TELLUS INSTITUTE
Resource and Environmental Strategies

Final Report:

RAMP Course in Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design & associated technical assistance

12–16 December 2004 ▪ Kabul, Afghanistan

To: John Priest, RAMP
Mikael Hook, Chemonics/Washington

Cc: Mumtaz Ahmad, RAMP
Wes Fisher, Tellus Institute
David McAnulty, Tellus Institute
Tim Prewitt, RAMP
John Wilson, USAID/ANE

From: Jeffrey Rosenblum & Mark Stoughton, Tellus Institute—Boston, USA

11 Arlington St, Boston MA 02116 USA
Tel +1.617.266.5400; fax +1.617.266.8303

jrosenblum@tellus.org; mstough@tellus.org

Date: 28 February 2005

Attachments:

Participant list
Final Agenda
Course evaluations
Final case site descriptions
Modified RAMP Environmental Review Form (DRAFT/PROPOSED)

Background and overview

The Capacity for Imapact Assessment and Management (CIAM) Program of Tellus Institute is contracted to provide environmentally related technical assistance to the ANE Bureau Environmental Officer and USAID's ANE missions and programs.

Wes Fisher, Director of CIAM, visited Afghanistan and RAMP under CIAM's core ANE contract in July 2004. During his visit, he assessed RAMP's environmental review procedures and RAMP's current compliance with the environmental review requirements set out in its IEE.

The results of this visit were summarized in a 11 July 2004 memo distributed to RAMP management and USAID ("Analysis of Environmental Documentation under USAID/Afghanistan's Rebuilding Agricultural Markets Program"). Two key recommendations were that RAMP should:

- Adopt a standard environmental review form and process,

- "Through targeted training and technical assistance, develop the capacity of IPs in: (i) preparing and applying the ERR to awarded projects; (ii) applying environmentally sound design principles at the survey, layout and design stage, (iii) ensuring effective mitigation and monitoring plans and follow-up and (iv) applying environmental 'best management practices' during implementation. "

Persuant to the 2nd recommendation, Fisher carried out preplanning activities for future delivery of a 5-day "environmental assessment and environmentally sound design (EA–ESD) course" during his visit. The course would be based on USAID/Africa Bureau's ENCAP EA–ESD course, and would be held after Afghanistan's national elections.

(Such a course had also been the subject of earlier discussions between CIAM. USAID & RAMP in late 2003.)

In late October 2004, RAMP communicated that planning should proceed for the course. The course was ultimately held 12–16 December 2004 in Kabul, with CIAM/Tellus trainers.

This memorandum serves as the final report of Tellus Institute on the course, related technical assistance and the delivery process. As such, it constitutes the final deliverable specified in Tellus' scope of work. In addition to the background and overview contained in this section, it documents:

- The general nature of the basic course, and the substantive adaptations and additions made for the RAMP presentation.
- Key attributes of the course
- Discussion of participant evaluations
- Description of additional technical assistance provided to RAMP
- Consultant's comments

Attachments to this memorandum provide additional information and documentation.

General course description & RAMP-specific adaptations

The course was a presentation of the "Regional Course in Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design for Small-Scale Activities," originally developed for USAID/Africa Bureau by CIAM and USAID/AFR staff.

This basic course is described immediately below, with the adaptations made for the RAMP presentation described at the end of this section

The basic course is a 5-day (M-F) course for 25–50 participants. Typically targeted at USAID partner organizations engaged in small-scale activities, it provides an introduction to environmentally sound design with application to key sectors, 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; day 3 consists of a one-day field trip in which participants conduct observation and assessment of actual or proposed project sites. Participants then write a draft IEE or environmental review based on their site visit experience. Typically more than one project site is identified for each of a few sectors (e.g., use of agrochemical inputs, small scale irrigation, agricultural micro and small enterprises, roads, etc.)

The course was originally developed by CIAM and staff of USAID's Africa Bureau. It has been given almost 30 times by CIAM staff and others since its creation in 1995. Original course development has been funded by ENCAP, an African environmental capacity-building initiative of USAID's Africa Bureau. Ongoing development is funded by ENCAP, USAID/ANE, and the missions and partners that have sponsored the course. As the lead provider of technical assistance under ENCAP, CIAM has provided preplanning and materials preparation services as well as a principal course trainer for the majority of the courses in the series. In ANE, the course has also been presented in Iraq and Gaza/West Bank.

A full description of the course, agenda and course materials, as well as a database of past participants, is available at http://www.encapafrica.org.

Adaptations.

Method of addressing Reg 216 procedures. RAMP functions under an "umbrella" IEE. Thus, RAMP IPs do not need a detailed understanding of Reg 216, but they do need a full working understanding of the "Environmental Review Report (ERR)." Therefore, the focus of the course was providing participants the context of the USAID procedures, and a working ability to create an ERR.

Addressing recurrent RAMP activities. Many IPs implement very similar projects that, if following proper mitigation, will not have an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, as part of RAMP's compliance with its IEE, has developed a procedure for developing blanket ERRs that adequately cover certain activities and a clear set of criteria for determining what projects fall under its purvue. A customized ERR Form has been developed for ramp that allows an IP to forgo completion of a formal ERR if there exists a blanket RAMP ERR that covers the activity, as long as the IP includes all of the applicable mitigation measures indicated in the blanket ERR (see attached).

Key attributes of RAMP EA-ESD course

Dates	Sunday, 12 December—Thursday, 16 December 2004.
Venue	RAMP conference rooms (new RAMP building)
Language	English, with occasional summary translation in Dari .
Participants	30 participants representing RAMP and 18 implementing partners attended the course. (Final participant list is attached.)
Course funding and support, including partner contributions	An MOU between Chemonics and Tellus was signed covering both Wes Fisher's initial technical assistance to RAMP (for assessing RAMP's environmental review procedures and RAMP's current compliance with the environmental review requirements set out in its IEE) and course delivery: The MOU committed Tellus to provide trainers and related services for the course, and Chemonics/RAMP to provide facilities and logistics. The parties agreed that Chemonics/RAMP would fund travel for the Tellus consultants, while their labor would be charged against Tellus' core contract with USAID/ANE.
Trainers	Mark Stoughton and Jeff Rosenblum of Tellus Institute served as co-trainers for the course.
Logistics	RAMP provided all necessary logistics, including catering (lunches and tea breaks), materials reproduction, and transport to case site venues.
Case study sites and descriptions	The course featured twosets of case sites, all within Kabul and Parwam provinces: • **Infrastructure for agriculture.** Site visits to new diversion structure construction & unrehabilitated diversion structures (Salang river); irrigation canal rehabilitation; market access road rehabilitation

	• **Agricultural techniques & inputs.** Site visits: DWC and/or ACTED agriculture activities in progress. (1) Agricultural demonstration/nursery plots. Used to promote new cultivation techniques); (2) Warehouse storage for agricultural inputs; (3) Agricultural processing factory (for dehydration) currently in construction. In addition, participants observed existing agricultural practice in the area.

Summary and analysis of course evaluations

23 course evaluations were received from the participants. On the question "Overall rating of the course," participants gave an average rating of 4.4 (on a scale of lowest 1 to highest 5). Detail of the evaluations is attached. Participants seemed particularly pleased with the emphasis on the hands-on process of completing ERRs, and with the high level of group interaction and discussion. A common complaint is that the course was too short, and they would have liked to have more time to engage the materials further, and had more practical applications of the material. Some would have preferred translated materials and a more condensed sourcebook.

Related technical assistance

While in Kabul, Rosenblum and Stoughton undertook consultation with and provided technical assistance to RAMP staff.

After arriving in Kabul and prior to the course, discussions with RAMP revealed that the project was using a supplemental checklist for natural resource management projects as its basic environmental review/clearance form. In the view of the consultants, this could not take the place of nor fulfill the intent of the environmental screening & review process specified by the IEE. (The situation appeared to result from a misunderstanding regarding Wes Fisher's July recommendations.)

These early discussions were followed by:

- Two 2-hour environmental compliance briefings/discussions with RAMP staff
- Consultations with RAMP's sectoral managers regarding environmental issues and the compliance process within their project areas.

In the course of these discussions, it became clear that implementing the standard subgrant review process would result in highly repetitive environmental review reports (ERRs) for a number of similar RAMP projects (e.g., road rehabilitations) while resulting in essential identical findings, conditions and mitigation measures. The ERRs would constitute a significant burden for RAMP staff and partners.

The consultants therefore proposed to modify the usual procedure for subgrant review by creating a new screening category of projects: "moderate risk activities with specified mitigation." For such activities, no ERR would be necessary. Instead, RAMP would specify and IPs would implement "required design and mitigation measures" for these activities.

Activities proposed for inclusion in this category were: rehabilitation of rural access roads, rehabilitation of diversion structures and canals, and medium-scale construction. These activities were chosen both because they are commonly funded by RAMP and because their impacts tend to be predictable and controllable with easily specified best practices and conditions.

The consultants modified the *Environmental Review Form* to include this new approach. However, for RAMP to implement this environmental review process, it must develop "required design and mitigation measures" for these activities.

TELLUS INSTITUTE
Resource and Environmental Strategies

Attachment 1: Participant List

USAID Asia Near East Regional Course in Environmental Assessment & Environmentally Sound Design For Small-Scale Activities

Kabul, Afghanistan RAMP Office 12 - 16 December 2004

Name	Organization	Title	Mobile	E-mail
Ab. Khalid Madadi	ACTED	Plant Pathologist	070-297-337	abdulkhalid_m@yahoo.com pathology.ramp@acted.org
Eng.Ibrahim	Afghan Aid	M&E Officer	070-233-637	ibrahimsaifi@yahoo.com
Mohn. Azam	CADG	Finance assistant	070-325-505	Azamafg@hotmail.com
Eng. Abdullah	CRS	Field Engineer	079-417-173	engineer_abdullah2005@yahoo.com
Gholam Nabi Rahimi	DWC	Agronomist	070-283-427	rahimi@developmentworks.ca
Mohd. Daud	EALCCO	Admin assistant	070-280-778	calcco@aol.com asokabul@hotmail.com
Eng.Kh.Hussain Nazari	GRSP	Programe Manager	070-280-588	zeerak@brain.net.pk
Eng.Ibrahim	GRSP	Engineer	070-275-079	
Eng. M. Shafi	HAFU	R. Manager	070-280-326	hafo@psh.paknet.com.pk
Sayed Hassan	Herat Irrigation Office	Engineer	070-427-110	
Enayat Safi	ICARDA	Communication	070-201-364	enayatsafi@yahoo.com
Mohd. Karim Kashmiri	IFDC	Senior Training Coordinator	079-566-138	m_k_kashmiri@yahoo.com
A. Molakhait	IFDC	Chief Agronomist	079-566-139	amolakhait@ifdc.com
Noor Ahmad	KRA	Admin assistant	079-567-772	
Eng.Rahimi	PCI - HAFO	Training Specialist	070-209-007	
Zia ul haqzia	PEACE	Site Engineer	070-293993	
Noor Hussain	PRB	Program Manager	070-280-995	prbkabul@hotmail.com
Abdul Salim Naier	RAFA	Finance assistant	079-303-075	
A.S.Nazari	RAMP	Marketing Specialist	070-208-819	nazariA@RAMP-AF.com
Abdul Qudous	RAMP	Production Agronomist	079-025-231	aqudous@RAMP-AF.com
Abdul Qadeem Niazi	RAMP	Site inspector of Lashkargha office	075-3910673	ANIAZI@RAMP-AF.COM
Eng.M.Afzal Muhsini	RAMP	Site inspector	070-299-715	afzal_muhsini@hotmail.com Amuhsini@RAMP-AF.com
Eng.Yar Mohammad	RAMP	Engineer	079-334-856	yarmohammad@RAMP-af.com
Dr.Samin	RAMP	Prod Agronmist	079-337-656	qahars@hotmail.com
Mumtaz Ahmad	RAMP	Projects Development Specialist	070-208-784	mumtaz@RAMP-AF.com
Eng.Mehrullah	RI	Monitor Engineer	079-358-691	Mehuallah_Perdes@yahoo.com
Dr. Saboori	ROP	Development & Marketing Senior	079-40-3249	saboori_22@hotmail.com
Esakhan Andar	RSSA	Regional Manager	079-349-264	rssa_org@yahoo.com
Eng.Mohammed Saleem	STAAR	R.Manager	070-275-548	staar-kabul@yahoo.com
Jeff Rosenblum	Tellus Institute/ USAID	Environmental Training Course Instructor	+1 617-939-3824	jrosenblum@alumni.carnegiemellon.edu
Mark Stoughton	Tellus Institute/ USAID	Environmental Training Course Instructor	+1 617-266-5400	mstough@tellus.org
Wes Fisher	Tellus Institute/ USAID	Environmental Training Project Manager	+1 617-266-5400	wfisher@tellus.org
Hamidullah Akbary	UNOPS/ACC	Regional Coordinator	079-332-219	hamidullah_akbary@yahoo.com

TELLUS INSTITUTE
Resource and Environmental Strategies

Attachment 2:
AGENDA

USAID/Afghanistan RAMP Course in Environmental Impact Assessment Review and Environmentally Sound Design
Kabul, Afghanistan • 12–16 December 2004

Sunday	Mod	Session
8.30-9.30		Opening, Course Overview, Participant Introductions
9.30-10.00	1	Why Assess Environmental Impacts?
10.00-10.30	1	Introduction to environmentally sound design
		BREAK
10.45-11.30	1	Basic Concepts for Assessing Environmental Impacts
11.30-12.15	2	Environmental Review Procedures for RAMP activities
		LUNCH
1.15-2.00	HO	Environmental Review Procedures for RAMP activities: screening practice
2.00-2.30	2	Writing the Environmental Review Report (ERR): overview
2.30-3.30	3	Information Requirements and Tools for Screening & Preliminary Assessment
		BREAK
3.45-4.30	HO	Writing the ERR: practice with an impact matrix

Monday	Mod	Session
8.30-9.00		Writing the ERR: practice with an impact matrix (cont'd)
9.00-10.15	4	Mitigation and monitoring
10.15-11.30	HO	Writing the ERR: practice with mitigation measures (includes **BREAK)**
11.30-12.15		The Afghanistan context
		LUNCH + sign-up for case study/field trip groups

1.15-1.45	2	The Afghanistan context (cont'd)
1.45-2.00	HO	Case study/field trip briefing
2.00-4.00	HO	Group work: preparing for the field trips (Planning for field observation and data-gathering)

Tuesday	Mod	Session
8.30--		Field trips (lunch in the field)

Wednesday	Mod	Session
8.30-8.50		Participant feedback from field trips
8.50-9.20	HO	Instructions to the Environmental Review Teams
9.20-11.20		Team Working Groups: Screening & Assessing Environmental Impacts from the Case Studies (includes **BREAK**)
11.20-12.15		Plenary: Presentation from each group & discussion
		LUNCH
1.15-1.30	HO	Instructions on Developing Mitigation and Monitoring Plans
1.30-3.30		Team Working Groups: Developing Mitigation and Monitoring Plans from the Case Studies
3.30-4.30		Plenary: Presentation from each group & discussion

Thursday	Mod	Session
8.30-9.30		Catch-up time/special topic
9.30-10.15	2	Beyond environmental review: The Full *Environmental Assessment* Study & *Programmatic Environmental Assessments*
		BREAK
10.30-11.30	HO	Special topic: Pesticides & USAID requirements
11.30-12.15		Closing & Award of Certificates
		Lunch & DEPARTURE

Attachment 3: Evaluations

COURSE EVALUATION, Kabul Afghanistan; December 12-16,	AVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
DAY 1																								
MODULE 1: Why assess environmental impacts?	**4.15**		5	4	5			3	5	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4
EXERCISE: Initial Screening using the colored cards	**4.5**		5	5	4			4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4
MODULE 2: RAMP Environmental Certification Program and Introd	**3.76**		4	4	3	5		4	4	5	5	4	3	2	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	3
MODULE 3: Environmental Assessment Techniques	**3.95**		4	4	5	4		3	5	4	5	5	3	4	3	5	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	3
DAY 2																								
MODULE 4: Writing Mitigation and Monitoring Plans	**4.33**		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4		4	3	5	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	4
DAY 3: CASE SITE FIELD TRIP																								
Please evaluate the overall value of the case site field trip	**4**		3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
Please evaluate the quality of the logistics for the trip	**3.62**		3	4	5	2	5	4	4	4	4	4	3		3	4	2	2	2	5	5	4	5	2
DAY 4: GROUP WORK EXERCISE: PRACTICE WRITING ERR																								
Please evaluate the overall value of the work group exercise	**4.18**		4	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Please evaluate the value of the group presentations	**3.91**		4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
DAY 5																								
Please evaluate the value of the additional session (A: USAID & Pesticides,		4	5	4	2	4	4	5	3	5	5	4	3	4	4	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	3	
OTHER																								
Rate the overall quality of the instructors	**4.48**		4	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
Rate the quality of the course materials/CD provided	**4.5**		4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
How appropriate was the level of the course for the participants	**4.16**		5	3	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4
Rate the quality of the venue (conference room, planning, food)	**4.05**		3	4	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
OVERALL																								
RATE THE OVERALL VALUE OF THE COURSE	**4.37**	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4

What were the three most valuable lessons you learned from the course?

- Case study, ERR
- Environmental Certificate Program, Introduction to ERR, Env. Assessment techniques, writing mitigation and monitoring plans
- ERR, screening, understanding
- Evaluate project for environmental impacts, both beneficial and adverse impact; mitigation and monitoring for environmental impacts; finally preparing the ERR
- Understanding; screening; preliminary assessment
- Importance of environment was signified; the process to tackle the environmental issue; the practice of how to tackle the environment
- Agricultural programs; construction canal system; writing the proposal
- Mitigation and monitoring section
- Assess environmental Impact; mitigation and monitoring plan; environmental review report
- Overview of environmental assessment; ERR process; assessing environmental impacts; mitigation and monitoring plans
- Preparation of proposal; identification of the first priority; familiarity with RAMP priority and procedure
- The course was useful to breakup our mind regarding the previous information plus new ones
- Environmental impact; EIR; and recommended determination
- How to find the adverse impacts and benefits of impact of all projects for the environment; How to mitigate the adverse impact caused by our projects to the Environment; and finally how to write an ERR form and submit to the donor after doing the recommended determination
- The three most valuable lessons were good and I understood.
- Overview of Environmental Assessment; the ERR process; assessing environmental impact

- Overview of environmental assessment; the environmental review process; assessing environmental impact
- Overview of environmental assessment; ERR process; mitigation and monitoring procedure
- How to screen; mitigation and monitoring
- We became familiar with how to prepare ERR, EIA, and ESD reports
- Lessons of environmental assessment.
- ERR; writing mitigation and monitoring plans
- How to screen; mitigation and monitoring

What did you like MOST about the course?

- Writing Environmental impact report
- Provide excellent lecture by trainers; open discussion; exchange of information; good service
- This 5-day workshop was very useful and valuable for the participants for the project assessment and application. We as course participants learned several useful things which were not known about.
- About ERR. I could understand how to prepare ERR report for the project.
- Environmental impact of different projects. I learned almost qualifying myself in writing proposals. Thinking of direct and adverse impact of projects in different areas of environmental conditions.
- Classification of assessment was interesting.
- I liked very much the lectures and subject of the course
- Monitoring of the project is needed
- Mitigation and monitoring; recommended determination
- EIA
- Brainstorming of the participants
- The course has a new up-to-date information which is very useful and will have a good impact on our future proposals
- Mitigation and monitoring is very important. Because we should have to know about the undesirable impacts of projects
- What I liked most about this course was to learn the whole phase I and II.
- I like the writing of the ERR, EIA
- Teaching of instructors; teamwork and discussions regarding the issue; site visit
- Teaching was so good; The site visit was good.
- Teaching; group working; field trip
- ERR writing
- The environmental impact assessment because it is very important for the project implementation
- The course subjects are new for me but I learned it.
- To know about RAMP plans (most of environmental developments)
- ERR writing; field trip was good

What could have been improved in the course?

- All the topics and presentations were good.
- The time was too short; Not every single environmental issue was addressed (e.g., scoping detailed environmental report)
- Provide very clear readable booklet; vehicle facilities for participants (transportation)
- The workshop days should extend and the daily schedule should be shorter
- The course was perfectly given and we would like the course instructors to have the best future
- The topics and presentations were good.
- The course would have been more effective and if you could provide each topic in explanation and use more examples
- Our field trip visit of projects especially the agriculture project in ACTED was after their implementation. It might have been better to have the visit during earlier stages.
- It could have been improved good idea. The agriculture and construction canal system.
- The second part is needed to explain.
- Showing some slides

- Special new methods and techniques about our own subjects.
- Some participants from Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation
- With practicing I think is very important and at the end if you say for everybody to choose a project and write a whole ERR and EIA individually and at the end of the course if you write down the most important point on a piece of paper with the description will be better.
- Extending of time in days; providing course in natural languages; lectures of the course should be translated by the national staff for better understanding
- Extending of time in days; providing course in natural languages; lectures of the course should be translated by the national staff for better understanding
- Extending of time in days; providing course in natural languages; lectures of the course should be translated by the national staff for better understanding

Please provide any other comments you might have:

- A more detailed version of this course would have been more useful by expanding the period from one week to two weeks
- Please continue such workshops for others
- Wish both instructors success in the future
- It is a strong feeling of USAID about the environment of Afghanistan, an I am as one of Afghan highly appreciative of this feeling. I suggest to USAID to be very careful of the environment.
- I would like to present my outstanding appreciation to both instructors.
- The workshop was conducted in the best possible manner. The workshop caused a greater and better awareness of environmental problems and this is good because we have to avoid them before we have such problems.
- This course is very good.
- We need the second phase of this course as also
- We may need more training and practical field work
- The topic was very large skills but the time was very short. Absolutely the training was very fruitful for us through this training we shared our ideas and learned through this course engineering and agriculture site can work together can give help to others.
- We hope that in the future RAMP office facilitate through donor partners for arranging such workshop. The workshop plays an outstanding role just in brush up in memories of participants by providing precious information.
- Thank you USAID, RAMP, and especially the instructors. If possible in the near future to provide the same workshop just for phase II for full EIA just for the participants of this workshop, thus I will thank a lot.
- This was a good chance for me to take part in the workshop, I am happy and proud. I got a lot of information about projects before design, implementation, operation, and maintenance. Thanks to the sponsor of the workshop and course instructors. I wish to the course instructors all the joy that they can wish.
- Providing transport for training staff or trainee; attention to stationary; extending the days of the course.
- Provide transport for training staff and trainees
- A common monitoring forms for monitoring the projects. If it is possible for capacity building the partner needs to have more training course which will conducting by donor especially RAMP the training should be on different aspects. The time was a little short for this course.
- This was a good workshop for out knowledge about environmental assessment. I think this we need it because now we live in very progressive process of the works we should learn it. I am very glad for that I learned all options of environmental assessment and environmentally sound design. I say thank you to RAMP for organizing this workshop.
- If every donor agency provided this kind of courses to the implementing partners or our own proposals that will solve every problems in the country and will give a new life to programmed in different areas.

Case Site Instructions

USAID/Afghanistan RAMP Course in Environmental Assessment and Environmentally Sound Design
Kabul, Afghanistan • 12–16 December 2004

1. Logistics

On Tuesday 14 December, we will take a field trip to visit case sites in Parwam province. All sites are close to the main North-South highway.

- There will be two vehicles. One vehicle will take the two groups seeing infrastructure sites. One vehicle will take two groups seeing agriculture sites.
- Please wear clothes and shoes for the field
- Reporting time is 8.15 AM
- We will be back in Kabul by or before 5pm.
- Lunch will be provided.

2. Instructions

A. Advance preparation. (Monday 13 Dec)

We have a two-hour session on Monday afternoon for *site visit preparation.*

Participants will work in their *case site groups.* The group must organize. Someone must take notes. Someone must speak for the group.

For each activity they will see, each group should:

- *Identify* the most important environmental impacts (adverse and beneficial) the activity is likely to cause (Make a "top 10" list). Identify the design or operating problems that could contribute to these impacts.
- *Identify* the elements of the *baseline situation* that must be described in the environmental review report. (Remember, focus on issues that are relevant to the potential impacts.)
- *Make an empty* IMPACT MATRIX. This will help you make an observation plan for the field.
- *Identify* the mitigation and monitoring actions typically needed for the activity.
- *Make an observation plan* to gather the information you need to:
  Describe the baseline situation, describe impacts, describe mitigation measures.

  Decide who will:
  – Draw a map.

– Make different baseline observations regarding:
land use, geography, economic activity, etc.
– Describe the activity itself.
Everyone should have an assignment.

Please refer to: the *Small-scale guidelines* for information about impacts and mitigation measures. Refer to checklists and other tools in *Module 3*.

Warning: Time is very short! You must organize quickly!

B. During the case site visits (Tuesday 14 Dec)

Implement your observation plan! *Each person must do their assigned task.*

C. Following the case site visits (Wed 15 Dec)

The case site visits give you an understanding of the environmental issues of certain types of activities. The visit will also help you understand the *baseline situation* in the Parwam/Shamali plains area.

Environmental review should be done *before* you start an activity. It is part of the activity proposal.

Therefore, each group will receive a short activity proposal. The proposal will be very similar to the types of activity observed during the case site visits.

Each group will work together and complete an *environmental review form* and a draft *environmental review report* based on the proposal. The facilitators will help each group.

Note: The groups will not write a complete environmental review report. They will write bullet points or a detailed outline for the report.

The day is divided into two parts. At the end of each part, each group presents their results to the other groups.

Part 1: Screening, baseline situation and impact assessment

This part covers step 1–step 5d of the Environmental Review Form:

Step	Summary
1	Give basic information about the activity
2	List all activities included in the proposal
3	Screen activities.
4	Determine which activities must be covered in the environmental review report
5	Begin the environmental review report 5a: summarize proposal→ JUSTIFY the proposal 5b: describe activities→ DO NOT DO THIS. It is already done for you! 5c: describe environmental situation 5d: assess impacts (make impact matrix or failure table. Then summarize key results for Env Review Report)

Please be efficient! Time will be very limited.

Part 2: Mitigation and Monitoring & Recommended Determinations

This part covers step 5e–step 8 of the Environmental Review Form

Step	Summary
5	5e: make mitigation and monitoring plan (be sure to match mitigation measures to impacts) 5f: identify additional information to include with the ERR.
6	Make a *recommended determination* for each activity.
7	Check appropriate box that summarizes your recommendations.
8	Sign your form

3. Case descriptions

A. Case #1. Infrastructure for agriculture.

This group will see ACTED and RAFA activities in progress. Specifically, the activities are:

- Construction of diversion structures on the Salang River (replacing existing locally constructed structures). Participant will have the opportunity to see both work-in-progress and an old diversion structure that has not been rehabilitated.
- Cleaning and widening of irrigation canals.
- Rehabilitation of canal-side roads. Participants will have the opportunity to talk to farmers and rural community members.

Irrigation infrastructure: needs & issues. In most of Afghanistan, agricultural production depends on community irrigation systems. Agricultural production is essential to: food security, household incomes and welfare, and rural economic development.

In general, irrigation systems are in poor repair due to the conflict. The conflict disrupted community maintenance of irrigation systems. Outside capital and expertise is required to restore systems and expand cultivation to at least pre-war levels. On the Shamali plains, many areas previously under irrigation currently have no available water. The problem is worse because of the long drought.

Reconstruction of irrigation systems is intended to have substantial social & economic benefits.

However, this work can also have adverse impacts that threaten the success of the project. Careful design and other mitigation are required to make sure that these impacts do not occur.

Some of these impacts are listed below:

Poorly designed/constructed diversion structures can fail. This failure can:

- Ruin the crop in mid-season
- Result in erosion that threatens nearby homes and structures

Newly cleaned and widened irrigation canals can take too much water, depriving downstream users & causing conflict between communities

Increased flow can destroy downstream control structures causing uncontrolled flooding

Construction operations can cause siltation and pollution of water used for domestic use downstream.

Construction work can interrupt the flow of water, causing economic hardship to the community

Expansion of irrigation with contaminated water can increase incidence of water-borne disease

Market access roads: needs and issues. Canals and diversion structures are not the only infrastructure required for agricultural production. Farmers must be able to deliver crops to market (and transport

agricultural inputs to their fields). Poor roads decrease profits, and also prevent access to education and health care, which are usually located in towns.

Construction and rehabilitation of market access roads is intended to have substantial social and economic benefits.

However, this work can also have adverse impacts that threaten the success of the project. Careful design and other mitigation is required to make sure that these impacts do not occur.

Some of these impacts are listed below:

Poorly designed/constructed roads can increase erosion , ruining adjacent fields (and also making the road worthless)

Roads often run parallel to canals. In this situation, road construction can: Silt canals; destroy canal walls; interfere with the flow of water in secondary canals (especially during construction of culverts, etc.).

Road construction can destroy or reduce the size of adjacent fields.

Improved roads near canals can promote contamination of irrigation water. (For example water can be used for car-washing, etc.)

B. Case #2. Agricultural techniques & inputs.

The group will see DWC and/or ACTED agriculture activities in progress. Specifically, the activities are:

- Agricultural demonstration/nursery plots. Used to promote new cultivation techniques).
- Warehouse storage for agricultural inputs
- Agricultural processing factory (for dehydration) currently in construction
- In addition, participants should observe EXISTING AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE in the area. This is an important part of the baseline situation.

Agricultural techniques and inputs: needs and issues. Strengthening the Afghanistan agricultural sector requires infrastructure (see above) *and also*

- Increased availability of high-quality inputs (seed, nursery stock, fertilizers, pesticides),
- Higher-productivity cultivation techniques
- development of agricultural processing and storage

Increased availability/promotion of inputs and techniques, as well as the development of agricultural processing facilities is intended to have a number of social and economic benefits.

However, these activities can also have adverse impacts that threaten the success of the project, or which cause adverse impacts on local communities and farming families. Careful design and other mitigation are required to make sure that these impacts do not occur.

Some of these impacts are listed below:

Wastes & waste water from agricultural processing can contaminate water supplies and create breeding conditions for vermin & disease

Expansion of cultivation driven by development of agricultural processing can lead to water use conflicts & over-reliance on a single crop.

Introduction of new crops can deplete soils, create vulnerability to pests, or create high reliance on chemical inputs.

Promotion of pesticides can result in acute and cumulative toxic exposures, including contamination of ground water.

Proposals for environmental review based on the field visits

USAID/Afghanistan RAMP Course in Environmental Impact Assessment Review and Environmentally Sound Design
Kabul, Afghanistan • 12–16 December 2004

Infrastructure Proposal #1: Rehabilitation of diversion structures on the Salang River

This project is intended to improve agricultural productivity and expand land currently under irrigation in Shamali/Parwam. It will accomplish this by improving supply to the Shamali Plains irrigation systems supplied by the Salang River. Specifically, the project will.

- replace three traditional diversion structures on the Salang River with modern structures. This replacement is intended to
  (1) reduce the impact of low water in the Salang on flow in the irrigation system
  (2) reduce demands on farmer communal labor, as the diversion structure will not need to be rebuilt every season
  (3) put the necessary water diversion structure in place for a future powerplant rehabilitation
- replace the first 50-100 hundred meters of each diversion canal with a modern structure
- survey irrigation water usage and the condition of primary and secondary canals fed by these Salang River diversions. This is in preparation for a 2nd-phase project to improve the distribution system.

The project will require interrupting water supply to the 3 primary canals at different times during construction.

The sites for the construction are the sites visited yesterday.

Infrastructure Proposal #2: Enhanced distribution of irrigation water and improved market access

This project is intended to contribute to improve farmer income by improving distribution of irrigation water on approximately 700 Ha of irrigation in the area south of Charikar town and improving market access in this area. Specifically, the project will:

- Rehabilitate 18 km earthen primary canals. This will include removing sediments and regularizing the width of the canal to 4m (from the current width of 2-5 m.)
- Rehabilitate 12 km of canal-side access road. This will include widening the road to the extent feasible, rebuilding culverts, and surfacing with laterite or suitable surfacing material.

- evaluate reduced-water irrigation techniques and crop varieties on demonstration plots of ~0.5 Ha. This is intended to support a second phase project to maximize efficiency of water use.
- Provide canal maintenance tools to irrigation associations.

While the canals carry irrigation water, a primary canal passes through Charikar town and is used for domestic purposes.

The sites for the activities are the sites visited yesterday.

The road is adjacent to both a primary canal and a secondary canal network feeding the fields immediately adjacent to the road. This secondary network crosses under the road in culverts, many of which are broken. Road repair work will require interrupting this secondary system at different times.

Agricultural Proposal #1
Dehydration facility

The project is intended to increase farmer incomes by providing a reliable market for their goods insulated from seasonal "glut" pricing. The project will accomplish this by creating an agricultural processing business purchasing vegetables on advance contracts from area farmers/farm cooperatives. The project sponsor will operate the business on a for-profit basis.

Specifically, the project will:

- Construct and operate a dehydration facility capable of processing 15tons vegetable/24 hr period.
- Conduct outreach to farmers/cooperatives to obtain contracts (supply commitments)
- Provide inputs (seed, fertilizer) in at least the first year for farmers under contract.
- Experiment with new crop varieties on demonstration plots of 0.5 Ha or less.

The dehydration facility is on the road-side and no new access road construction is needed. A deep well is being drilled to provide process water.

To avoid over-supply or under-supply of particular vegetables, advance contracts are made on a crop-specific basis. The processing business will employ crop selection specialists.