform. To the extent possible, involve advocacy groups (business, private citizens, non-government) so that the process is not all government. Understand how long policy reform takes before engaging in programs designed to achieve that goal.



# **ANNEX 1: The Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP) Evaluation Scope of Work**

## **Background**

Sudan is the largest country in Africa, borders 9 countries, and has a population estimated at 40 million. Although the first census in decades is planned, the current Southern Sudan population is estimated at 10-12 million people – with an estimated 4 million displaced to Northern Sudan and as refugees outside the country. Since independence in 1956, Southern Sudan has suffered from civil war with only a decade of troubled peace from 1972 to 1983.

Southern Sudan is characterized by years of underdevelopment, war, famine, drought and flood, producing a crisis of enormous proportions across the region and resulting in the devastation of the South's economic, political and social structures – leaving the health, education and infrastructure status of the Sudanese people and region among the poorest globally. In addition to the loss of lives, lost opportunities and destruction of infrastructure, the war displaced families and divided communities. Since the mid-1990s, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), and multilateral/bilateral agencies offering humanitarian relief became the prime providers of an array of much needed services.

After decades of civil war, Sudan's warring parties signed a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) on January 9, 2005. Since that time, the country has taken giant steps toward peace, reconciliation and good governance.

## **GOSS Intuitional Framework**

The peace process recognized that access to natural resources was a key driver of the conflict, and could again cause a return to local conflict or larger civil war. The peace agreement focused on land and petroleum resources, and describes a set of institutions that will help to resolve conflicts over those resources, including land commissions, a petroleum commission, and sharing of revenues from exploitation among different levels of government. Parallel to the need for strengthened institutional capabilities to manage all sectors of the economy identified in the Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) reports is the need for improved environmental assessments and education .

## **USAID/Sudan's Approach**

USAID/Sudan's investment in environmental capacity-building and training are passing through three stages.

- a. Initial "pilot" training rounds.
- b. Bridge to major investments in environmental capacity
- c. Large-scale environmental training and capacity-building

## **International Resources Group**

The goal of the USG's "Fragile States Strategy" is to guide USAID's efforts in reversing decline in fragile states and advancing recovery to a state where transformational development is possible. It is on the basis of this that USAID awarded this contract to IRG to develop an initial base of skills and institutional capacity for the environmental analyses and planning necessary for Southern Sudan to conserve its natural and environmental resources while embarking on future economic and social development programs.

## **Program Description**

### **Program Goal**

The goal of this program is "to develop an initial base of skills and institutional capacity for the environmental analysis and planning necessary for Southern Sudan to conserve natural and environmental resources while embarking on future economic and social development program".

### **Program Objectives**

STEP started in August of 2005 and is scheduled to end in September of 2009. It is implemented through a performance-based USAID Task Order with International Resources Group, Ltd (IRG) under EPIQ II IQC. Per the original Task Order, the contractor was expected to achieve the following results:

- Government of Southern Sudan establishes its institutional framework for environmental policy and impact monitoring
- Assessment of options for a 3-5 year environmental program completed
- 120 participants trained in environmental impact assessment (EIA)
- EIA alumni association established and operational
- GOSS staff and EIA alumni learn about other approaches to environmental impact assessment, policy and regulations
- Sudan Road Infrastructure Program Environmental Assessment completed

## **Program Activities**

STEP provides its support principally to the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Conservation, and Tourism (MEWCT) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). It has also helped to establish the South Sudan National Environmental Association (SSNEA) and, in coordination with MEWCT and MAF, provides support to the Kagelu Forestry Training Center (KFTC) and the Boma Wildlife Training Center (BWTC). IRG has subcontracts with Winrock International, for forestry activities, and with Cadmus Group, for study tours and for assistance to SSNEA.

IRG's program activities include:

1. Environmental Policy Analysis and Institutional Capacity Building for the MEWCT and the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA)
2. Forestry Department Technical Support including Forest Governance
3. Training on Environmental Impact Analysis
4. Environmental Threats & Opportunities Assessment (ETOA)

5. Supporting the Southern Sudan National Environmental Association
6. Roads Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA)
7. Strengthening the Kagalu Forestry Training Center and the Boma Wildlife Training Center
8. Establishing Oil Environmental Standards

### **Impact Areas**

STEP primarily works with the GOSS Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Conservation, and Tourism and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Juba. It also works with the Kagalu Forestry Training Center and the Boma Wildlife Training Center.

### **Program Expansion and Extension**

Since the signing of the original contract in August 2005, there have been four contract amendments.

**Modification 1:** Mod1 realigns the project scope of work and activities with the new USAID/Sudan Strategy Statement 2006 -2008. Increases the Total Estimated Cost (TEC) by \$4,600,000 from \$1,239,615.78 to \$5,839,615.78 and revises the budget to incorporate changes in the TEC and extends the LOP from February 11,2007 to September 30, 2009.

**Modification 2:** Mod2 approves IRG’s proposal to contribute to the refurbishment of the GOSS Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Conservation and Tourism. It also changes Performance Measure 2 to read “Revised Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment (FAA 118/119 analysis) based on USAID’s new Sudan Strategy 2006 – 2008. It also incrementally funds the Contract by an additional \$2,100,000 thereby bringing the total obligated amount from \$1,200,000 to \$3,300,000.

**Modification 3:** Mod 3 incrementally funds the contract by \$2,539,615.79 thus revising the total obligated funds to date, from \$3,300,000.00 to \$5,839,615.79 bring the contract to full funding.

**Modification 4:** Mod 4 amends statement of work to incorporate critical Environmental Needs in Southern Sudan and makes budget revisions by increasing TEC by \$2,500,000 to bring the total contract budget to \$8,339,615.79.

### **Linkages to USAID/Sudan Country Strategy**

IRG/STEP activities directly support the new USAID Strategy for Sudan, which focuses on support for the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and the achievement of lasting peace and security. Issues addressed by the STEP project include developing the institutional capacity of the Government of National Unity (GNU) and in particular that of the Government of Southern Sudan to manage and mitigate natural resources based conflicts that could enhance the chances for peace.

### **Evaluation Purposes and Objectives**

As the USAID program in Southern Sudan has grown considerably and, at times since inception, in a somewhat sporadic and varying manner – due to, *inter alia*, the difficulties

encountered when running the program entirely from Nairobi and the changing program landscape, as dictated by Washington – the Mission now wants to undertake an array of mid- and late-term evaluations over this year and next. While wanting to also focus on a variety of project-specific issues and questions to assist with corrective implementation actions, the Mission is particularly focused on the following broader programmatic points, and these will be clearly addressed in this evaluation:

- How effective was the program strategy in achieving the objectives of both the original and subsequently revised Contract?
- What is the strategic relevance of the program to the USAID/USG Sudan program and foreign policy priorities – are the program activities rendering a clear CPA “peace dividend?” and in what ways do they build the capacity of the GOSS and legitimize the GOSS leadership?
- How has IRG contributed to sustainable development and protection of Southern Sudan natural and environmental resource? How effectively has it built the capacities of the GOSS Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Conservation, and Tourism and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry?
- What has IRG achieved since the signing of the STEP contract in August 2005? This will be based on quarterly reports, as well as subject interviews.
- What is its performance in terms of results achieved, efficiency and value for money – are there better ways to improve efficiency and invest the limited resources in this sector?
- How effective is IRG’s approach to institutional capacity building? Can this be demonstrated with the institutions it has been working with?
- Rate the overall effectiveness of IRG in achieving the stated objective and performance measures.
- What recommendations are there for moving forward if the STEP activities were to continue and/or expand – are they replicable and desirable?
- Identify the best practices, success stories, and testimonials – are there important lessons to be learned, and is there a story which can best demonstrate to the U.S. Congress lasting impacts of the program?
- To what extent is IRG addressing the different needs and constraints faced by men and women? How is IRG defining and addressing gender equity? To what extent is IRG empowering women to increase their productivity and earnings power?
- To what extent are the activities of IRG addressing problems and challenges faced by the youth in Southern Sudan?
- How effectively is IRG building local institutional capacity for environmental impact assessment and natural resources management? How effectively has IRG addressed environmental conservation and protection awareness in Southern Sudan?

The Evaluation Team will ensure that the evaluation is fully compliant with the terms for Project Evaluations contained in the USAID Automated Directives System (ADS) Series 203 and other relevant regulatory requirements, as may be determined by USAID. Additionally, the Team will utilize MSI’s “SUPPORT Evaluation/Special Study Quality Management Guide.” The Guide will be presented to the Team members prior to their initial MSI briefing in Washington, DC.

### **Issues and Questions to Be Addressed**

While the Evaluation Team will be looking at the progress and achievement of results, strategic importance, etc. from the commencement of the Program, the Team should particularly focus on the steps taken to improve efficiency, effectiveness and strategic relevance of STEP. For example, the Team should examine the program's M&E framework and its relevance and the procedures used for reporting on performance indicators and how data quality is assured.

### **Efficiency (Activities, Costs and Management)**

In terms of assessing overall Program efficiency, the Evaluation Team should look at cost/benefit in terms of economic, social and political benefits.

1. What is the relevance of the program to the local recipient Sudanese when considering the size of the population and geographic area?
2. Language is a major concern with few Southerners being fluent in English. How did IRG address this deficiency when implementing program activities and building indigenous capacity? Recommendations?
3. What degree of follow-up is there with the individuals trained through STEP? Are the trainees able to use the skills and information gained on the job? Recommendations?
4. To what degree has IRG activities changed the policy environment?
5. What cost-reducing measures has IRG used to keep the high costs of doing business in Juba and elsewhere in Southern Sudan as low as possible? Is there more that can be done?

### **Effectiveness (Results)**

6. What are the concrete results and impacts of STEP to date? Can benefits to individuals and the targeted institutions be measured? What recommendations can be made to increase effectiveness?
7. What strategy and efforts, if any, does IRG have to address issues related to the sustainability of program results?
8. How does IRG relate capacity building to increased environmental awareness and protection? Recommendations?

### **Required Tasks and Work Plan**

<b>Tasks</b> (All Team members unless otherwise noted)	<b>Work Days</b> (6-day weeks)	<b>Timeline for Completion</b>
<b>Initial Preparation</b> Review advance background documents, attend MSI Team Planning Meetings (TPM), make travel preparations, provide feedback on SOW and SUPPORT Project's Evaluation Quality Management Guide, conduct other Washington meetings, and travel days.	3	June- July 2008
<b>In-Country Evaluation</b> Initial briefings, meetings, field visits, draft report preparation and debriefings.	12	June-July 2008
<b>Final Report Preparation in U.S.</b> Incorporate collective Sudan feedback, complete final report, and submit to USAID EGI Team Leader.	3 for second member and 5 for COP	NLT 10 work days after receipt of USAID's comments on draft report
<b>Total for Second Evaluation Team member</b>	18	
<b>Total for Evaluation Team COP</b>	20	

### **Team Composition, Activities and Timing**

The Evaluation Team will be comprised of:

1. Environmental Policy Expert familiar with wildlife and forestry conservation, ecotourism and environmental protection. This person would most likely be the Chief-of-Party (COP).
2. Institutional Development or Capacity Building Specialist in a post-conflict environment where institutional structures have been destroyed or never existed.
3. Local Information/Communication Specialist fluent in the local languages spoken in the project area.

The Environmental Policy Expert and the Institutional Development Specialist must ideally have experience in Southern Sudan or East Africa. One or both of these Team members should be well versed in social science/soundness and gender analysis.

The Team Leader will ensure that the evaluation is rigorous and is compliant with USAID's Automated Directive System (ADS) 203 and MSI's evaluation and special studies quality standards. The local Information/Communication Specialist will produce the following for purposes of USAID monitoring, reporting and evaluation:

- tape interviews with key informants (a brief testimony of impressions of the program, if positive);

- GPS coordinates of each site observed, accompanied by a brief description of what it represents;
- photographs of the area and anything that captures the USAID activity there; and
- anything else of relevance to telling the USAID/Sudan assistance story.

The project CTO and GOSS representatives are encouraged to accompany the team on all site visits and meetings to gain an understanding of how IRG activities are perceived by the project beneficiaries.

### Activities and Timing

The USAID/Sudan Mission requests that the two-person Team arrive in Juba at the same time (i.e., fragmentation of their arrivals is unacceptable) for the initial briefings and discussions with USAID's Economic Growth and Infrastructure (EGI) Team Leader, Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) and other Mission officers, as well as IRG and GOSS representatives. Subsequently, the Team will commence its field trips and meetings.

During the initial meetings in Juba, the Evaluation Team COP will present in writing and orally the Team's proposed work plan for the entire period of the Team's presence in Sudan as well as thereafter with respect to the submission of the final report, i.e., no later than ten work days after receipt of the Mission's final comments on the draft report. The work plan also will include a schedule for periodic USAID meetings/progress reports and possible submissions of specific work products, as determined by the two parties.

While subject to change with the acceptance by both parties, it is envisioned that the two Team members will be in Southern Sudan the entire duration of the evaluation's in-country component, i.e., two weeks (six-day work weeks are authorized). Besides travel days to and from Sudan, an additional two days are provided for each Team member for purposes of the Team's initial U.S. preparations and an additional one day for any necessary post-Sudan work related to the completion of the final report. The COP, however, will be provided a total of two additional days back in the U.S. to ensure the completion and transmission of the final report as well as the closure of any outstanding matters. (See above graphic presentation.)

The COP will be totally responsible for managing the Team, organizing the Team's work, and ensuring quality control and delivery of the required report as agreed by both parties.

Note: The CTO, other USAID staff and GOSS employees will be encouraged, when practical, to join the Evaluation Team and, in so far as the CTO, other USAID staff and GOSS counterparts join the Team, MSI also will be responsible for their arrangements (travel, housing in the field, etc.). Lastly, MSI will be responsible for arranging all meetings for the Team, in conjunction with the USAID/Juba Office.

### **Report Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations**

Three copies of the draft report (*even if not entirely complete*) on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Evaluation Team will be presented to the USAID/Sudan EGI Team Leader three full days prior to the departure of the COP and

other Team members. The document, in MS Word, will not exceed 40 pages (excluding fact sheets, data charts and graphs). The report should include:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction/Background
- Methodology
- Findings/Lessons Learned (with respect to, *inter alia*, the key questions identified above, e.g., strategic relevance in terms of support for CPA implementation and USAID/USG policy and program, program performance, results [positive and negative], value for money and gender)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (with respect, *inter alia*, mid-course corrections, follow-on activities, expansion, models for scaling up, orderly close out, etc.)
- Annexes: This section should include, *inter alia*, the Team's SOW and a listing of Useful Tools and Products that should be repackaged and produced for wider distribution to other USAID-funded implementing partners in Sudan.

Following the CTO's (and possibly sector Team Leader's) expedited review and comments on the draft report (*which, again, may not be entirely complete*), the Team's findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented (only orally) by the Team to appropriate GOSS officials and other stakeholders, as determined by USAID. (Note: This pre-departure draft submission will enable the CTO to determine the extent of the Team's fulfillment of its SOW as well as identify, in the company of the Team, any major issues or omissions that must still be addressed before submission of the final report).

Subsequently, the Team will incorporate the requested additions and changes to the draft document, while still in Juba and thereafter in the U.S. The final report will be submitted 10 work days after the COP's receipt of USAID's final written comments on the draft report that was presented prior to the Team's departure from Juba. The USAID Mission will receive ten paper copies of the final report as well as an electronic version.



## **ANNEX 2: Key Informants Interviewed**

### **IRG**

Bruce Kernan, STEP COP, Juba  
Jane Kahata, EIA Specialist and Training Coordinator, Juba  
Tom Catterson, STEP Program Manager, Washington  
Sean White, STEP Senior Forestry Advisor, Juba

### **USAID**

Yugulle (West) Kayuku Labadiah, USAID/Sudan CTO, Juba  
Mary Hobbs, USAID/Sudan, Economic Growth Program Manager, Juba  
Walter Knausenberger, USAID East Africa, Senior Regional Environmental Officer,  
Nairobi  
David Kinyua, USAID East Africa, Regional Environment Procedures & Policies  
Specialist, Nairobi  
Mark Meassick, USAID/Sudan, Program Officer, Nairobi

### **Government of Southern Sudan**

Major General Alfred Akwoch Omoli, Under Secretary, Ministry of Environment,  
Wildlife Conservation and Tourism, Juba  
Victor Wurda Lotombe, Director General of Environment, Juba  
David Batali, Deputy Director of Environment, Directorate of Environmental Affairs,  
Juba  
Jaden Tongun Emilio, Under Secretary for Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry,  
Juba  
Timonhy Thwol Onak, Director General Forestry MAF, Juba  
Christopher Lemi, Director of Forest Survey and Inventory, MAF, Juba  
Loro George Leju Ligor, Director General of Research and Training, MAF, Juba  
Mary Benjamin Loki, Director of Post Harvest & Home Economics, MAF, Juba

### **Kegalu Forestry Training Center**

Martin Tobiolo, Principal, Kagalu Forestry Training Center, Yei

### **Other**

Paul Elkan, Country Director, Wildlife Conservation Society, Juba  
Boniface Shilobe, Highways Engineer, Ministry of Transport and Roads, Juba  
Sandra Cooper, Environmental/Social Management Specialist, MTR, Juba  
Patricia Wachate Gibril, Environmental Officer, MTR, Juba  
Mathenge Wanderi, Management Consultant, Development Impact Consulting, Juba  
James Nyaga, Financial Consultant, Development Impact Consulting, Juba

## **ANNEX 3: Key Informant Interview Questions**

### **Questions to USAID**

#### General Questions

- (a) Assessment, weaknesses and strengths of implementation of each component; appropriateness to USAID program and strategy?
- (b) What are USAID priorities for project focus from now until end of project (9/09)?
- (c) Is USAID partnering with other donors on the broader issues of improving environmental management? If so, at what level, and to what effectiveness?
- (d) We understand that the primary funding source for this activity is the ‘biodiversity earmark’. If that is the case does the Mission expect that this source of funding will continue over the short term?

#### Component Questions

##### **Component 1: Framework for Environmental Institutions and Policy**

What is your assessment of the GOSS’s ability to not only adopt these policies, but to implement them? And if this project terminates as scheduled (9/09) with only the adoption of the policies is that sufficient? If not, what would be the next step, if any?

##### **Component 2: Sudan Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment**

What does USAID find in this analysis that should be considered for implementation? To what degree can the GOSS and/or other donors incorporate the findings of this assessment into their programs?

##### **Component 3: Environmental Impact Assessment Training**

An initial impression is that the focus is on numbers trained and gender equality. What can be done by USAID, and/or others, to ensure that EIAs are fully adopted and utilized by government? What about a program to have some of the trained personnel supported for OJT to conduct performance audits of IEEs or EAs for other USAID funded project activities?

##### **Component 4: Environmental Association**

How is the sustainability of this organization being addressed, and why choose them to be the focus of an environmental awareness program as opposed to, for example, a journalist training program?

##### **Component 5: Study Tours**

How did USAID determine priority topics for the tours? What are the highest priorities for the remaining tours? How useful have they been and in what way?

##### **Component 6: Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Road Rehabilitation in Southern Sudan**

How is USAID applying this PEA to its road construction activities in Southern Sudan? To what degree has the GOSS incorporated this into its own road assessment work?

**Component 7: (a) Forest Governance and (b) Kagelu Forestry Training Center**

What USAID actions (not partner) are being taken to ensure GOSS is taking steps to incorporate support for these areas within Ministry budgets and responsibility? Is it correct that the community forestry aspect is not going forward? If it is going forward why is the Mission initiating community forestry actions at this late date in the project? And to what extent has an assessment helped determine the level of intervention for successfully implementing a community forestry activity?

**Component 8: Boma Wildlife Training Center**

What USAID actions (not partner) are being taken to ensure GOSS is taking steps to incorporate support for these areas within Ministry budgets and responsibility?

**Component 9: Petroleum Environmental Standards**

How important is this to the government and what is their level of acceptance of it? What does USAID plan to do?

**Component 10: STEP Crisis Modifier**

What is the importance of this component?

**Component 11: Solid Waste in Juba**

Is this officially removed from IRG's contract? If this is to move forward, then how will USAID maintain its function post September '09?

**Component 12: Trans-boundary Peace Parks**

Is this officially removed from IRG's contract?

## **ANNEX 4: Documents Reviewed**

### STEP Documents

- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Sept. 30, 2005. Rep.No. One. International Resource Group. 1-4.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Dec. 30, 2005. Rep.No. Two. International Resource Group. 1-7.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Mar. 31, 2006. Rep.No. Three. International Resource Group. 1-7.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending June 30, 2006. Rep.No. Four. International Resource Group. 1-7.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Sept. 30, 2006. Rep.No. Five. International Resource Group. 1-7.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Dec. 31, 2006. Rep.No. Six. International Resource Group. 1-11.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Mar. 31, 2007. Rep.No. Seven. International Resource Group. 1-13.
- Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending June 30, 2007. Rep.No. Eight. International Resource Group. 1-13.
- Catterson, Thomas M., Menczer, Karen, Maker, Jacob M., LoTombe, Victor W. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Programmatic Environmental Assessment of Road Rehabilitation Activities in Southern Sudan, Final Report. June 2006. Sudan. USAID. 1- 78.
- Cooper, Jon C, and Catterson, Thomas M., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report, Scoping Statement for a Programmatic Environmental Assessment of Oil Exploration and Production Activities in Southern Sudan. Sudan. USAID. 1-22.
- International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Kenya Study Tour. Sudan. USAID. 1-26.
- International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Uganda Study Tour. Sudan. USAID. 1-16.
- International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Ghana Study Tour. Sudan. USAID. 1-31.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Namibia Study Tour. Sudan. USAID. 1-25.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 1st Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-51.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 2nd Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-48.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 3rd Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-43.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 4th Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-18.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 6th Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-24.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 7th Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-14.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 8th Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small Scale Activities. Sudan. USAID. 1-20.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report on the Proceedings of the 9th Training Workshop, Environmental Assessment and Management. Sudan. USAID. 1-22.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Operational Plan FY07. USAID. 1-6.

International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Operational Plan FY08. USAID. 1-8.

International Resources Group, comp. South Sudan National Environmental Association (SSNEA), Report on South Sudan National Environmental Association Second Quarterly Meeting, 27-29 June 2006. Sudan. USAID. 1 – 37.

- International Resources Group, comp. Southern Sudan Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment, Biodiversity and Tropical Forest Assessment. Sept. 2007. Sudan. USAID. 1-72.
- International Resources Group, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Working Documents File Folder, Prepared for the MSI Evaluation Team. June 2008. Sudan. USAID. 1+
- Kasolo, Wilson, comp. Kagelu Forestry Training Center, Draft Curriculum for the Forestry Certificate Course (Revised June 2008). Sudan. USAID. 1-75.
- Kernan, Bruce S., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Sept. 30, 2007. Rep.No. Nine. International Resource Group. 1-17.
- Kernan, Bruce S., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Dec. 31, 2007. Rep.No. Ten. International Resource Group. 1-21.
- Kernan, Bruce S., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending Mar. 31, 2008. Rep.No. Eleven. International Resource Group. 1-20.
- Kernan, Bruce S., comp. Draft Sudan Transitional Environment Report Quarterly Report for Quarter Ending June 30, 2008. Rep.No. Twelve Eleven. International Resource Group. 1-20.
- Kwaje, John P. William; Arop, Daniel; Jino, Mark Odu, comp. The Impact of Conflict on Nimule National Park, The Survey on the Food Security Situation. 1-35.
- Owino, F; White, Sean, comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Assessment of the Training Needs of the Forestry Sector in Southern Sudan. Apr. 2008. Sudan. USAID. 1-24.
- Salter, Richard E., comp. Sudan Transitional Environment Program, Report of Wildlife Conservation Policy Advisor. August 2006. Sudan. USAID. 1- 40
- White, Sean, ed. Sudan Transition Environment Program, Training Notes on Forest Concessions and Forest Revenue Systems, Annex to the report on the forest concessions and revenue systems review and training workshop, Juba: 21-25 January 2008 (based on PowerPoint training presentations developed and presented at the workshop in Juba, Southern Sudan by Rex Baumbach of the US Forest Service). Sudan. USAID. 1-55.
- White, Sean, comp. Sudan Transition Environment Program, Reviewing Forest Concession Procedures and Forest Revenue Systems in Southern Sudan, A Report on Training and Concessions Review Workshop Juba: 21-25 January 2008. Sudan. USAID. 1-55.

## Evaluation of the Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP)

---

White, Sean; Tobiolo, Martin; Patrick, Drama; Francis, Noel; Frazer, Nadia; Lado, Samson; Buyomo, Timothy, comp. Kagelu Forest Reserve Management Plan, 2008-2012. 1-18.

USDA Forest Service. Training Report on Low-Volume Roads Engineering Best Management Practices, 28-31 January 2008. Sudan. USAID. 1 – 6.

### USAID Documents

Fisher, Wes; Stoughton, Mark, comp. ENCAP – Achievements, Lessons and Future Directions, A Review of USAID Africa Bureau’s Environmental Capacity Building Program, 1995-2003. May 2003. U.S. 1- 52.

Mathuva, Joseph, comp. Effectiveness of USAID Training Courses in Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design and Management in Africa, Results of the ENCAP Participant’s Survey, Final Report. October 2007. Kenya. USAID. 1-62.

USAID. Contract No. EPP-I-00-03-00013-00; Order No: EPP-I-05-03-0013-IRG. August 2005. Sudan. USAID. 1-20.

USAID. USAID/Sudan Strategy Statement, 2006-2008, December 2005, Public Version. Sudan. 1-12.

USAID. Contract No. EPP-I-00-03-00013-00; Order No: EPP-I-05-03-0013-IRG, Modification 1 (FaceSheet). August 2006. Sudan. USAID.

USAID. Contract No. EPP-I-00-03-00013-00; Order No: EPP-I-05-03-0013-IRG, Modification 4. September 2007. Sudan. USAID. 1-7.

## **ANNEX 5: Timeline on Quarterly Progress of ‘STEP’ Performance Measures**

<b>Performance Measure 1 – Establish a Framework for Environmental Institutions &amp; Policy.</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – It was in late October that GoSS formally established a ‘Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Wildlife and Tourism’. The Ministry was based in Juba and the IRG team was based in Rumbek. Established an MOU between Ministry and project. Assisted Ministry in preparation of budget for upcoming year. Guidance to Ministry on accessing resources from Capacity Building Trust Fund and Multi-Donor Trust Fund. Working documents relating to this performance measure prepared and discussed. Advice to Ministry for meetings with multilateral sector donors and Government of National Unity.
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Activities developed slowly, as additional staff below the level of Under Secretary have not been finalized and budget provided was ‘incipient’. Close work with UNEP to refurbish offices for STEP and UNEP within Ministry. STEP and UNEP collaboration on a capacity building development plan. Provided advise to Ministry regarding absorption of SPLA military personnel into Wildlife Directorate.
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 - Assistance to MEAWT on a 200 day action plan matrix, a planning tool for the remainder of 2006 required for all ministries. Following study tour to Kenya assistance provided to develop an MOU with Kenya National Environmental Measurement Agency. Decision taken to bring in a Wildlife Policy Advisor.
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Only 8 of 21 approved positions in Directorate of Environmental Affairs filled and most are junior level and/or inexperienced. Wildlife policy advisor report completed. Assisting UNEP with establishing operations and preparation of National Environmental Action Plan. MOU draft from Kenya received
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Concluded that “certain more immediate and basic achievements in the area of public administration will first be required” before environmental policy work can be effective, with much attention given to “the nature of the Directorate, its staffing pattern and staff assignments and responsibilities”. First meeting of environmental consultative group with 10 other Ministries, but a consultant to facilitate did not arrive due to visa issues. Continued support to UNEP program. Efforts also devoted to Juba waste disposal problem. Continued support with wildlife policy and planning. Proposal prepared for World Bank.
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 - Long absences of key Ministry personnel for policy work, accompanied by inadequate delegation of authority to allow the work to continue; also corresponded to limited USAID presence due to space issues and absence of COP due to previously planned trip. Continued assistance to UNEP and favorable comments from World Bank on proposal.
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Continued lengthy absences by Under Secretary and movement of Ministry to different and inadequate headquarters. Continued involvement in government’s natural resources sector budget working group. First substantive meeting of environmental consultative group, but involved representatives



from only five GoSS Ministries. Group conclusion was that a more developed draft policy statement in advance would have been useful.
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – Proposes to assist Ministry define role with state and local governments regarding environmental policy. Need to establish a methodology for measuring improvements in institutional capacity and will work with Kenya Institute of Administration and Ministry to define an evaluation methodology. Will work to identify financing for adequate office space for Directorate of Environmental Affairs.
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – A task force on environmental policy was established; task force has met three times, review draft environmental policy and reports from study trips and prepared a work plan. Need to clarify role of Directorate of Environmental Affairs vis-à-vis other Ministries, as well as determine how the different levels of government (federal, state, county and payam) will interact to formulate and implement environmental policy. Ministry’s poor experience in public administration will lead to STEP developing a public administration training program.
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – Task force visited each of 10 states for stakeholder input into development of an environmental policy. Requested proposals from neighboring country organizations to prepare a Public Administration course for MEAWT and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – A second draft of the environmental policy was completed. 33 staff members of the MEAWT completed a 10 day course in public administration.

<b>Performance Measure 2 – Revise the 2003 Sudan Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment (originally PM 2 was “Assessment of Options for a 3-5 year Environment Program”)</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005– Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Due to change in USAID/Sudan strategy USAID stated intent not to continue support for a stand alone environmental program as part of the new strategy which is to consolidate program gains related to successful implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. USAID/Sudan will be instructing IRG to forego activities under this PM and to use the level of effort foreseen for it to update the Environmental Threats and Opportunities Analysis (ETOA) required for the new Sudan Strategy.
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – No new action
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – No new action
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Began planning for conducting ETOA
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Actions delayed due to visa problems for consultant
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Scope of work prepared and consultant identified
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Consultant began work
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – Draft completed
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Report finalized
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – Copies distributed
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – No further action required

<b>Performance Measure 3 – Conduct Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Other Specialized Training</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Number of planning actions specific to holding of first class in Boma completed; participants selected and invited; training course adopted for southern Sudan
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – First class held Jan 2006; 40 participants; planning underway for next course
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 - Second course conducted in May 2006; 37 participants; training costs are increasing; planning begun for next course
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Decision taken to increase total number of trained participants from 120 to 500; however, training will not be exclusively EIA, but also include identified specialized courses. Third course held in September 2006; 37 participants.
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Planned December 2006 course canceled at last minute due to cash flow problems. Training needs assessment for additional courses for Ministry completed. 6 participants sent to Kenya for a 9 day GPS course
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Fourth EIA course held February 2007; 38 participants. Specialized training include ‘Tourism Management and Ecotourism Development for 4 participants in Kenya
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Fifth EIA course held; 32 participants. Specialized training courses in planning: high level course for senior GoSS and members of assembly on most pressing environmental issues and opportunities; and advanced EIA training for selected participants from basic course.
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – 3 participants attended an “Access Initiative” meeting. Planning continues for an advance EIA to enable staff to utilize EIA in planning and implementation activities.
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Two EIA courses delivered, Nov and Dec. 2007 for 64 participants. 2 participants sent to a 6 week wetland management course in Uganda; 3 participants in an ecotourism training in Kenya.
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – A course delivered by USFS on ‘environmental design of low volume road construction’ to 59 road construction participants. An eight EIA course held for 26 participants.
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 - Ninth EIA course held for 56 women (EIA combined with selected ag and conservation related technical information). Public administration for 32 participants from Ministry of Ag and Forestry and MEAWT.

<b>Performance Measure 4 – Establish an Environmental Association</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – A planned, initial meeting for December not held due to logistical reasons. Approval by USAID of a concept paper on how to achieve performance measure. Support expressed by previous participants for an association, and first meeting planned for next quarter

## Evaluation of the Sudan Transitional Environment Program (STEP)

---

<p>Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – 1<sup>st</sup> meeting held in January with 22 attendees, and formed an interim steering committee. (initial enthusiasm met reality of finding time from fully time work to volunteer for organization's work). Consultant retain to help with organization and function of association.</p>
<p>Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – The consultant worked with Ministry to conduct a celebration of World Environmental Day. 2<sup>nd</sup> quarterly meeting of association took place in June 2006; constitution drafted; plan for a lawyer to assist with registration; new interim council chosen</p>
<p>Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Work continued on constitution and registration process. Questions raised about ability of a volunteer association to operate successfully in current environment of a new government forming and members just beginning new jobs</p>
<p>Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Officially registered as an NGO. Log frame for near term activities completed and approved. Question put to USAID as to whether a voluntary professional organization can function in the current climate of intense change in southern Sudan</p>
<p>Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Continuing efforts to make association have been largely ineffectual; requested USAID CTO to examine the issue of continued viability of STEP support to association.</p>
<p>Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – No further progress</p>
<p>Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – 3 association members attended Access Initiative regional meeting. Organization has not undertaken any significant activities.</p>
<p>Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Association presented to STEP a draft public environmental education program. STEP focus now on Juba chapter of association</p>
<p>Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – Difficult for association to prepare a feasible public education program. Assistance sought from USAID supported Sudan Radio Service (SRS). SRS willing to do a 15 minute radio program and members of association will assist in preparation of program.</p>
<p>Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 - SRS sent proposal to association and Director of Environmental Affairs, but no response had been prepared.</p>

<b>Performance Measure 5 – Study Tours</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Intention to make this part of the continuing education element of the association together with senior GoSS officials. Planning for study tour to Kenya
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Study tour to Kenya
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Study tour to Ghana
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Awaiting publication of study tour to Ghana. Planning for study tour to Uganda
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Ghana study tour report published. Study tour taken to Uganda
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Uganda study tour report published
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Planning for study tour to Namibia
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – 4 participants to Namibia
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – No study tours during this period. 2 more planned but waiting for environmental policy group to identify specific issues.
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – No study tours during this period
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – No study tours during this period; limited funding may eliminate any further tours (the latter is from personal communication with the STEP COP)

<b>Performance Measure 6 – Road Programmatic Environmental Assessment</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Original consultant to prepare PEA could not come; COP assumed charge. Interim papers on scoping and issues prepared for comment. Scoping statement completed. Implementation plan for PEA prepared
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Draft PEA prepared and circulated for comment (note – LBG did not appear to be part of group consulted on preparation of draft?)
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Comments received and preparation of final begun
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Final PEA prepared and submitted. Next step with Min. Roads and LBG to developed set of GoSS sanctioned environmental guidelines for roads and suggested language for environmental clauses in road construction contracts.
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Considered complete

<b>Performance Measure 7 – Forest Governance</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning. Was not a PM at this time.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Was not a PM at this time
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time; planning to add
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Contract modified in September and 4 new PMs added, including this one (others were wildlife school; enactment of GoSS petroleum policies and a crisis modifier). Project extended to 9/09 and an additional \$4.6 million
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – TA for forestry brought in to assist on rules and regulations on the management of teak plantation and technical assistance to the Kagelu Forestry Training Center. MOU's agreed, but not yet signed. Main focus of governance is capacity building of timber inventory and utilization unit of Directorate. KFTC trainer sent for GIS/GPS training. Contractor identified to rehabilitate water system. \$100K/yr in operational costs to be provided.
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Four forestry staff assigned to work on governance part, and training and orientation begun; assessment, inventory and utilization work begun in earnest. Made aware that Ministry would not provide field allowances and per-diem, so project had to assume field allowance; Ministry supposed to include in next years budget.
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Supplementary payment issued resolved (???), and staff able to travel to other states to assess potential project activities. Computer equipment provided. 4 FD staff given refresher course in inventory; 5 FD staff given computer training; 4 FD staff trained on inventory data processing; 4 FD staff trained in GPS; and forest inventory tutor at KFTU took one week Access database training. Various technical actions to improve data for harvest were initiated. Timber market studies initiated.
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – Contract amendment added a community forestry element to this PM. Various training conducted (English language for 1 staff; 3 in GPS and Google Earth tools for plantation mapping. 19 forest reserve maps scanned, printed and digitized. Training planned in forest revenue collection and concession arrangements
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – 1 English training course; 1 forestry sector training needs assessment; 1 training course in forest inventory; 1 computer course for 2 FD staff. 2 Reconnaissance inventories of teak plantations in Central Equatorial State; 16 forest technicians graduated from Kagelu Forestry Training Centre; KFTC water system rehabilitated.
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – 1 course on forestry concessions; reports on design of inventories for 2 teak plantations; reports on reconnaissance inventories for 3 forest reserves. “For reasons that remain unclear, the Directorate of Forestry has blocked the implementation of some aspects of the forest governance activities proposed by the STEP Forestry Advisor. STEP has recommended to the responsible USAID officials that they hold a meeting with the Under-Secretary for Forestry with the purpose of clarifying the purpose and content of STEP’s forest governance activities forestry activities. As of the end of the reporting period, such a meeting had not occurred, although it is planned for early in the next Reporting period.”

Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – completed training needs assessment for forestry training; report on forest concessions workshop; report on reconnaissance inventories of teak plantations; report on timber market survey; paper and conference on teak plantation inventory and timber market data; report on timber sales procedures; reconnaissance inventory of teak plantations in Western Equatoria; course on forest management principles and criteria.

**Performance Measure 8 – Boma Wildlife Training Center**

First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.

Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Was not a PM at this time

Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time

Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time.

Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Contract modified in September and 4 new PMs added, including this one. Project extended to 9/09 and an additional \$4.6 million

Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – MOU regarding STEP support to training center; working relationship between STEP and WCS

Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Working agreement between STEP and WCS still being developed.

Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Agreement reached with WCS; agreement not reached with Training Center, thus funds not yet released. PO to WCS pays for WCS technical assistance to Center. STEP advisory support to Flora and Fauna International; two national parks suggested to FFT for support by STEP; planning for work in Trans-boundary parks. (claiming partial credit for media reporting on discovery of large wildlife populations in Sudd)

Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – Purchased order signed between STEP and Training Center. Planning for a water system

Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Operational costs provided assisting with training of 40 wildlife officers. Planning for water system continues

Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – 39 wildlife officers graduated. Strategic plan for center received for review. Water engineer conducted and evaluation visit. Suggestion made to Center that their transition plan from USAID funding to government funding be shorter.

Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – Transition plan completed; hydrological survey completed. Unknown to STEP another NGO came in and drilled 3 bore hole wells on the campus, thus STEP support for a water system will not continue. Noted that the bore holes do not meet normal and potable water standards.

<b>Performance Measure 9 – Develop Programmatic Environmental Assessment for petroleum environmental standards</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Was not a PM at this time
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Contract modified in September and 4 new PMs added, including this one. Project extended to 9/09 and an additional \$4.6 million
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Consultant planned to scope out issues and methodologies did not arrive due to visa problems; project also unable to participate in conference in Juba on oil and the future of Sudan due to a scheduling conflict with UNEP. Government of National Unity Minister for Industry and Mining expressed interest in cooperation on environmental impact of oil
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Consultation with northern government entities and US Embassy about intention to do a PEA of oil exploration and production; environmental consultants with experience in Sudan oil also contacted. STEP and rep of MEAWT joined a team from ESF consultants from Nairobi that were preparing a scoping exercise on behalf of White Nile Ltd. STEP consultant arrived to draft scoping exercise for PEA. USAID/Sudan and GoSS MEAWT expressing concerns about whether this PEA should go forward.
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Draft scoping statement prepared and submitted to USAID/Sudan and REDSO. USAID/Sudan maintains doubts about going ahead. At request of U.S. CG STEP presented a paper detailing environmental impacts identified during scoping exercise at a conference on oil in southern Sudan
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – USAID/Sudan not yet authorized STEP to proceed with preparation of a PEA for oil. Planning a visit for southern Sudan officials to Louisiana to observe how oil production is managed in wetland.
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Scoping study finalized; no word from USAID/Sudan regarding permission to proceed.
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – No response from USAID/Sudan. Planning a visit for EA to African oil producing countries to oil practices and their effect on environment.
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – No additional action.

<b>Performance Measure 10 – Crisis Modifier</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning. Was not a PM at this time.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Was not a PM at this time
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time; planning to add
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Contract modified in September and 4 new this added. Project extended to 9/09 and an additional \$4.6 million
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – No action for this and any following quarters

<b>Performance Measure 11 – Improve Solid Waste Management in Juba</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning. Was not a PM at this time.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Was not a PM at this time
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time; planning to add
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Not a PM
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Not a PM
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Not a PM
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Not a PM
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – Contract modification to add two additional PM, including this one, PM11, and a PM for transboundary parks.
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Investigated options for effective waste management; feasibility study initiated for micro-enterprise plastic recycling. Several other issues identified for study. Support sought from other donors.
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – Feasibility study completed
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – Pilot plastic recycling project developed; one hand-operated plastic compressor ordered. Informed by USAID/Sudan that funds anticipated when contract was modified would no longer be available. STEP will limit activities under this PM to the pilot plastic recycling project.



<b>Performance Measure 12 – Establish Trans-boundary Peace Parks.</b>
First Quarter Ending September 30, 2005 – Project officially began 8/12/05 and focus of activities in August and September were on fielding a team and planning. Was not a PM at this time.
Second Quarter Ending December 31, 2005 – Was not a PM at this time
Third Quarter Ending March 31, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fourth Quarter Ending June 30, 2006 – Was not a PM at this time
Fifth Quarter Ending September 30, 2006 – Not a PM
Sixth Quarter Ending December 31, 2006 – Not a PM
Seventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2007 – Not a PM
Eighth Quarter Ending June 30, 2007 – Not a PM
Ninth Quarter Ending September 30, 2007 – Contract modification to add two additional PM, including this one.
Tenth Quarter Ending December 31, 2007 – Planning activities initiated 1 coordinating meeting with WCS and the Directorate of Wildlife; 1 trip to Nimule to see the Nimule National Park & meet with the Nimule Chamber of Commerce; 1 coordinating meeting with WCS/Uganda and USAID/Uganda
Eleventh Quarter Ending March 31, 2008 – 1 coordinating meeting with WCS and the Directorate of Wildlife; 1 trip to Nimule to see the Nimule National Park & meet with the Nimule Chamber of Commerce; 1 coordinating meeting with WCS/Uganda and USAID/Uganda.
Twelfth Quarter Ending June 30, 2008 – 2 coordinating meetings, one in Nimule and a second in Kampala; 2 vehicles purchased for Sudan national park use; 4 Wildlife staff sponsored at African College of Wildlife in Tanzania. USAID/Sudan informed STEP that further funding would not be available, thus STEP will only continue to support the students in Tanzania and complete procurement of the vehicles.