

Task Order No. 845
Contract No. PCE-I-00-96-00002-00

Facilitators' Guide: USAID/West Bank and Gaza Course in Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design

**PREPARED FOR USE IN RAMALLAH
27–30 August 2001**

Principal contributors

Mohammad Said Al-Hmaid, EPIQ/ECODIT
Wes Fisher, EPIQ/Tellus Institute
Joseph Karam, EPIQ/ECODIT
Thomas Rhodes, USAID West Bank and Gaza
Marwan Samadi, EPIQ/ECODIT
Mohammad Shahin, EPIQ/ECODIT
Mark Stoughton, EPIQ/Tellus Institute

Course sponsor

USAID West Bank and Gaza



Course history and development

Ramallah will mark the 19th presentation of this course, and the first time it has been adapted to the Middle Eastern context. While the materials and content have undergone subsequent update and revision, the course owes much to the knowledge and vision of its initial developers:

Walter Knausenberger, now with USAID's Regional Economic Development Support Office for East and Southern Africa (REDSO/ESA) in Nairobi, Kenya, played essential coordination and cross-fertilization roles, providing many of the materials that shaped the course. As REDSO/ESA's Environmental Advisor, Charlotte Bingham provided expert editing and technical contributions to the modules, significantly improving the quality of the sourcebooks with each re-drafting. She also proved to be the course's most dynamic presenter, particularly for the sessions on environmental assessment and environmental mitigation and monitoring. Others who played crucial roles in course development include: Michael Lazarus, Idi Samba, Eric Loken, Rich Tobin, John Gaudet, and Wayne Macdonald.

Peter Croal of the Canadian International Development Agency and Patrice LeBlanc of the Canadian Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office followed the development of this course and supplied a number of very useful supporting documents. The US Environmental Protection Agency provided copies of its Environmental Assessment course materials, which proved very useful. The Centre for Our Common Future is gratefully acknowledged for allowing reproduction of sections of its layperson's version of Agenda 21.

The course also owes a great deal to many other individuals and institutions who have contributed ideas, documents, and assistance since its inception in 1995.

Past courses

The course has been held in Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Uganda, Tanzania (twice), Madagascar, Senegal, Mali, Kenya and Botswana.

Key portions of the course have been adapted for use in providing Bureau of Humanitarian Response Environmental Assessment Training to U.S. P.L.480 Cooperating Sponsors engaged in Food for Development Activities: Ethiopia (February 1997), Ghana (December 1997), Cape Verde (March 1998), Mozambique (March 1999), Washington DC Training of Trainers for Title II Cooperating Sponsors (September 2000), Angola (October 2000), and Mali (Nov. 2000) and Zambia (April 2001).

Components of the course were incorporated by the Europe and Eurasia (E&E) Bureau in a 5 day training course presented in Skopje, Macedonia (May 2001). These included many of the overhead presentations, the application of case site visits; and subsequent working group sessions on preparation of environmental documentation based on the review of proposed case site activities.

Table of contents

1. Motivation, Objectives, Overview	5
1.1. <i>What is the course?</i>	5
1.2. <i>Who should use this guide</i>	5
1.3. <i>USAID environmental requirements</i>	5
1.4. <i>Specific objectives</i>	6
1.5. <i>The course materials</i>	7
2. Preparing for the course	9
2.1. <i>Identifying course participants and facilitators</i>	9
2.2. <i>Logistical and Other Advance Arrangements</i>	10
3. Designing the Course Program	15
3.1. <i>Overview of program</i>	15
3.2. <i>Draft course agenda</i>	16
3.3. <i>Assigning presenters to sessions</i>	19
4. During the course	19
4.1. <i>Setting up Working Groups</i>	19
4.2. <i>Definition of Roles</i>	20
4.3. <i>Special notes for Facilitators and Chairs</i>	20
4.4. <i>Special notes for presenters</i>	22
5. Module guides	25
5.1. <i>Module 1: Opening Statements and Introductory Session</i>	25
5.2. <i>Module 2 Why assess environmental impacts, and an introduction to environmentally sound design</i>	27
5.3. <i>Module 3: Assessing Environmental Impacts: Basic Concepts</i>	28
5.4. <i>Module 4: Information, background, and resources for EIA in the Palestinian context</i>	29
5.5. <i>Module 5: USAID Environmental Procedures</i>	30
5.6. <i>Module 6: USAID/WBG Mission environmental requirements</i>	32
5.7. <i>Module 7: Examination and discussion of sample USAID/WBG environmental documentation and IEEs</i>	33

5.8. Module 8: Information requirements and tools for screening and preliminary assessment	34
5.9. Module 9: Briefing on case site descriptions	35
5.10. Module 10: Drafting case site environmental documentation: baseline information and impacts	36
5.11. Module 11: Introduction to mitigation and monitoring	37
5.12. Module 12 Drafting Mitigation and Monitoring Plans for the case studies	39
5.13. Module 13: Field Visit	41
5.14. Module 14: Beyond subgrant Environmental Reviews, Writing the IEE, Environmental Assessments, Programmatic Environmental Assessments and “Umbrella” IEEs	43
5.15. Module 15: Special topics – Best Practices in construction management, pesticide use, etc.	46
5.16. Module 16: Other EIA issues and capacity building	47
5.17. Module 17: Course evaluation, synthesis, and recommendations for follow-up activities	48
5.18. Closing	49

1. Motivation, Objectives, Overview

1.1. What is the course?

The *USAID Regional Course in Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small-Scale Activities* is typically a 5-day (M-F) course for 20-40 participants. Targeted at USAID partner organizations engaged primarily in small scale activities, it provides an introduction to environmentally sound design, and to compliance with USAID environmental review requirements (Reg. 216 and associated directives). It is *not* intended as advanced technical training in impact assessment.

The course is centered around a set of case studies; normally there is a one-day field trip in which participants conduct observation and assessment of actual or proposed project sites. Participants then write a draft Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) or Environmental Review outline based on their site visit experience. Typically more than one project site is identified for each of a few sectors. (e.g., roads, water and sanitation, agriculture, etc.) For the USAID West Bank/Gaza course, case sites descriptions have been prepared to be used in the environmental review workgroup exercises, but there are no visits to proposed project sites. Thus in this course, the workgroup sessions are more classroom oriented, without the benefit of getting the participants to observe proposed activities under field conditions.

1.2. Who should use this guide

This guide is intended for facilitators of the EA Training Course—that is, individuals who will be presenting individual sessions, and/or who will be acting as resource persons throughout the course. The guide assumes understanding of the environmental assessment process and prior experience in facilitated training.

The guide is also intended for individuals sponsoring, planning, or organizing this course. This guide contains the key points and general guidance for facilitating the training course. It intentionally does not provide step-by-step instructions. The facilitators should tailor the modules to local needs and the lectures to their own style and expertise. The essential information and themes that usually need to be transferred are indicated in the module guides.

1.3. USAID environmental requirements

All USAID activities must adhere to the environmental procedures that are defined in Regulation 216 (22 CFR Part 216, commonly referred to as “Reg. 216”). These procedures define the analysis and documentation needed for approval of project activities. Required analyses can range from simpler Environmental Reviews and Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) to more complete Environmental

Assessments (EAs) and, in special or unusual circumstances, Environmental Impact Statements (EISs)¹. In contrast, some activities, such as education or disaster relief, are excluded or exempted from environmental analysis requirements.

To comply with USAID environmental procedures -- indeed to design and implement environmentally-sound activities generally -- project implementers require familiarity not only with the procedures themselves, but with the broader principles and practices of environmental assessment and project design. They must be capable of anticipating "reasonably foreseeable impacts" and of designing alternative actions, companion projects, mitigation measures, monitoring plans, or other steps to ensure that these impacts are minimized.

Inadequate familiarity and experience with these procedures and principles frequently result in significant delays in project design and implementation. This problem is particularly evident in the case of USAID Partner "umbrella" projects, which are approved before many of the specific "sub-project" activities are well-defined. Once defined, each sub-project activity may be subject to environmental review prior to implementation; should incorporate practical and effective environmental design considerations; and should be monitored to ensure that mitigation steps are followed and environmental damage does not occur. This course is specifically designed to assist project implementers in completing these tasks.

The bulk of USAID activities require only an environmental review or an Initial Environmental Examination, with follow-up reviews and monitoring arrangements, rather than more sophisticated Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA). For some larger USAID "umbrella projects," it is likely that an "umbrella-type IEE" will have already been prepared. In such cases, specific grants or sub-grants will not require a full IEE, but rather a briefer environmental review or screening of the specific, proposed activities.

1.4. Specific objectives

The Regional Environmental Assessment Training for USAID/West Bank Gaza has four primary objectives, assisting USAID Missions and Mission Partners (contractors, PVOs, NGOs, host governments and other entities) to:

- 1) **Design and implement environmentally-sound activities.** This is the overriding goal of the course, as well as of the environmental methods and procedures that will be taught. The course will help participants develop deeper understanding and awareness of how environmental concerns can affect the sustainability of development programs, projects and activities, and thus to appreciate the role for environmental assessment, mitigation and monitoring.
- 2) **Identify and assess reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts.** The course will familiarize participants with the basic principles and practice of environmental assessment, and provide them with practical experience in the application of simple assessment tools and approaches.

¹ An EIS is conducted in cases where there are reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts on the global environment, on areas outside any nation's jurisdiction, or on the US.

3) **Mitigate, monitor**, and thereby avoid unnecessary adverse environmental impacts. Reference materials will be introduced to participants for use in identifying options to minimize adverse environmental impacts. This will include introduction to “best practice” guidelines, mitigation measures and checklists for various sectors and activities, e.g., construction health and safety.

4) **Follow USAID procedures** in the context of evolving local policies and needs, using local expertise where possible to do so, and thereby avoiding unnecessary delays in activity approval and implementation.

The course relies heavily on case studies and participant working group exercises to achieve these objectives.

Because most USAID supported activities in USAID West Bank/Gaza require only an Environmental Review (and not a full EA), the course focuses on developing participants’ capability to:

- a) prepare an environmental review and relevant supporting material; and
- b) design a mitigation and monitoring process for project components with potential adverse environmental impacts.

While participants will gain knowledge of the other Reg. 216 procedural requirements and the logical progression of required documentation and analysis, less emphasis will be placed on more complex environmental procedures and documents.

1.5. The course materials

Facilitators’ and Organizer’s materials

These documents are only distributed to course facilitators/organizers

<p>Facilitator’s Guide</p>	<p>This manual provides guidance for the facilitators who will be leading the course. <i>It supplements, but does not replace, the participant sourcebook</i> (below). It:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contains the general course description, • provides some information on advance preparations, • describes the general roles and responsibilities of course participants and instructors. • contains a guide to each module. Each module guide contains a description of module objectives, sample discussion questions, a list of relevant background and supplementary readings, and any additional guidance notes for facilitators.
<p>Organizer’s notes</p>	<p>This short (30pp.) document contains course pre-planning checklists, draft scopes of work for course planning activities and hiring local presenters, and notes for field trip preparations and venue selection. It designed as a resource for the principal course organizers in the country.</p>

Materials for all participants (including facilitators)

<p>Participant's Sourcebook</p>	<p>This document contains the course description and program, a listing of suggested roles and responsibilities for participants in general sessions and working groups, and for each course module, where applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module descriptions. These are abbreviated forms of the module guides, excluding facilitator notes and sample discussion questions. • Module backgrounders. These have been prepared for some lecture-oriented sessions to outline the major points that should be covered. They vary in length, depending on the subject and availability of appropriate other background readings. • Other background readings and documents. These include a limited number of relevant and succinct documents, which participants should read or review during the course. • A list of references/resources as an appendix. • A set of sample overheads. In general, the overheads are closely linked to the module backgrounders or the <i>Topic Briefing</i> (below). <p>Presenters should be very familiar with not only the overheads, but also the content of the backgrounders and other background readings. Course presenters can use some or all of these overheads or supplement them with their own material.</p>
<p>Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Impact Assessment</p>	<p>This document has been drafted as a reference and reading to accompany the modules addressing the concepts and practice of environmentally sound design, EIA and Mitigation and Monitoring.</p>
<p>"Best Practice" Guidelines, Mitigation Measures and Checklists</p>	<p>These are provided in three sets.</p>

2. Preparing for the course

Considerable effort must be expended on logistics in order to present the course in a professional manner. These logistical items may include document preparation, case site identification, procurement of a training site, translation, among others.

2.1. Identifying course participants and facilitators

Participants

Each version of the course may differ in terms of its emphasis and target audience. In general, participants should:

- represent institutions involved in the delivery of USAID-funded assistance; or
- work for environmentally-related government agencies or local authorities; or
- be knowledgeable resource persons and experts in environmental assessment within the host country that can be tapped for future IEE and EA preparation;
- be proficient in English; and,
- hold mid- to upper-level professional positions, with some expertise in project design or evaluation.

Each participant should be requested to bring relevant information -- project documents, environmental assessments or reviews, photos or slides -- to place course material emphasis on real-life examples, to tap the knowledge base of the participants, and to encourage active and lively discussions.

Additional MEOs in the region should be encouraged to attend, particularly from countries that are potential hosts of future EA trainings. The MEO can contribute as facilitator and participant, can bring home knowledge and experiences gained, and, hopefully, initiate a similar EA course. Not only will they learn about the content of the course, but they will return with an understanding of the logistics that must be handled for successful course delivery. This should, in turn, greatly improve the efficiency and reduce the costs of advance preparations.

Facilitators

Each working group requires a facilitator with Environmental Review/IEE/EA experience—this is particularly critical for the case site environmental reviews. Therefore, courses should seek approximately one qualified facilitator for every eight participants. For a preferable course size of 25-30 participants, 3-4 capable facilitators would be needed. The course benefits from the presence of experienced AID staff, in addition to the two contracted facilitators, and two local resource persons.

Local resource persons

Local presenters can and should play an integral role in the course. The course is about capacity building, and the choice of resource persons—individuals chosen to give presentations on the local social and environmental context and in general assist the course—should reflect this goal.

Local resource persons should ideally be selected from universities or NGOs where they a) have experience presenting important issues in natural resource management and/or environmental assessment; b) can afterwards transfer the lessons learned during the course to a broader audience; and c) will remain available to assist in subsequent training activities.

Suggested topics and issues to cover are described in the Module Guide below, but relevant natural resource issues should be defined generally by the presenters. If EA expertise is weak in the host country, local presenters should focus on sensitive environmental issues.

Lecture outlines or sets of transparencies should be requested from the local resource persons, ideally at least one month prior to the course (this point should be included in their contracts). Facilitators can then provide any needed suggestions to ensure full coverage of topical issues, either in the local presentations or by other presenters during the course.

Local resource persons should also be contracted to serve as course evaluators, reviewing and commenting on presentations, materials, working group exercises, and other elements of the course design.

See the *Organizer's Notes* for generic Scopes of Work and letters for local presenters and resource persons.

2.2. Logistical and Other Advance Arrangements

The success of the course (and sanity of course facilitators) depends critically on effective advance planning.

This section addresses the most essential elements of the planning and preparation process. The *Organizer's Notes* contains a far more detailed series of planning checklists for key items that course organizers can use to guide preparation well in advance of the course.

Venue selection

The course venue should be selected based on a number of important criteria, including:

- proximity to useful field case study sites;
- good workshop facilities;
- ease of transport of participants to the venue;
- availability of nearby local experts; and,
- attractiveness of venue as a desirable destination.

See the course *Organizer's Notes* for a list of criteria for venue selection.

Advance Visits to the Host Country

Note: courses to date have been conducted using USAID contractors as lead facilitators. This discussion of “advance visits” assumes that the lead facilitator is based out-of-country.

Advance visits are needed by the USAID lead course facilitator in order to coordinate in-country support and logistics. The number of visits will depend on local infrastructure, the capacity and familiarity of in-country AID personnel with the course format and requirements, and the length of visits. If possible, the first visit should be made approximately 6 months in advance to determine venue, participants, and local resource persons and line up mission support; the second to arrange field trips and finalize various arrangements.

Two advance visits of 3-5 days duration should be viewed as a minimum, and the various objectives of these visits are described below. In some cases, three visits, or perhaps four, will be needed, particularly where local infrastructure or familiarity with the course material is weak. Ideally these should overlap with travel plans of contractors or USAID Bureau course facilitator staff in order to minimize costs.

visit 1	visit 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discuss overall planning requirements with AID mission; • determine audience and participants and meet with the respective organizations (contractors, host country institutions, PVOs, NGOs, etc.); • evaluate venue options and set tentative date; • meet with and line-up local resource persons, obtain CVs, and fee histories; • list of prospective field trip sites; • discuss modifications to the generic course agenda; and, • discuss host government involvement and need for official opening/closing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • finalize logistical arrangements with the AID mission and local resource persons (agree on presentations, facilitation duties, etc.); • collect slides, maps, and other visuals for use in the course (particularly important is a large country map to put on the conference room wall); • draft invitations, if not done during Visit 1; • negotiate honoraria; • meet again with USAID Partners to discuss the agenda; • visit prospective field trip sites and venue to evaluate appropriateness and facilities; take photographs to develop as slides for use in the course; and, • establish format and signature(s) for course completion certificates

Field trip preparations

The field trips are the center of the course. Through them, participants apply their classroom learning. Field trips provide hands-on experience in:

- conducting the data-gathering necessary to conduct an Environmental Review or IEE
- drafting an Environmental Review or IEE based on the case study site
- drafting a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan based on the case study site.

Therefore, attention to field trip preparations is essential.

Although surrogate written materials or oral presentation can be used if absolutely necessary, field trips to project sites where the tools of the course can be applied are an essential element of the course. Therefore, choice of field sites and advance preparations are critical.

As noted earlier, advance visit(s) to the field sites will be required to determine whether the content of the projects, underway and proposed, are sufficiently rich and stimulating to serve as course material. The textbox provides some key criteria for selecting case sites.

In advance of the course, each field site will require:

- a brief site and project description, including a map (ideally showing important human settlements, land uses, and natural resources);
- community representatives prepared to meet the participants; and,
- one or more course participants familiar with the project who can describe the project verbally in advance of the field trips.

Based on past experience with the course, careful attention will need to be paid to vehicle arrangements, especially their reliability and suitability, and to ensuring that distribution of box lunches (if needed) is arranged in advance.

Sites need not to be USAID-funded projects, nor do they need to be well-developed project proposals ready for implementation. They can include projects already implemented, as long as participants can “step back” from the present and assess the project as they might have when it was at the project proposal stage.

See the *Organizer's Notes* for a field trip reconnaissance form and guidelines for preparers of field site case study descriptions.

Invitations

Course invitations should (ideally) be prepared and sent out 2 months in advance of the course. Prior to this, Mission staff should have informal expressions of interest from USAID Partners expected to attend. The invitations should include:

- a preliminary course agenda;
- logistical details, particularly when to arrive and expect to depart, where to go upon arrival, and details on the “icebreaker” social function; and,
- a short list of ideas that participants should be prepared to discuss (e.g., experience with environmental regulations or procedures, thoughts are on national environmental policy or key/sensitive natural resources, examples of sound or unsound design).

Case site selection criteria

Does the project (proposed or under implementation) present the potential for non-trivial environmental or natural resource degradation?

Is the site within a maximum of 3 hours of the course venue, and can transport be arranged? Alternatively, can participants spend the night at the field site, thereby extending the course duration by one day?

Are community representatives prepared to openly discuss their perceptions (through translators if necessary) of the project costs and benefits?

Are there alternative projects or mitigation strategies for the course participants to conceptualize or investigate?

Can sufficient written documentation be generated for course participants to review the basic elements of the project design and its context in advance of the visit? Ideally answers to all of the above questions should be positive.

Sourcebook reproduction and assembly

Reproduction and provision of the *Participant Sourcebook* (see 1.5 “The course materials,” above) is a significant undertaking, as upwards of 5000-10,000 pages of material will need to be duplicated and assembled.

The *Sourcebook* original is available on 8.5 X 11(American letter size) paper, single-sided, marked for section breaks (which should ideally be numbered tabs), and slip-sheeted for easy double-sided copying. Blank pages should be marked "deliberately left blank" to assist in reproduction and handling.

The *Sourcebook* should be assembled in a loose-leaf binder, and due to its size should be double-sided to minimize bulk and leave room for additional local materials. Sourcebook copies can be produced either in the US or in the host countries, with distinct advantages to each.

The Mission should obtain an estimate for loose-leaf binders and reproduction of specified number of pages and specified number of books in advance. This cost should be contrasted with cost of US reproduction and excess accompanied baggage. If materials are to be reproduced locally, the Mission must have confidence that a local firm will be able to do double-sided xeroxing; and at least one to two weeks lead time for reproduction and assembly will be needed. Any inconsistencies due to A4 vs. US letter sizes for paper and notebooks should be addressed in advance.

Student assistants

If possible, a student interested in environmental assessment should be recruited to perform “gopher” services, which can be distractions to already busy facilitators (e.g., posting the daily agenda, handing out materials, running to the copiers, etc.). A student might be quite willing to exchange these services for an expense-free opportunity to observe the course (assuming resources permit).

3. Designing the Course Program

An outline of the course program is presented below. Each training will be unique, however, and will require revisions to the generic course program based on the participants, their familiarity with environmental project design and assessment procedures, the availability of local presenters, and the emphasis and needs of partners within the country. In general, a typical course would evolve as follows:

3.1. Overview of program

<p>Day 1</p> <p><i>Introduction to Environmentally-Sound Design and USAID procedures</i></p>	<p>Day 1 contains the largest number of more standard presentations or lectures; subsequent days place greater emphasis on working group exercises and participant presentations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The day begins with introductions and solicitations of group goals and objectives for the course, which are recorded on flip chart paper and placed where they can be reviewed again later. • The morning then progresses through a series of lectures which serve to motivate the course and communicate basic EIA concepts. Participants should be encouraged to share their own experiences. • The day includes sessions on national and regional environmental management and policy by local presenters. Topics should include the regional environmental setting; the national or local natural resource base and environmental/natural resource trends and issues; social, cultural and land tenure issues affecting natural resource and environmental management. Also to be addressed is national environmental impact assessment policy and procedures, and the status of EA within the country. • USAID environmental procedures are introduced in the afternoon and there is a workgroup exercise to give participants the opportunity to practice activity categorization using USAID terminology.
<p>DAY 2</p> <p><i>EIA Methods: Focus on IEEs</i></p>	<p>For the USAID West Bank/Gaza Course Day 2 focuses on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific examples of USAID documentation, • the Palestinian Socio-Cultural and Socio-Economic Setting, and • Work Group Exercises to develop Environmental Review Outlines based on case site descriptions of "proposed" activities that are typical of those that might be undertaken by the USAID partners.
<p>DAY 3</p> <p><i>Case Study IEEs and Mitigation and Monitoring Plans</i></p>	<p>On Day 3 participants present their workgroup Environmental Review outlines in plenary on case site environmental impacts and their proposed categorizations. After a lecture on more issues and methods in environmental mitigation and monitoring, the environmental review teams return to their workgroups and begin preparing case site mitigation and monitoring plans based on the same case site reviews. They then present their plans in plenary.</p>

<p>DAY 4</p> <p>Advanced and special topics and course closing</p>	<p>DAY 4 includes a session on USAID procedures for environmental documentation that go beyond USAID's Environmental Review processes, including IEEs, Environmental Assessments (EAs) for projects or programs with significant adverse environmental impacts, Programmatic Environmental Assessments (PEAs) for broad assessments of similar projects or activities, and Strategic Environmental Assessments of proposed policy or program initiatives.</p> <p>A field trip visit is planned to give the participants an opportunity to apply their training to the evaluation of an existing project and the mitigation measures that were incorporated in planning and design, construction and operation.</p> <p>A special 1 ½ hour session is devoted to "best practices" guidelines, mitigation measures and checklists for typical development activities carried out by USAID partners in West Bank/Gaza. These are organized by sector and include, but are not limited to, construction management, health and safety, etc.</p> <p>Where appropriate, lectures on USAID procedures for pesticides, on EIA tools and methods in greater detail than in Day 2, and on new directions in environmental procedures can be given.</p> <p>Finally, the workshop ends with a discussion of plans for follow-up activities, course evaluations, closing, and individual consultations.</p>
---	--

3.2. Draft course agenda

The following draft course program lists the suggested time for each module. The timing and duration of each session maybe modified to accommodate last minute changes. The agenda sessions are keyed to the *Participant Sourcebook* modules.

USAID/West Bank and Gaza Environmental Assessment Training Course

Best Eastern Hotel, Al-Irsal Street, Ramallah

August 27-30, 2001

Sun. Aug 26	Arrival and Registration
4:00-6:00 pm	Registration and Logistical Arrangements
5:00-6:00 pm	Facilitators' Meeting
6:00-7:00 pm	Participant Introductions and Housekeeping
7:00-8:00 pm	Welcome Reception
Mon. Aug 27	Why EIA, Environmentally-Sound Design, EA Basic Concepts, Palestinian EA Policy, USAID Environmental Procedures
8:00-8:30	Opening Statements
8:30-9:15	1. Presentation of Course Objectives/Agenda, Solicitation of Group Goals and Expectations
9:15-10:15	2A. Why Assess Environmental Impacts? The Big Picture
10:15-10:30	<i>Break</i>
10:30-11:00	2B. Environmentally-Sound Design and Implementation

11:00-12:15	3. Assessing Environmental Impacts: Basic Concepts
12:15-1:15 pm	Lunch
1:15-2:00 pm	4B. Palestinian Environmental/Natural Resource Issues, Programs, Policies and Information Sources
2:00-2:45 pm	4B. The Palestinian Environmental Assessment Policy
2:45-3:00 pm	Break
3:00-4:00 pm	5A. Overview of Tiered Environmental Procedures: The USAID Example
4:00-5:15 pm	5B. Working Groups: Categorizing Activities Using USAID Environmental Procedures
5:45-6:30 pm	Facilitators' Meeting
Tues. Aug 28	USAID/WBG Mission Environmental Requirements, EA Tools & Methods, Environmental Screening (Impacts)
8:00-8:45	5C. Workgroup Reports on Categorization Exercise
8:45-10:00	6A. USAID/West Bank and Gaza Mission Environmental Requirements 6B. How to Respond to USAID/WBG Mission Environmental Requirements
10:00-10:15	Break
10:15-11:00	7. Examination and Discussion of Sample IEEs and Environmental Documentation
11:00-12:00 pm	Information Requirements and Tools for Screening and Preliminary Assessment
12:00-1:00 pm	Lunch
1:00-1:45 pm	4C. The Palestinian Socio-Cultural and Socio-Economic Setting: Case Study Presentation
1:45-2:15 pm	9. Briefing on Case Site Descriptions
2:15-9:45 Wed.	10. Drafting Case Site Environmental Documentation (Impacts)
2:15-2:30 pm	10A Instructions to Working Groups
2:30-3:30 pm	10B Working Groups: Organization (Getting Ready) (including informal break)
3:30-5:30 pm	10C Working Groups
5:45-6:30 pm	Facilitators' Meeting
Wed. Aug 29	Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring
8:00-8:15	Review of Days 1 and 2
8:15-9:45	10D Workgroup Reports on Case Site Impacts

9:45-10:00	<i>Break</i>
10:00-11:30	11. Introduction to Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring
11:30-4:45 pm	12. Drafting Case Site Environmental Documentation (Mitigation and Monitoring)
11:30-12:00 pm	12A Instructions to Working Groups
12:00-1:00 pm	<i>Lunch</i>
1:00-3:00 pm	12B Working Groups
3:00-3:15 pm	<i>Break</i>
3:15-4:45 pm	12C. Workgroup Reports on Case Site Mitigation and Monitoring Plans
4:45-5:00 pm	Instructions to Prepare for Field Visit
5:45-6:30 pm	Facilitators' Meeting
Thurs. Aug 30	EA and PEA, Special EIA Issues, Course Evaluation and Award of Certificates
8:00-8:15 pm	Announcements
8:15-9:00 pm	14. Beyond Subgrant Environmental Reviews 14A. Writing the IEE 14B. Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Environmental Assessment
9:00-9:15 pm	<i>Break</i>
9:15-11:45 pm	13B. Field Visit
11:45-12:15 pm	13C. Field Visit Reactions and Discussion
12:15-1:15 pm	<i>Lunch</i>
1:15-2:30 pm	15. Special Issues – Best Practices in Construction Management, etc.
2:30-3:00 pm	16. Other EIA Issues and Capacity Building
3:00-3:15 pm	<i>Break</i>
3:15-3:30 pm	17A. Completion of Course Evaluation Forms
3:30-4:00 pm	17B. Discussion of Course and Recommendations for Follow-up Activities
4:00-5:00 pm	Closing and Award of Certificates
5:00 pm	End of Course

3.3. Assigning presenters to sessions

The course facilitators and organizers should select resource persons and presenters well in advance of the course. Ideally, some of the participants with relevant expertise would be selected as presenters and session chairs. Resource persons should be briefed in advance about expectations and responsibilities.

4. During the course

4.1. Setting up Working Groups

Initial working groups. An initial working group session for Categorization of activities using USAID terminology is to take place on Day 1. There are to be three workgroups and assignment to these groups should simply be by counting off or some other easy method (See 5.5. Module 5 Part B. Forming different groups for this workgroup exercise will help the participants know each other better.

(Facilitators may want to “seed” the special discussion groups to ensure active participation and to encourage those participants with strong interest and understanding and good presentation/acting skills to play a special role.)

Case site working groups.

Signing up for workgroups. Signup sheets for the four case site working groups need to be posted around the room during the 10:00-10:15 coffee break on Day 2. Once these are posted, the participants should receive instruction on which group to sign up for. You should encourage the participants and sector specialists (from CARE, CRS, ANERA and CHF) to **NOT sign up for a workgroup related to their own specific sectoral knowledge** (as a way of broadening their experience with the environmental review process).

Let the participants know that if numbers for any one workgroup session exceed the number of participant slots allocated for that case site, overflow will be assigned to other case sites workgroups by trying to meet the participant’s second choice. The established teams will then remain together as workgroups throughout the remainder of the course, both in the workgroup session on preparing Environmental Reviews (afternoon of Day 2) and again in the session on preparing Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plans (afternoon of Day 3).

Answering case site team questions. CRS, ANERA, CARE and CHF sector specialists **should** be instructed to be available to answer questions as needed by the individual workgroup “teams.” The teams should be encouraged to consult these specialists and to ask them about specific environmental impacts. Also, **after the teams have attempted to identify mitigation measures** they should consult the sector specialists to see which, if any, were overlooked or need elaboration.

To keep the presentations and interactions manageable, a maximum of four working groups should be formed, with 8-12 participants each. Working group chairs and rapporteurs can be designated by the course facilitators, or this decision-making can be left to the groups themselves.

(Notes on Working Groups are found in the *Sourcebook* Introductory Section. Specific instructions for the workgroup teams are found in **Modules 9: Briefing on Case Site Descriptions; Module 10: Drafting**

Case Site Environmental Documentation (Impacts) and Module 12: Drafting Case Site Environmental Documentation (Mitigation and Monitoring).

4.2. Definition of Roles

Facilitators	<p>the individuals responsible for running the course. The facilitators' principal responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appointing chairs and working groups; • introducing and closing each day of the course, and if appropriate, each module; and, • meeting and coordinating with presenters, rapporteurs, and chairs prior to their sessions. <p>When not presenting or chairing themselves, facilitators should closely monitor each session and intervene where necessary to provoke useful discussions or get a session back on track in terms of timing or substance.</p>
Presenters or Speakers	<p>the individuals appointed to deliver the lectures or working group presentations. Presenters can include facilitators, participants, or invited guests.</p>
Chairs	<p>preside over each plenary session or working group, and ensure flowing and provocative discussions, encourage even participation, and maintain the time schedule. The role of chairs is very similar to that of facilitators; for the purposes of this course, facilitators are defined as the individuals responsible for the entire course, while chairs are responsible for an individual sessions. For a given session, a chair could be either a participant, facilitator, or resource person. Working group chairs may be selected in advance or appointed by the groups themselves.</p>
Resource Persons	<p>typically local specialists invited to chair, present, or advise during the course.</p>
Rapporteurs	<p>those individuals appointed to keep notes, and if appropriate, report the discussions of working groups and plenary sessions (optional). (Roles of rapporteurs are described in the <i>Sourcebook</i>, Introductory Session)</p>

4.3. Special notes for Facilitators and Chairs

Facilitated training is based on the belief that education is best done by participation and involvement. Facilitators and chairs should not preach or dictate an answer, but rather encourage participants to think about how they would approach the problem by asking questions and stimulating discussion. They should have good skills in, and knowledge of both facilitated training concepts and of the subject matters they are teaching. They should work as a team and communicate decisions well. In addition, it is recommended that a Facilitator Wrap-up Session be held at the end of each day to review the progress of the course, make any minor adjustments necessary, and especially to plan the next day's facilitation and schedule.

The role of the facilitators and chairs is not only to clarify, but also challenge the group if necessary. Facilitators may find themselves on different sides of the issues from moment to moment. Part of their job is to stimulate discussion, raise ideas, and take the role of the less accepted view. The facilitator should try to foster full participation by each member of the class.

Before presentations	<p>Meet with speakers to ensure that they understand their assignments and the session objectives. Discuss how speakers will be introduced, how time limits will be maintained, and how questions and comments will be handled. You may wish to ask speakers to write down a paragraph describing themselves that can be used to introduce them. Ask speakers to be present at least 15</p>
-----------------------------	---

	<p>minutes before sessions start.</p> <p>Check with speakers to determine any equipment needs and make sure needed equipment is available, correctly placed, and functional.</p>
During a session	<p>Open the session. Introduce yourself. Identify the topic to be discussed and link it to previous or upcoming sessions. Introduce the speakers. Set the ground rules. Keep these remarks brief-not more than two or three minutes.</p> <p>Manage the time. (If you wish, ask someone in the audience to assist.) Intervene to stop the speaker, if necessary.</p> <p>After the presentations, open the session for discussion and questions from the floor. Assist in directing questions to different speakers. Repeat the question. Keep discussion focused on the objective of the session. Point out areas of consensus. Note unresolved questions, information needed or assumptions made. Encourage broad participation (limit overactive participation) and keep discussion moving. Again, manage the time. Announce when you have time for one last question.</p> <p>Record lessons learned and future actions needed.</p> <p>Close the session by making a brief summary statement. Thank the speakers. Make announcements regarding the next session-where, when, what. For breakout sessions, clarify room assignments. Announce the time the next session is to begin.</p>
During a Session (Non-Chairing Facilitators)	<p>Record important notes, quotes and issues raised to be followed up in subsequent sessions.</p> <p>Serve as resource persons on course procedures.</p> <p>Ensure that speakers, chairs, and rapporteurs understand their individual assignments and the session objectives.</p> <p>Brief any chairs who might be introducing other presenters.</p> <p>Monitor the sessions. Make periodic interventions, as necessary, to keep things moving and resolve difficulties.</p> <p>Ensure that discussions are recorded and, if necessary, chart key points.</p>
During Working Groups (Facilitators)	<p>Rotate among groups to ensure that the task is clear and discussions are proceeding in accordance with appropriate participatory dynamics and time frame. If necessary, assist the group.</p>
In General	<p>Provide guidance and feedback to course organizers, steering committee and planning committee. As the course proceeds, ensure that the work is on track, difficulties are resolved, and objectives are met. Assist the chair in all sessions.</p> <p>Receive and maintain flipcharts recording class discussions and working group results.</p> <p>Collect any speakers' papers that are part of course records and make sure the Steering Committee has all of them.</p> <p>Contribute to follow on sessions, as requested.</p>
Helpful Hints:	<p>Pay attention to both the substance (words) and process/non-verbal cues.</p> <p>Intervene only if needed. Do not direct or dominate. If group dynamics click, a facilitator may need to do little more than monitor time and seek clarity of statements. If you see someone overly advocating his/her position or telling war stories, individuals off on tangents, or less aggressive members trying to say something but being cut off, intervene.</p> <p>Get the group talking to each other, not to the chair or the rapporteur. If you are asked a direct question, perhaps you could pass it to someone else to respond to, e.g., "What do you think, Philip?"</p> <p>The use of questions, rather than statements, is key to good facilitation. Here are some questions you can ask.</p> <p>TO GET DISCUSSION STARTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "What do you think about this problem?" • "What has been your experience with this type of problem?" • "Has anyone experienced a similar success?"

	<p>ENCOURAGE MORE PARTICIPATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "How does what we have been saying so far sound to the rest of you?" • "What other aspects of the problem have we missed?" <p>LIMIT OVERACTIVE PARTICIPATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "You've made several interesting observations. Does anyone else want to add to them?" <p>ORIENT THE DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Where do we stand now in relation to our objective?" <p>KEEP THE DISCUSSION MOVING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Do you think we have spent enough time on his phase of the problem? Can we move on to another part of it?" <p>PRESS FOR CLARITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "What is the sequence of events?" "What resources are required?" • "Who has what responsibilities? What groups are involved?" • "What was the outcome? What was the impact?" <p>PRESS FOR A DECISION</p> <p>"Have we reached consensus on this point?"</p>
--	--

4.4. Special notes for presenters

The course is organized so that technical sessions are interspersed with working group sessions. The purpose is to have each inform the other. Presenters are advised to listen carefully to work group reports to see if they can relate some of their comments to issues raised in the groups.

Before presenting	<p>Prepare your presentation. Decide what you want to say and what you can say in the time available. Arrange points in a sequence that assists the audience in understanding the topic. Know how much time you have (check with moderator).</p> <p>Structure your presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction: Tell them what you are going to say. • Body: Say it. Use examples to illustrate your points • Conclusion: Tell them what you said. <p>Review overheads and lecture notes provided in course materials. Modify or add to these as needed. Use non-text visual aids, like diagrams, pictures, and graphs, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Provide copies of your presentation and any handouts to the course organizers or facilitators, so that copies can be made in advance of your session.</p> <p>Make sure equipment is available in the room where you will be presenting and that it works. Make</p>
--------------------------	---

	<p>sure visuals are in order and visible throughout the room. Put key words only on overheads.</p> <p>Practice your planned presentation with another persons before the session, if possible or needed. Run through the presentation and ask for feedback. Make adjustments to fit the time allocated.</p>
While Presenting:	<p>Relax. Be yourself. Express your own personality. Establish a pace and tone that is comfortable for you. Keep in touch with the audience. Maintain eye contact.</p> <p>Refer to your own practical experiences as much as possible.</p> <p>Speak slowly and clearly, particularly if the course language is not your primary language. Minimize use of jargon and acronyms, and explain those that you do use.</p> <p>Use stories or humor to the extent possible, but check the sensitivities of the group to avoid offending anyone.</p> <p>Remember your time limit; the chair will enforce it. Stick to your prepared points. Avoid over-elaboration and going off on tangents. If you exceed your time limit, quit gracefully. If you can finish early, do so.</p>
After Presenting	<p>Give succinct responses to questions and comments. First, make sure that you understand the question. Then, respond with information, not emotion. (Facts may be more helpful than opinions.) Offer sources of additional information. Stay after the session to discuss issues further with interested participants.</p> <p>Give feedback to chair and facilitator</p>

5. Module guides

5.1. Module 1: Opening Statements and Introductory Session

Format: Lecture/Discussion

Session Length: 1 hour

Suggested timing: Day 1 AM

Preparation:

Select chair for this session. Good candidates are high-level government officials or representatives of major collaborating PVOs or NGOs.

Arrange for opening statements. If host country government involvement is significant, you may wish to arrange with relevant Ministry/Agency for a short, informal opening address. Bear in mind that if an official opening is planned, it may be local protocol that the course cannot officially begin until the official delivers his or her address. If this is the case, and the official arrives late, then proceed with other agenda activities as an “unofficial” part of the course. If there is a possibility of significant delay, consider having the official close, rather than open the course.

Prepare for welcoming. Check the list below, and check with organizers, facility personnel, resource persons, to see that all important announcements are made. Alert any people you would like to introduce in any special manner.

Suggested order of events

1. Opening Statements
2. Facilitators' Welcome
facilitators should provide a brief description of their background and experience
3. Purpose and intent of the course; course agenda
See note, below
4. Participant Introductions
Request each participant to comment very briefly on their personal and institutional experience with environmental assessment and USAID environmental regulations (name, title, institution, then experience). Suggest a time limit of 1-2 minutes per participant if the group is large.
5. Solicitation of Group Goals
After all the introductions are complete, ask the group what they want to accomplish by taking the course. Post these on flip chart paper for future reference as the course progresses

Notes on presenting the purpose and agenda

- Discuss the rationale for the course and the principal objectives to be achieved
- Note that All of the topics introduced in the course may not be applicable to all of the participants' situations but it should provide a framework of the basic principles
- Course was designed for implementers from government, academia, public life, and environmental and industrial organization

Review agenda

- Explain how the course will proceed
- Briefly review the course agenda. Point out where participants might have an opportunity to discuss additional topics of their choice;
- Describe how most days will proceed, with breaks and meals;
- Describe the special nature of the field trip; and,
- Note the importance that participants share their experiences and provide their own case studies for discussion and analysis.

Explain course materials

- Hold up the sourcebook and explain how it is organized
- Walk through each chapter, giving a brief summary of the chapter's contents; and,
- Note that additional inserts will likely be provided as course proceeds.

Explain facilitators', speakers' and participants' roles (see above)

- Remind participants to raise hands or otherwise intervene, if points are not well understood or acronyms and jargon are unexplained.

Identify key personnel and have them introduce any important logistical points

- Introduce administrative/clerical staff and have them make additional announcements and explain who will be responsible for any important logistical aspects (e.g., duplication, supplies, per diems, etc., as appropriate); and,
- Explain or have someone else describe the layout of the course facilities and where important items can be found (working group breakout rooms, copiers, facility staff, etc.)

5.2. Module 2

Why assess environmental impacts, and an introduction to environmentally sound design

Format: Lecture/Discussion

Session Length: 1 hour

Suggested timing: Day 1 AM

Preparation:

One or two presenters may be used.

- The presenter for the “why assess” portion (suggested length: 20 minutes) must have familiarity with the history of interest and concern for environmental protection and management, both in the U.S., globally and in the region and make the case for why environmental impact assessment is important.
- the presenter for the environmentally sound design portion (ESD) should ideally have an environmental background with several years of experience in project design and evaluation. The presenter may wish to modify or add to the overheads and handouts, or include additional selected readings or reference materials.

References for Facilitators:

Module overheads

Three set *Sectoral Guidelines, Mitigation Measures and Checklists*

Discussion Questions—“why assess?”:

This is primarily a presentation providing an historical perspective and the motivation for doing environmental assessments.

1. Why carry out environmental assessments?
2. Is the interest in environmental assessment driven by developed countries who have the resources to address environmental problems while many developing countries do not? How should the developing countries respond to the need for increased capacity in environmental assessment?

Discussion Questions—ESD:

1. The principles of environmentally-sound design are not new. Have they been followed? If not, why not?
2. Do participants have specific examples of sound or unsound designs that the other participants would benefit from knowing about or should be alerted to? Are there particularly sensitive situations to watch out for? What low-cost techniques have they seen applied to identify potential problems? Are there certain

kinds of regionally-based technical resources/expertise (e.g. GIS, remote sensing, water resource planning, etc.) that could improve environmentally sound design?

3. How might environmental impacts associated with emergency situations, such as refugee resettlement, food and disaster relief, pest outbreaks, etc. best be managed and/or mitigated? Do participants have examples? What steps might be taken to improve management and mitigation in the future?
- 4.. What kinds of problems are encountered in trying to increase local participation in activity and project design? Can participants provide examples from their own experience? What strategies might be followed to improve local involvement?
5. What are the constraints at the community level to the participation of women in decision-making and management of natural resources? What more might be done to improve women's access and control over natural resources?
6. Are there other rural community groupings who lack access to management and control of natural resources? What more could be done to improve equity or access for these groups?

5.3. Module 3: Assessing Environmental Impacts: Basic Concepts

Format: Lecture/Discussion

Session Length: 1 hour 15 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 1 AM

Preparation:

The presenter for this module should be selected well in advance, since some preparation will be required. The ideal candidate would have practical experience with EIA implementation and have taught EIA courses at the university level. Other candidates might include government environmental ministry staff, specialists from NGOs, or USAID staff with environmental background and duties. An interesting option is to use 2-3 presenters, if several qualified people are available, in a panel format.

This is an introductory session, designed to introduce participants to the thought processes of environmental assessment not the jargon or formalized procedures.

The presenter should review the overheads and background reading. These materials are rather generic, and should ideally be modified and supplemented with the presenter's own materials (overheads, readings, and discussion based on experience).

Additional References for Facilitators:

Attachment

Module overheads

Readings

(attached) UNEP, 1988. *Environmental Impact Assessment: Basic Procedures for Developing Countries.*

World Bank, Middle East and North Africa Region, 2000. *A Guide to the Preparation and Review of Environmental Assessment Reports*.

(Appendix B) “Section 1 “Basic Concepts for Assessing Environmental Impacts,” in *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*. M. Stoughton, ed. USAID, August 2000.

5.4. Module 4: Information, background, and resources for EIA in the Palestinian context

Format: Presentation/Q&A

Session length: 1 hours 30 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 1 PM, Day 2 PM

Preparation:

This presentation by local resource persons (usually 1 environmental specialist, and 1 social/cultural specialist) should discuss broad concerns in national and regional environmental management and policy. Topics should include the regional environmental setting; the national or local natural resource base and environmental/natural resource trends and issues; social, cultural and land tenure issues affecting natural resource and environmental management. Also to be addressed is national environmental impact assessment policy and procedures, and the status of EA within the country.

The presentation should also provide participants with a sense of what kind of local resources, institutions, and expertise can and should be tapped for assistance with environmental assessment.

The latter point is extremely important given the possible need for participants to seek additional assistance from local institutions and experts should they undertake an environmental review or examination.

To assist participants, request the presenters to compile a handout for participants illustrating:

- institutions and resources based within the country that can assist in environmental assessment;
- a brief description of their expertise; and
- relevant contact information (phone, address, etc., key individuals).

EIA must be conducted on the basis of sound information, and with a close awareness of the local context. Unfortunately, these two criteria also present the largest obstacles to sound EIA of small-scale activities. This module is presented in three separate course sections discussing various aspects of the Palestinian context:

- Module 4A discusses general Environment and Natural Resource issues in Palestine, as well as programs, policies, and information sources
- Module 4B presents the Palestinian Environmental Assessment Policy

- Module 4C presents social and cultural issues relevant to EIA in Palestine, as well as sources of social information and statistics

The session provides Q&A time with the expert presenters.

Additional References for Facilitators:

Readings

(attached) Background papers and other materials prepared by expert presenters

(attached) The Palestinian Environmental Assessment Policy

(attached) The Palestinian National Environmental Policy

(attached) Other basic country information

5.5. Module 5: USAID Environmental Procedures

(Part A: Lecture)

Format: Presentation/Discussion

Session length: 1 hour

Suggested timing: Day 1 PM

Preparation:

Ideally this session should be presented by a USAID environmental specialist intimately familiar with USAID's relationship to the U.S. National Environmental Policy ACT (NEPA) and the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act (FAA), USAID Regulation 216, the Initial Environmental Examination process, the environmental review process applicable to umbrella grant projects, and FAA requirements related to tropical forestry and biodiversity.

USAID's procedures are governed by "Regulation 216." They are presented as a specific implementation of the general EIA process described in module 3.

As with any EIA process, the first step is to conduct a screening exercise. Dependent on the screening exercise, USAID's procedures specify what level of additional environmental review may be necessary.

The details of conducting such additional review—usually writing an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) or, in the case of subgrant activities, an Environmental Review —are addressed in later modules.

Additional References for Facilitators:

Attachments

Module overheads

Readings

Module 5 in the *Participants' Sourcebook* contains Chapters 1 & 2 of the Draft USAID Environmental Procedures Training Manual, which provides a guide to screening under Regulation 216.

Module 5 also contains the text of Regulation 216 (22 CFR Part 216)

Discussion Questions:

1. Is the terminology and environmental review process clear to the participants? Ask various trainees to reiterate each of the key definitions and categories. For example:

- What is the meaning of 'significant' impact?
- Who decides if an activity is exempt?
- How are Categorical Exclusions defined? Positive Determinations? Negative determinations with and without conditions? An initial environmental examination (IEE)? When should environmental documentation be prepared?
- What are deferrals? Why should they be avoided, if possible?

2. Ask participants to describe some examples of projects they've worked on and their experience, if any, with the Environmental Review process. How long does it take to prepare the document? How long does approval take? Were outside technical assistance (TA) or other resources needed to complete the examination (or to design the assessment)? Who provided the TA? What did it cost? Did the process serve any useful purpose? To what extent were 'affected stakeholders' involved in the process?

(Part B: Classifying activities)

Format: Brief presentation/explanation, followed by Workgroups

Session length: 1 hour 15 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 1 PM, Day 2 Report outs AM

Preparation

The presenter explains the environmental screening process with limited reference to USAID Environmental Procedures. With the instructions on how to conduct environmental screening in hand, the participants work in groups to attempt to categorize a set of theoretical activities following USAID categories.

See the *Participants Sourcebook* Module 5 for general working group preparations. In advance, facilitators should assign one resource person or facilitator to each group to help stimulate discussion.

This initial working group is primarily designed to get all of the participants involved and talking about environmental screening and "loosen up" the group. The composition of working groups is thus not as important as in subsequent days. Little time should be needed to assemble the groups. For efficiency, the facilitators can divide up the room as seated, or preferably, "count out" around the room. (There are to be three work groups for this exercise. To "count out", determine the number of groups needed for a group

size of 10-14 people, and go around the room asking each person to say the next number out loud "1", "2", "3", "1", "2", "3" etc.) The groups should each elect a chair who will report out in plenary and a rapporteur.

The participants are given a different list of theoretical activities to categorize. After discussing and deciding how to categorize activities for 45 minutes, the groups go back into plenary the next morning and each chair then becomes part of an open panel discussion on how each group categorized their activities and the rationale they used.

References for Facilitators:

Workgroup category classification exercise (See Module 5 in the *Participants' Sourcebook*)

Optional: "20 Questions" (classifying activities under Regulation 216)

Questions:

1. To what degree are the choices made for classifying activities under the USAID categories open to interpretation?
2. Ask for feedback. Do the participants understand why one group categorized an activity one way, while others used different assumptions? How many participants are still confused about the categorization process? Try a few more examples with individuals from around the room. Emphasize that there may be no right answer depending on interpretation, and that environmental impact assessment often involves multi-disciplinary expert judgment that is subjective and part science/part art.

5.6. Module 6: USAID/WBG Mission environmental requirements

Format: Presentation/explanation, followed by discussion

Session length: 1 hour 15 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 2 AM

USAID West Bank and Gaza has established environmental documentation requirements for grants under the Community Services Program (CSP).

The CSP was approved under an "umbrella IEE" which covers the various activities carried out under CSP grants. The terms of the IEE simplify environmental review and documentation requirements for most common activities under the CSP.

For many activities that would normally require an environmental review, USAID-WB/G has determined that recommended practices or standards will, under most circumstances, (1) prevent significant adverse environmental impacts and/or (2) mitigate these impacts.

For these common CSP activities, partners need not conduct a full environmental review (similar to an IEE) of the project activity. Instead, they:

1. certify that recommended practices and standards are being followed; and

2. submit a list of mitigation measures required to address these impacts.

USAID *strongly recommends* that partners carry out an Environmental Review exercise to properly and systematically identify mitigation measures. (The environmental review is essentially a short IEE). However, partners are not required to write environmental reviews. Environmental reviews are not submitted to USAID.

In other respects, USAID–WB/G procedures for CSP grants follow the general Reg 216 environmental screening and documentation the presented in the previous module

This module presents these USAID/WB-G requirements, using the environmental documentation form. USAID WB/G has adapted the environmental documentation form from the general screening form presented in the previous module.

The facilitator/presenter should **walk the participants through use of the Environmental Documentation Form** using the overheads provided for this module.

References for Facilitators:

Module overheads

USAID–West Bank and Gaza environmental documentation form for CSP grants

5.7. Module 7: Examination and discussion of sample USAID/WBG environmental documentation and IEEs

Format: Plenary discussion

Session length: 45 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 2 AM

In plenary, participants will critique and analyze the sample documentation provided in the *Sourcebook*.

This module presents Community Service Program (CSP) environmental documentation examples and IEEs. Based on material presented in Modules 5 & 6, Participants should examine, analyze and critique these documents in preparation for writing their own environmental documentation:

- Does the actual documentation conform to the indicative environmental documentation outline?
- Do participants agree with the classification assigned to activities?
- Have all categories of possible significant impacts have been addressed?
- Are the mitigation and monitoring measures adequate?

Note that the samples are actual project documentation submitted to USAID. Because CSP environmental documentation requirements are newly established, the CSP environmental documentation is a constructed example.

References for Facilitators:

SAMPLE USAID WEST BANK GAZA Environmental Documentation Form

Revisions to Community Services Program (CSP) Initial Environmental Examination

EA Outline: Middle Egypt Water and Wastewater Master Planning Project (Harza Env Services, April 2001)

Environmental Assessment: Ramallah Wastewater Treatment Complex (includes Record of USAID determination under Regulation 216, with mitigation conditions) (PRIDE, Oct 1994)

“Background Documents”—prepared by consultants. These documents provide information to USAID’s ANE Bureau Environmental Officer in making a determination regarding (1) the classification that applies to an activity under Reg 216; and (2) the mitigation or monitoring conditions that are required. They are useful because they illustrate the types of impacts (and mitigation measures) of project activities common to WBG:

- ANERA Cooperative and Municipal Development Project (PRIDE, Feb 1995)
- CRS Integrated Rural Development and Capacity-Building Project (PRIDE, Feb 1995)

Readings

Refer to USAID environmental screening procedures under Reg 216, Module 5

Refer to IEE requirements and indicative outline, Module 14

5.8. Module 8: Information requirements and tools for screening and preliminary assessment

Format: Presentation/Discussion

Session length: 1 hour

Suggested timing: Day 2 AM

Preparation:

Based on the knowledge and expertise of the participants, facilitators should review the background material and decide upon the basic tools and methods to discuss.

In most cases, it is likely that the emphasis should be placed on the use of checklists and maps, especially the utility of collecting and using available maps to identify and chart the location and movement of human and natural resources.

You should also review the checklists included in the Sourcebook for this session, and determine whether these should be supplemented or replaced with other useful tools, such as locally developed checklists if they exist.

The practical demonstration of an overlay method using acetate sheets is suggested.

References for Facilitators:

Module overheads

Selected checklist(s) and tools for general assessment of project sites (specific checklists are provided in the accompanying sector materials)

Examples of a Leopold matrix and a network

Readings

Appendix B: “Section 3: Information Requirements for Screening and Preliminary Assessment,” in *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*. M. Stoughton, ed. USAID, August 2000.

5.9. Module 9: *Briefing on Case Site Descriptions*

Format: Presentation/Discussion

Session length: 30 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 2 PM

Thus far, the course has presented the principles of EIA and environmentally sound design, and information regarding the Palestinian situation. The remainder of the course is intended to focus on *application* of these principles and information.

Working in groups, participants will write environmental reviews of case study projects (1 project per group). Normally, the basic information needed to write the environmental review would be gathered on a one-day field trip. Due to current travel restrictions and security concerns, information will instead be gathered via (1) written case study briefings (including photos) particularly prepared for this purpose, and (2) participants’ knowledge of the area and of similar projects.

Participants should be asked to read all four case site descriptions on Monday evening.

This section presents the written case study briefings. All are actual projects. In many cases, details of the environmental reviews conducted for these projects have been provided to course organizers. These details have been withheld from participants. The briefings should be done in each workgroup session by an individual(s) familiar with the case site under discussion, e.g., CARE for agricultural access roads; CRS for cisterns and greywater recycling; CHF for water networks, and ANERA for waste water treatment.

Preparation:

Signup sheets for the four case site working groups need to be posted around the room during the 10:00-10:15 coffee break on Day 2. Once these are posted, the participants should receive instruction on which group to sign up for. You should encourage the participants and sector specialists (from CARE, CRS,

ANERA and CHF) to **NOT sit in a workgroup related to their own specific sectoral knowledge** (as a way of broadening their experience with the environmental review process).

Let the participants know that if numbers for any one workgroup session exceed the number of participant slots allocated for that case site, overflow will be assigned to other case sites workgroups by trying to meet the participant's second choice. The established teams will then remain together as workgroups throughout the remainder of the course, both in the workgroup session on preparing Environmental Reviews (afternoon of Day 2) and again in the session on preparing Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plans (afternoon of Day 3).

Facilitators should meet with PVO or partner sector specialists (from CRS, ANERA, CARE and CHF) on **Monday evening** to review their briefing presentations. These specialists need be instructed to **avoid discussing specific mitigation measures** since these are supposed to be identified by the work group teams in their mitigation and monitoring workplan exercise on Day 3. There are four case sites to be described. Bring to the attention of the sector specialists that for purposes of learning how to conduct environmental reviews of "proposed" activities and to use the USAID categorization process, the case site activities **may have been altered** from the original. They may also be described as proposed when, in reality, they have already been completed.

Answering case site team questions. CRS, ANERA, CARE and CHF sector specialists **should** be instructed to be available to answer questions as needed by the individual workgroup "teams." The teams should be encouraged to consult these specialists and to ask them about specific environmental impacts. Also, **after the teams have attempted to identify mitigation measures** they should consult the sector specialists to see which, if any, were overlooked or need elaboration.

To keep the presentations and interactions manageable, a maximum of four working groups should be formed with 8-12 participants each. Working group chairs and rapporteurs can be designated by the course facilitators, or this decision-making can be left to the groups themselves.

References for Facilitators:

Readings

Case study briefings

5.10. Module 10:

Drafting case site environmental documentation: baseline information and impacts

Format: Working Groups and Plenary Presentation/Discussion

Session length: 3 hours 15 minutes for Working Group Teams; 1 hour 15 minutes for Plenary

Suggested timing: Day 2 PM Working Group Teams, Day 3 AM Plenary report outs from Teams

After the participants have divided into working groups and have received the case site briefings, each "Team" will be responsible for drafting environmental documentation for ONE of the case studies. The work of each group will be presented in plenary and discussed.

Again, participants should NOT choose a working group assigned to a project with which they have previous or current involvement.

Each case study briefing contains instructions for the conduct of the environmental review. Reviews will use the USAID West Bank and Gaza *Environmental Documentation Form*.

In writing their environmental review, participants should make use of the sector-specific materials which accompany this sourcebook for guidance on environmental impacts and recommended practices.

An important role of the facilitators is ensure that each Environmental Review Team identifies the primary issues to be examined in the review and that **each Team member is assigned specific environmental review responsibilities**. For example, for a proposed water development activity, the following specialties might need to be engaged in the review: a hydrogeologist to look at aquifer location and recharge data, historical precipitation, etc.; a water quality specialist; a soil scientist to examine construction issues related to drilling and soil stability; an engineer to select appropriate well and pump technology for the setting, an economist to look at overall cost issues, pricing and maintenance fee arrangements; a social scientist to examine use and water rights issues; and perhaps a health and safety specialist.

Each team member should be assigned an area of specialization, even though they may not have these skills, **ROLE PLAYING IS ALLOWED**. In the course of the environmental review they should remember to think about the issues related to their assigned specialties. Some Team members should also be assigned the responsibility for testing the various sectoral guidelines, mitigation measures and checklists that apply. This should be useful in determining the utility of these materials in conducting the environmental review. At **least 2 Team members** should also have lead responsibility for helping guide the Team in the preparation of their Team's **Leopold Matrix**.

5.11. Module 11: Introduction to mitigation and monitoring

Format: Presentation/discussion

Session length: 1 hour 30 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 3 AM

Preparation:

If possible, obtain local expertise to serve as presenters or to assist with this session.

Presenters should briefly introduce material from the USAID *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*, Section 4 "Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring.

Mitigation and monitoring is an essential part of the EIA/ESD process. This session introduces participants to mitigation and monitoring concepts needed in preparation for the field trip, including:

- basic terminology
- a conceptual understanding of the value of environmental mitigation and monitoring and the importance of developing mitigation and monitoring plans in the design process

- the kinds of information you will need in order to develop field trip case study mitigation and monitoring plans
- basic approaches to mitigation and monitoring, and basic issues encountered—for example, the issues of establishing controls and baseline, indicators, sample size and reliability, etc
- design and content of mitigation monitoring plans
- institutional responsibilities for environmental mitigation, monitoring and evaluation

The presenters of this module should be prepared to: (1) review problems and issues involved in mitigation, monitoring and evaluation (including the issues of establishing controls and baseline, indicators, sample size and reliability, etc.); and (2) expose participants to the techniques used for environmental monitoring and evaluation, including tips for minimizing the technical, financial and human resource requirements for effective mitigation and monitoring. While environmental monitoring and evaluation and the use of environmental indicators is generally separate and distinct from Performance Monitoring and Evaluation of Strategic Objectives (SOs) and Intermediate Results (IRs), it can often be linked with IRs as a measure of long-term sustainability of an activity or program. An effort should be made to provide participants of examples of this linkage. It is probably most useful to discuss mitigation first, since the mitigation alternatives generally determine the type of environmental monitoring that will be needed. Topics to be covered under this module include:

- the definitions of mitigation, monitoring and evaluation;
- the purpose of mitigation, monitoring and evaluation of programs, sectors, projects and umbrella projects;
- a discussion of when environmental monitoring is needed;
- design of a plan for environmental mitigation and monitoring;
- implementation of the plan;
- use of mitigation, monitoring and evaluation results; and
- institutional responsibilities for environmental mitigation, monitoring and evaluation.

Additional References for Facilitators:

World Bank. 1991. *World Bank Environmental Sourcebook*. Various sections on monitoring, evaluation and mitigation.

Module 11, Annex 1 - Excerpts from “Indicative List of Factors to be Monitored,” *Volume II Sectoral Guidelines World Bank Environmental Assessment Sourcebook*, Electronic Version (1991).

Module 11, Annex 2: Form for indicating mitigation strategy by activity phase

Mitigation tables in accompanying sector-specific material

Appendix B: “Section 4: Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring,” in *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*. M. Stoughton, ed. USAID, August 2000 DRAFT.

Discussion Questions:

1. Why mitigate environmental impacts? Why monitor mitigative measures success and other environmental aspects of an activity purpose?
2. By whom, with what resources?
3. What adverse impacts should be mitigated? If there are many factors to be mitigated and/or mitigation is costly, should project or activity design be re-examined? What factors and indicators should be monitored?
4. How should mitigation and monitoring activities be designed and implemented?
5. What level of detail is required in monitoring and collecting data? How should it be done?
6. When should mitigation and monitoring measures be implemented?
7. Who pays for it, and through what mechanism?
8. What timing and frequency for monitoring?
9. Who and/or what institution has responsibility for monitoring and evaluation?
10. What happens to environmental mitigation, monitoring and evaluation after a project or program has ended?
11. How are monitoring results interpreted?
12. How is the generated information to be used?

5.12. Module 12

Drafting Mitigation and Monitoring Plans for the case studies

Format: Presentation/Discussion

Session length: 2 hours Team Working Groups, 1 hour 30 minutes for Plenary report outs by Teams.

Suggested timing: Day 3 AM/PM

Preparation:

Obtain local expertise to serve as presenters or to assist with this module. In most countries there is an institution in charge of these functions.

This module provides participants with hands-on exposure to the design of activity, project or program plans for mitigation and monitoring.

Participants will again divide into their workgroups (8-12 persons) to produce a “sketch” or outline mitigation and monitoring plan for their case site project. This is item 5E of the *Environmental Documentation Form*.

Groups should summarize their work on flipcharts. Each group’s work will again be presented and discussed in plenary.

- Facilitators should encourage the participants to select the three to five **most critical impacts** that need to be mitigated from their Leopold Matrix. If they have extra time, they can do more. **At least one** of the mitigation measures selected should involve **mitigation during initial project or activity design**. **Note:** Mitigation during planning and design typically **does not appear on the Leopold Matrix** since it only identifies and lists impacts.
- Distribute the “Mitigation and Monitoring Tables “Templates” provided by the Facilitators to organize and present Team recommendations. These are actually much more useful than the “Mitigation Strategy by Activity Phase” form recommended for use in Module 12 of the Participants’ Sourcebook.
- Have participants consider the cost of the mitigation measures relative to project cost. If they are more than ten percent of the cost, participants should be encouraged to consider re-design alternatives.
- Ensure that participants designate who is to be responsible for design, implementation and monitoring of the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.

Monitoring:

Participants should select three or four priority impacts/issues to be monitored and the indicator to be used (In all likelihood there may be many more possible indicators, but because of the time constraints for the workgroups, the facilitators should guide the Teams to concentrate on only three or four). Have them:

- Indicate why they have chosen a specific indicator;
- Indicate whether comparisons will be to baseline situations, to control situations, or both;
- Explain who will be responsible for monitoring;
- Explain how often monitoring will be done (frequency);
- Include cost considerations for each indicator;
- State how the results will be used and what analysis will need to be done;
- Describe who the results will be shared with.

Review the instructions provided in Module 12 of the *Sourcebook*. Make use of the *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*, Section 4 “Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring,” as well as the *USAID Environmental Procedures Training Manual*. With respect to both mitigation and monitoring, it is important to make sure that participants understand that mitigation and monitoring can be costly and that someone has to pay, someone has to be responsible, someone has to carry it out and someone has to know what to do with the results. The level of monitoring (adequacy, reliability, replicability, scientific and statistical validity) is important to consider. Is it desirable, for example, to monitor more things versus fewer, if monitoring more items means that the level of validity is less high?

Discussion Questions:

1. What is a monitoring plan? Purpose?

2. What is a mitigation plan?
3. How would you use the results of a mitigation and monitoring plan?
4. What subjects and concerns would you cover in such a plan?
5. What do you want to know? For what purpose?
6. How would you monitor? What are the different possibilities and resources offered to you?
7. What is an indicator? A proxy?
8. What is a data management and analysis system? Who are the individuals targeted by the mitigation and monitoring plan? For what purpose?

5.13. Module 13: Field Visit

Format: Briefing/Visit/Discussion

Session Length: 15 minute Briefing, 2 hours 45 minutes Field Visit, 30 minutes Reaction and Discussion

Suggested timing: Day 3 PM for Briefing, Day 4 AM for Field Visit and Discussion

A field trip to the Al-Bireh wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is planned. This is an example of a project that would typically trigger an EA (full environmental impact assessment study) under Regulation 216. A number of treatment plant projects are planned for the West Bank and Gaza; USAID is likely to be one funder of such projects.

Preparation:

Participants should apply the knowledge they have learned during the course to the field trip. Because the WWTP is a complex project, potential impacts are numerous—and benefits likewise extensive. Help them approach the field trip as if they were writing an environmental review for the project as detailed in the USAID–WB/G *Environmental Documentation Form*. **Make sure they address the following questions:**

- what were the full set of activities involved in WWTP construction?
- how would they characterize the baseline environmental situation at the site?
- how would they characterize the environmental impacts (adverse and beneficial) associated with the WWTP?
- what mitigation and monitoring measures were undertaken by the project, and which impacts do they address?
- Also, do they consider mitigation and monitoring to have been effective? ineffective? excessive? Insufficient?

References for Facilitators:

See Participants' Sourcebook Module 13

5.14. Module 14: Beyond Subgrant Environmental Reviews, Writing the IEE, Environmental Assessments and Programmatic Environmental Assessments and “Umbrella” IEEs

Format: Lecture

Session Length: 45 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 4 AM

Description/Objectives:

This module covers USAID environmental procedures beyond review of CSP grants.

Beyond the Environmental Documentation Form, the most common document that participants in this course may need familiarity with in future projects is the Initial Environmental Examination (IEE). This module presents the basic IEE outline specified by Reg 216, and the steps involved in writing it.

If time permits, and if the material is useful to participants, the course session will also cover additional details of USAID procedures, including Environmental Assessments (EAs), Programmatic Environmental Assessments (PEAs), and “Umbrella” IEEs (that is, IEEs for programs which include a number of separate grants and activities carried out by different partners. The CSP IEE is an umbrella IEE.)

EAs are USAID’s term for full environmental impact assessment studies. Under Reg 216, EAs are triggered by a list of “high risk” activities, or by a finding under the IEE that an activity will have significant, adverse environmental impacts. EAs usually require a multi-disciplinary professional team and at least several person-months of effort.

Discussing EAs, or full environmental impact assessment studies, requires some knowledge of the more detailed environmental impact assessment processes and techniques that are commonly used by the EIA community around the world today. Facilitators need to be fully conversant in these tools and methods, however, for participants in most courses, this knowledge is unlikely to be needed unless they will be participating directly in EA preparation. Nevertheless, having a general understanding of the EA process, including Scoping, and the components of a well-done EA, can be important.

The purpose for presenting this material is to familiarize participants with the universe of options and technical requirements:

- should such a document (EIA, EA, etc.) ever be required for a project they are associated with; or,
- should they ever need to probe more deeply into a specific, potential environmental problem than the simpler tools of information gathering and judgment seem to enable.

Most likely, there are scientific experts within the government or research institutions of the host country that can assist them should such a situation arise.

This session can be designed to fill the participants' needs as identified by the end of Day 3. It also provides them with the opportunity to clarify assessment procedures and requirements that still remain unclear at this point. With participant input, the facilitators can adapt this session to meet their needs.

It is therefore important for facilitators to encourage participants to let them know whether they would like the facilitators to cover any of these or other topics during this module.

By default, it is an opportunity to describe more complex assessment techniques and the full EA process. However, if this appears inappropriate for the audience (e.g., they are unlikely to need to be familiar with this material) or if there are issues in more basic environmental review that need further reinforcement, then this session can be revised accordingly or skipped in its entirety. Options might include:

- repeating and clarifying USAID Environmental Review procedures for CSP grants; or
- a free-wheeling group discussion on the relevance of IEE/environmental procedures, the level of input to be expected on USAID activities, and participant needs for additional support requirements.

Preparation:

Facilitators should meet at the end of Day 3 to assess which concepts need reinforcing or have yet to be covered. They should also solicit feedback from participants at the end of the last Day 3 session. If there is time, participants should read the *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*, Section 2, "The EIA Process in More Detail."

If the default presentation is used, the presenter should review the overheads that accompany this module and then review the background readings on EIA tools and methods. These materials can be easily modified and supplemented with the presenter's own materials, if available. This module relies heavily on the background readings. Since several good reviews of EIA methods already exist, the section in the *Topic Briefing* has been kept deliberately short.

It is suggested that the presenter, if possible, obtain examples of EIA tools applied within the country, and distribute these as handouts and/or use as overheads to illustrate the methods. These might include filled-out matrices, network analyses, and the like for a project.

References for Facilitators:

Module overheads—writing the IEE
Module overheads—Beyond the IEE
IEE Annotated outline

Readings:

Appendix B: USAID, *Topic Briefing: An Introduction to Environmental Assessment*, Section 2 "The Environmental Assessment Process in More Detail.," August 2000.

materials on USAID environmental procedures contained and referenced in Module 5, "USAID Environmental Procedures"

sample environmental documentation in Module 7

Additional References: There are numerous useful references in the EIA field. The following is a more comprehensive list than you are likely to use, but are included in any case for background purposes and in case only some references can be located. The most relevant and useful references are indicated with an “*”.

Ahmad, Y. J. and Sammy, G. K. 1985. *Guidelines to Environmental Impact Assessment in Developing Countries*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.

Beattie, R. B. 1995. “Everything You Already Know About EIA (But Don't Often Admit)”, in *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 13:299-308.

Bisset R., 1987. “Methods for Environmental Impact Assessment: a selective survey with case studies”, Chapter 1 in Biswas and Geping. (From p.4 onward)

Bisset, R. 1983. “Introduction to Methods for Environmental Impact Assessment”, in University of Aberdeen, PADC Environmental Impact Assessment and Planning Unit, ed.

* Biswas, A., and Geping, Q. eds. 1987. *Environmental Impact Assessment for Developing Countries*, Tycooly International, London.

Campbell, I. 1993. *Environmental Impact Assessment: Where to from Here?*, UNEP Environment and Economics Unit, Environmental Economics Series, Paper No. 6. October.

Cook, C. and Donnelly-Roark. 1994. “Public Participation in Environmental Assessments in Africa”, in Goodland, P.R, and Edmundson, V. eds. *Environmental Assessment and Development: A World Bank-IAIA Symposium*, World Bank.

Dixon, J. et al. 1988. *Economic Analysis of the Environmental Impacts of Development Projects*, Asian Development Bank, Earthscan, London.

* Sadar M. H. and Associates. 1994. *Environmental Impact Assessment*. Carleton University Press for the Impact Assessment Centre, Carleton University, Ottawa.

University of Aberdeen, PADC Environmental Impact Assessment and Planning Unit, ed. 1983. *Environmental Impact Assessment*, NATO Advanced Study Institute on Environmental Impact Assessment, Martinus Nijhoff, Boston. See sections: Chatzimikes, F. “A Method for Evaluating Environmental Impacts from Land Development Projects” and Canter, L. “Methods for Environmental Impact Assessment: Theory and Application”

UNEP, *Environmental Impact Assessment Training Resource Manual*, Environment and Economics Unit, EEU, Preliminary Version, June 1996.

* Wathern, P. ed. 1988. *Environmental Impact Assessment*, Unwin Hyman, London

Weber, Fred R., *NRM Framework Review*, World Resources Institute, Center for International Development and Environment, Washington, D.C., January, 1991.

World Bank. 1995. "Implementing Geographic Information Systems for Environmental Assessment", Environmental Assessment Sourcebook Update No.9, Environment Department.

World Bank. 1993. "Geographic Information Systems for Environmental Assessment and Review", Environmental Assessment Sourcebook Update No.3, Environment Department

Discussion Questions:

1. Which methods have participants used before for EIA or in other disciplines?
2. Which could be usefully applied at the level of projects participants are working on?

5.15. Module15: Special topics – Best Practices in Construction Management, Pesticide Use, etc.

Format: Lecture/Discussion

Session Length: 1 hour and 15 minutes PM

Suggested timing: Day 4

Preparation:

Best construction management practices have been identified as one of the special topics for this session.

If useful to participants, issues regarding pesticide use in USAID projects may also be addressed. Although pesticide environmental assessment is generally performed by specialists, participants may be involved in the interpretation of results from a pesticide environmental assessment, as well as in the implementation of recommended monitoring activities.

Optional:

If pesticides are presented as a formal topic this is typically covered in another 45 minute session. Given the tight schedule and abbreviated course length, participants may simply be referred to the materials contained in Module 15 on this topic.

The presenter should be selected in advance, and have the opportunity to review and revise the standard course materials. The presenter should ideally have experience with USAID pesticide assessments. If a USAID environmental officer or advisor will be present at the course, they should be asked to assist this session, if the facilitators and/or resource persons do not have such experience.

This presentation should discuss:

- the major classes of pesticides;
- the content of pesticide label;
- integrated pest management (IPM) and alternatives to pesticides use;

- Reg. 16/USAID’s specific pesticide assessment procedures;
- what is needed to conduct a pesticide environmental assessment; and,
- pesticide mitigation measures and requirements.

Discussion Questions:

1. How would you qualify the risks associated with pesticide use from your own experiences?
2. What are the principal ways of avoiding pesticide risks and hazards? To what extent can farmers be counted on to follow suggested application and exposure-minimization measures? What do you usually observe in the market regarding the sale and handling of pesticides?
3. Are these local laws, regulations, environmental procedures regarding pesticides? How efficient are these laws and regulations?
4. Do you have experience or an impression about IPM and any alternatives to pesticides use?
5. How well have they succeeded?

Additional References for Facilitators:

Pesticide overheads

Readings

For construction management practices, see sector materials that accompany the *Participants’ Sourcebook*.

In the Sourcebook under Module 15 “Appendix C: Pesticide Safe Use Guidelines.” From *Environmental Guidelines for Small Scale Activities in Africa*. USAID/AFR/SD. June 1996. Knausenberger, Booth, Bingham and Gaudet, eds.

see also text or Regulation Reg 216.3(b) (provided in **Module 5**) for environmental requirements applying to pesticide use.

**5.16. Module 16:
Other EIA Issues and Capacity Building**

Format: Presentation/Discussion

Session Length: 30 minutes

Suggested timing: Day 4 PM

5.17. Module 17: Course Evaluation, Synthesis, and Recommendations for Follow-Up Activities

Format: Presentation/Discussion

Session Length: 1 hour (20 min evaluations/20 minutes synthesis presentation/ 20 min discussion)

Suggested timing: Day 5 PM

Preparation:

This module typically contains 4 related components: 1) a short written test to determine the degree to which participants have grasped USAID environmental procedures and definitions, with a post test discussion of the questions and answers (**this was not prepared for the course**); 2) the completion and collection of evaluation forms; 3) the delivery of a synthesis presentation by previously selected course participants; and 4) a discussion of recommended follow-up activities.

Written Test: Participants are tested anonymously and results tabulated over lunch or late coffee break on Day 4. Portions of the test cover specifics and nuances of Regulation 216 and FAA Sections 118 and 119.

Course Evaluation: Duplicate training session evaluation forms and distribute to the participants. Participants can be made aware of the form at the **beginning of the course** and asked to record written comments on the back at the end of each day. However, approximately 20 minutes is typically needed during this session to fill them out, since fuller participation and more complete information are likely.

Synthesis Presentation: At the **beginning of the course**, a group of approximately three participants should be designated to make a final workshop synthesis presentation of lessons learned (see below for content). The group will be responsible for taking notes and for making the necessary arrangements for a synthesis presentation. This includes designating either a rapporteur to present their summary or deciding to present their finding as a group. The facilitators should meet regularly with the group during the workshop to make sure that they are on track. A short written report (2-3 pp.), which could consist simply of a bulleted list) by the group should be encouraged as this would provide a lasting record for the other participants.

A synthesis presentation enables participants to take stock of what they have learned, accomplished, and exchanged during the training session, and to identify further skills they may need, if any, to be fully capable of meeting USAID requirements for environmental documentation, including Environmental Reviews, IEEs, or Environmental Assessments. The synthesis presentation should touch upon the following:

- general skills acquired during training session;
- Environmental Review, IEE, or Environmental Assessment technical knowledge acquired;
- lessons learned during work group sessions;

- review of materials, references, and other sources of information;
- thoughts on "what's next" for course participants; and,
- recommendations for future Environmental Review or assessment training sessions.

Discussion: A chair should be identified in advance. The course facilitators are likely candidates, as are the resource persons. The course evaluation form can easily serve as a guide for discussion, as can the synthesis presentation. The module will provide facilitators with input for further modification of course materials, therefore good note-taking is essential. A **rapporteur should be appointed** for this purpose.

Follow-up: Evaluations are important for obtaining feedback on the value of the training to participants and suggestions for how to improve such trainings in the future. After the evaluations are collected, they can be passed on to a workshop secretary or administrator for tabulation of results and suggestions. The tabulated summary should then be distributed to the facilitators, organizers, and funders of the training workshop. Facilitators should also review each of the individual evaluation forms for additional suggestions and feedback not contained in the forms.

5.18. Closing

Format: Presentation

Session Length: 30-60 minutes

Suggested timing: Final session

Preparation:

- 1) A **chair** can be appointed prior to the beginning of the course, most likely a representative from government, a participating USAID Partner, or a facilitator. The chair will also be responsible for distributing course certificates.
- 2) **Individual speakers** should be identified in advance, and might include: a USAID representative, a representative of the participants and/or their parent institution(s).
- 3) **Course certificates** will need to be prepared in advance; some blanks will be useful for last minute changes in the participant list. The USAID representative should hand these out.