



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# Training, Technical Assistance, and Capacity Building in the Asia and Near East Region



## FINAL REPORT December 2005

Prepared in accordance with the requirements of  
Contract RAN-E-00-04-00046-00  
Task Order RAN-M-00-04-00047-00

## **FINAL REPORT**

Prepared in accordance with the requirements of  
Contract RAN-E-00-04-00046-00  
Task Order RAN-M-00-04-00047-00

Prepared for

Dr John Wilson  
Cognizant Technical Officer, ANE/TS  
U.S. Agency for International Development  
Washington, D.C.

Prepared by

The Cadmus Group, Inc.  
57 Water Street  
Watertown, Massachusetts 02472

December 2005

# CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>MEO TRAINING COURSES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND DESIGN OF SMALL-SCALE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>AFGHANISTAN MANDATORY ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>REGIONAL COURSE: INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT AND PESTICIDES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>EAST TIMOR INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>TECHNICAL CHANGES TO THE ANE ENVIRONMENT WEBSITE .....</b>	<b>3</b>

## ANNEXURES

**BANGKOK MEO COURSE REPORT**

**CAIRO MEO COURSE REPORT**

**ACEH ESD COURSE REPORT**

**AFGHANISTAN DRAFT STATEMENT OF WORK**

**JORDAN REGIONAL IPM AND PESTICIDES COURSE REPORT**

**EAST TIMOR IEE DOCUMENTS**

**TECHNICAL CHANGES TO THE ANE ENVIRONMENT WEBSITE**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This report summarizes major accomplishments of task order RAN-M-00-04-00047-00, issued under contract number RAN-E-00-04-00046-00. The aim of this task order was to provide technical assistance and training to support implementation of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) environmental regulations (22 CFR 216) and build capacity for environmentally sound design of USAID programs in the Asia and Near East (ANE) Region.

In what follows, we present activities and accomplishments in chronological order. Details of each activity or accomplishment are provided in annexures.

### **MEO Training Courses Bangkok and Cairo, February 2005**

Two training courses were conducted in February 2005, as part of the ANE Bureau's response to the challenge of improving compliance with federally mandated environmental regulations, agency and bureau environmental policy, and environmentally sound design. The first course was held in Bangkok from February 8<sup>th</sup> to February 10<sup>th</sup>; the second in Cairo, from February 14<sup>th</sup> to February 17<sup>th</sup>.

The Cadmus Group provided trainers and training materials development services. The course in Bangkok was attended by 19 participants and received an overall ranking of 4 on a scale of 1 to 5. The course in Cairo was attended by 25 participants and received an overall ranking of 4.6. For details on each of these courses, please see the accompanying course summaries.

### **Environmentally Sound Design of Small-Scale Activities: A training course in practical concepts and skills for Aceh reconstruction Indonesia, June 2005**

On 28 and 29 June 2005, an Environmentally Sound Design (ESD) training was held in Banda Aceh for organizations involved in Aceh reconstruction. On June 30, an additional half-day training for USAID partners only was held regarding USAID environmental procedures.

There are a large number of organizations undertaking post-tsunami infrastructure reconstruction projects in Aceh, Indonesia. Housing and water and sanitation projects are the main infrastructure priorities. USAID/Indonesia believes that although the development organizations involved in the water and sanitation and housing sectors are capable and motivated, capacity-building is required to better equip these organizations with the technical and conceptual skills to understand the long-term environmental

consequences of their activities, and to proactively incorporate environmentally sound design (ESD) measures in their work.

With the agreement of USAID/ANE, The Cadmus Group undertook development of the training curriculum and materials for a 2-day ESD course, with an additional half-day training on USAID environmental procedures for USAID partners. The Cadmus Group's USAID/ANE contract covered trainer LOE for materials preparation and course delivery, travel costs, and transport for the field visits.

The training was sponsored by USAID/Indonesia and USAID's Bureau for Asia and the Near East, and hosted by BAPEDALDA Propinsi NAD (the Aceh provincial environment agency). The Cadmus Group provided trainers and training materials development services. The USAID/Indonesia Environmental Services Program provided organization and logistics support in Banda Aceh. For details, please see the accompanying final report.

### **Afghanistan Mandatory Environmental Documentation August 2005**

USAID/Afghanistan is undertaking programs/projects involving various sectors, including power and other energy resources, roads, dams, irrigation canals, agriculture, construction of schools and clinics, vertical structures and other major infrastructure with potentially adverse impacts on the environment.

A number of projects will require full Environmental Assessments (EAs). Others will require Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) or lower level environmental reviews. Environmental documentation must also be completed for all upcoming projects in the portfolio. USAID/Afghanistan is considering awarding a contract to a team of environmental impact assessment experts for assistance with environmental documentation. USAID/Afghanistan is also interested in procuring training for Cognizant Technical Officers, project design and implementation officials, and a select group of implementing partners from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and local partners.

The Cadmus Group drafted a Statement of Work to assist USAID/Afghanistan with this procurement. For details, please see the accompanying draft Statement of Work.

### **Regional Course: Integrated Pest Management and Pesticides September 2005**

From September 26–30, a training course was held at the Dead Sea in Jordan. Training topics included integrated pest management, integrated management of vectors of human and animal diseases, pesticide hazards, safety measures, toxicology, environmental fate for pesticides, the regulation and disposal of pesticides and Pesticide Evaluation Reports and Safer Use Action Plans (PERSUAPs). The course was attended by 28 participants, who received instruction from 11 lecturers. Course activities included group exercises and field visits. For details, please see the accompanying course report.

About 95 percent of course expectations as expressed on the first day of training were fulfilled. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 for the highest score, the course received a ranking of 3.8 for both overall quality of content and the extent to which the course improved participants' understanding of environmental assessment. For scheduling and organization the overall response was 4.5; for logistics and venue the response was 4.3, and for content of participants' sourcebook the response was 4.3.

### **East Timor Initial Environmental Examination September–October 2005**

The Cadmus Group drafted an Initial Environmental Examination review of USAID/East Timor's Accelerated Economic Growth Strategic Objective (SO1). SO1 is intended to reduce several critical, interrelated impediments to sustained economic growth. This IEE addressed all activities within the East Timor SO1 program, except for the Timor Economic Rehabilitation and Development Project (TERADP), which was operating under its own IEE. As such, this IEE addressed activities initiated prior to the current (2005–2009) country strategic plan. These activities had, until then, operated without clearance under 22 CFR 216.

The IEE also addressed the East Timor Small Grants Program, which supports the programs of all USAID/East Timor Strategic Objectives. The Small Grants Program also predated the current country strategic plan.

For details, please see the accompanying IEE document.

### **Technical Changes to the ANE Environment website July–December 2005**

In response to changes in administrative responsibilities at USAID/ANE, The Cadmus Group was requested to assist with improvements to and maintenance of the ANE Environment website ([www.ane-environment.net](http://www.ane-environment.net)). Several tasks were undertaken, which are summarized below.

#### *Website conversion and additions*

Converted website from Cold Fusion to ASP.Net technology. The conversion allowed many of the pages and functionality of the site to be consolidated into single pages, reducing code duplication and making site administration and editing much more efficient. These changes were made in tandem with major changes to the database structure.

#### *Database conversion and normalization*

The existing database was converted to SQL Server format, normalized to improve data integrity. Also, the editing process was streamlined. For example, instead of typing in the names of countries, and program types for each record, a list of countries, program types, is maintained in the database and each record is associated with items from the list. This

process helps avoid duplicates, misspelled entries, etc. It also helps maintain the accuracy of searches from the search page.

#### *Administration page*

A password-protected administration page was created that allows an administrator to add and edit activity records, upload documents, and maintain the lists of countries, program types, etc. When the changes are reviewed and approved as ready for deployment, the changes are quickly deployed to the live site.

#### *Additional website changes*

In addition to normalizing the information about activity records, a new system of storing information about documents associated with activity records was created. For example, rather than being limited to PDF and Word formats, other file formats can be added as well. The same is true for document types: new types can be added in addition to the previously existing ETD and IEE types. The search functionality was changed to allow a search on any of the criteria from the same page, instead of being limited to one search criteria at a time.

#### *Site Modifications*

Bureau Environmental Officers tracker information, received from Barney Popkin and Julie Fossler, was uploaded into the database system and deployed to the live site. All corresponding documents (Initial Environmental Examination, Environmental Threshold Decision, etc.) were also uploaded.

#### *Training Page Modifications*

The training page was rearranged so that more recent course information appears at the top of the page. Africa Bureau-related materials were moved toward the bottom of the page. A new page was created to display the PowerPoint presentations that were given during the Integrated Pest Management and Safer Pesticide Use training that took place in Jordan on September 25-28, 2005.

#### *Other Issues Addressed*

A temporary Web site was created to address problems (now solved) that were encountered at the time by USAID representatives on temporary duty in Afghanistan. Access to BEO information and related documents were made available through this Web site at <http://www.cadmusdev.com/ANEDocs/Barney/>.

For more details on each of these tasks, please see the accompanying report on Technical Changes to the ANE Environment web site.

## SUMMARY

### USAID Asia and Near East Region Mission Environmental Officers and Mission Staff Course Environmental Compliance Procedures and Environmentally Sound Design Bangkok, February 8–10, 2005

Prepared by The Cadmus Group, Inc.

---

This document summarizes the results of a course provided to Mission Environmental Officers and Mission Staff in Bangkok, Thailand, 8–10 February, 2005, by The Cadmus Group, Inc. The course was part of the Bureau's response to the challenge of improving compliance with federally mandated environmental regulations, agency and bureau environmental policy, and environmentally sound design. USAID's mandatory environmental procedures (as codified in 22 CFR 216, or "Reg 216") provide a systematic way to avoid environmental failures in USAID-supported development interventions.

#### Course Objectives

The aim of the Bangkok course was to advance the capacity of Mission staff to:

- Design and implement environmentally sound activities to improve program and project sustainability.
- Assess reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts. Mitigate and monitor to minimize adverse impacts and potential design errors.
- Review how USAID procedures are to be applied in the context of evolving local policies and needs in environmental impact assessment (EIA) and environmentally sound design and management.
- Address the question: "How can environmentally sound design processes be strengthened within our Missions and the Agency?"
- Provide an opportunity to discuss capacity building approaches.
- Review new approaches to knowledge management and their potential application to Agency and Mission responsibilities to promote environmentally sound design.

#### Participants and Facilitators

Participants included Mission Environmental Officers, Strategic Objective Team Members, Cognizant Technical Officers (CTOs), and other USAID staff. The 19 participants represented Missions in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, East Timor, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, and Thailand. Also present was a representative from the Jordanian Ministry of the Environment. A list of participants accompanies this report.

Jim Hester, Agency Environmental Coordinator, delivered introductory remarks and the closing and John Wilson, Bureau Environmental Officer, offered a Bureau-wide view of course objectives. Principal trainers included Wes Fisher, from The Cadmus Group, Inc., and Jim Hester.

The DAA for the Asia Near & Near East Bureau, Mark Ward, also spoke to the group on the second day of the course (Wednesday, February 9<sup>th</sup>) outlining the Agency's increased emphasis on infrastructure development and the role Mission staff need to play in ensuring adherence to USAID environmental procedures for environmental and economically sound design. He also highlighted his role and the Agency's approach to the Tsunami relief and reconstruction effort.

Special appreciation goes to Winston Bowman and his office who took on the responsibility for hosting the course and to both Winston and Saengroaj Srisawasdraisorn for providing key logistical support. Winston also generously organized a special course reception for the participants at his residence.

Barney Popkin, USAID/ANE/TS Environmental Protection Specialist took on the responsibility for communicating with the Missions to identify participants, and then to ensure their travel and logistics needs with the hotel were addressed, an effort critical to the success of the course. Tim Resch of ANE/TS was also involved in helping garner Mission interest in sending representatives to the course.

### **Course Methodology**

Agency Environmental Coordinator Jim Hester set the tone by emphasizing how environmental impact assessment is the key to state-of-the-art development. Over the next three days, facilitators and participants together explored ways to strengthen USAID program performance by using environmental procedures in conjunction with environmental best management practices.

Through presentations, case studies, and group exercises participants learned how to review Initial Environmental Examinations, and implement Mitigation and Monitoring Plans (Environmental Management Action Plans). Participants were also introduced to special environmental topics. These included pesticides and integrated pest management, public-private partnerships, and biosafety. Special attention was given to ways to enhance the environmental and economic sustainability of USAID programs.

Roles and responsibilities as outlined in the Automated Directive System (ADS), especially ADS 201 and ADS 204 were discussed. Participants were encouraged to share experiences with their peers. Segments of certain modules were also used to elicit ideas regarding ways to improve the implementation of USAID procedures pertaining environmental impact analysis. These are summarized in *Participant Recommendations on How to More Effectively Apply USAID Environmental Procedures to USAID-Supported Projects and Programs*, which accompanies this report.

### **Course Evaluation**

Out of a total evaluation ranking (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 for the highest score), the course received an overall ranking of 4 for "How would you assess the overall quality of the course content?" and 4.1 for "Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment."

### **General Comments**

Sixteen participants provided written comments along with their quantitative response to the first question. Several expressed general appreciation:

"Very relevant"

"Presence and presentations of the AEC and the BEO added a lot of value to the course."

"[I]t was good as all participants were given opportunity to frequently ask questions and clarifications."

"The Source Book and EPTM are excellent reference documents. These help locate the Reg 216 related queries. Revisiting the key fundamental environmental compliance procedures [is] tremendously useful."

### ***Areas for Improvement***

Several participants (ten) provided comments that suggest general or specific areas for improvement. For example:

“The course was comprehensive and provided enormous amounts of useful information, especially reference and contract information. It would have been helpful to have actually prepared an IEE in the workshop or at least engaged in developing mitigation options.”

“Instead of going over the IEE format in great detail, spend more time using existing IEE samples.”

“There should be more in-depth discussions of topics directly affecting Missions. Presentations could be made more interesting; there should be some activities to wake people up.”

### ***Improvements Reported by Participants***

When asked to comment on the extent to which the course improved their understanding of environmental assessment, fifteen participants responded with written comments. A majority (10) described discernible improvements resulting from the course. For example:

“Now I know what I should be looking for to ensure environmental compliance in the activities I manage.”

“Improved my understanding tremendously.”

“Before taking this course, I knew Reg 216 but my understanding was ‘zero’. Now I’m ready to start [with] my responsibility and role as MEO.”

“As a non-MEO, my baseline was low and I had a lot to learn. I feel this has been a god introduction to work I’m sure will be increasingly important to the Agency (as concern for environment grows).”

### ***Enhanced environmental review capacity***

Fourteen participants provided written comments on the extent to which they felt prepared, as a result of the course, to undertake or assist in the preparation of an environmental review. Their responses to this question varied according to their prior experience and their current responsibilities. Examples include:

“I have been doing it for a number of years – still I have benefited a lot.”

“I feel confident I can now handle an environmental review.”

“I have a good base and know where to go if I need help.”

“Now I feel I am capable of taking responsibility of a Environmental Officer.”

“I’m not 100% prepared but I’ll do my best and ready to assist in the preparation of an Environmental Review.”

## **ANE/TS Support Services Task Order**

This course was supported through core funds and technical assistance under the USAID Asia and Near East Bureau Office of Technical Support (ANE/TS) Support Services Task Order. For more information on services available through this Task Order, please contact Barney Popkin (202-712-1063) or John Wilson (202-712-4633).

## **SUMMARY**

### **USAID Asia and Near East Region Mission Environmental Officers and Mission Staff Course Environmental Compliance Procedures and Environmentally Sound Design**

**Cairo, February 14–17, 2005**

Prepared by The Cadmus Group, Inc.

---

This document summarizes the results of a course offered to Mission Environmental Officers and Mission Staff in Cairo, Egypt, February 14–17, 2005, by The Cadmus Group, Inc. The course was part of the Bureau's response to the challenge of improving compliance with federally mandated environmental regulations, agency and bureau environmental policy, and environmentally sound design. USAID's mandatory environmental procedures (as codified in 22 CFR 216, or "Reg 216") provide a systematic way to avoid environmental failures in USAID-supported development interventions.

#### **Course Objectives**

The aim of the Cairo course was to advance the capacity of Mission staff to:

- Design and implement environmentally sound activities to improve program and project sustainability.
- Assess reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts. Mitigate and monitor to minimize adverse impacts and potential design errors.
- Review how USAID procedures are to be applied in the context of evolving local policies and needs in environmental impact assessment (EIA) and environmentally sound design and management.
- Address the question: "How can environmentally sound design processes be strengthened within our Missions and the Agency?"
- Provide an opportunity to discuss capacity building approaches.
- Review new approaches to knowledge management and their potential application to Agency and Mission responsibilities to promote environmentally sound design.

#### **Participants and Facilitators**

Participants included Mission Environmental Officers, Strategic Objective Team Members, Cognizant Technical Officers (CTOs), and other USAID staff. The 25 participants represented Missions in Bangladesh, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Malawi, West Bank/Gaza, and Yemen. Also present was a representative from the Jordanian Ministry of the Environment. A list of participants accompanies this report.

Jim Hester, Agency Environmental Coordinator, delivered introductory remarks and the closing. He also presented special modules throughout the course. Barney Popkin, USAID/ANE/TS Environmental Protection Specialist, offered a Bureau-wide view of course objectives and monitored participant performance throughout the course. He also stimulated and contributed to the development and facilitation of the group exercises, and developed and conducted a pre- and post-test of the participants' knowledge of USAID Regulation 216 processes (see course results below).

In addition, Barney took on the responsibility for communicating with the Missions to identify participants, and then to ensure their travel and logistics needs with the hotel were addressed. Tim Resch of ANE/TS was involved in helping solicit Mission interest in sending representatives to the course.

The principal trainers included Wes Fisher, from The Cadmus Group, Inc., and Jim Hester. They were assisted by Shreedhar Kanetkar, also from Cadmus. The course organizers are indebted to various members of the USAID Mission in Cairo, particularly Seifalla Hassanein, Mission Environmental Officer, and Inas Tawadrous, Administrative Assistant. Their help enriched the participants' learning experience.

### **Course Methodology**

Agency Environmental Coordinator Jim Hester set the tone by emphasizing how environmental impact assessment is the key to state-of-the-art development. Over the next three days, facilitators and participants together explored ways to strengthen USAID program performance by using environmental procedures in conjunction with environmental best management practices.

Through presentations, case studies, and group exercises participants learned how to review Initial Environmental Examinations, and implement Mitigation and Monitoring Plans (Environmental Management Action Plans). Participants were also introduced to special environmental topics. These included pesticides and integrated pest management, public-private partnerships, and biosafety. Special attention was given to ways to enhance the environmental and economic sustainability of USAID programs.

Roles and responsibilities as outlined in the Automated Directive System (ADS), especially ADS 201 and ADS 204, were discussed. Participants were encouraged to share experiences with their peers. Segments of certain modules were also used to elicit ideas regarding ways to improve the implementation of USAID procedures pertaining environmental impact analysis. These are summarized in *Participant Recommendations on How to More Effectively Apply USAID Environmental Procedures to USAID-Supported Projects and Programs*, which accompanies this report.

Several group exercises were used during the course. Participants were divided into four groups, each with between five and seven members. Each group was given a short set of open-ended case questions designed to deepen the group's understanding of topics covered in prior modules. Each case question was based on real-world examples identified by Barney Popkin and developed collaboratively by all four facilitators. During the group exercise, facilitators visited each group to monitor progress and address questions that arose as the group worked on the question. At the end of the exercise, each group reported its results to the class. Group composition and choice of rapporteur changed throughout the course, bringing a fresh perspective to each exercise and allowing participants to get to know their colleagues in a variety of settings.

### **Course Evaluation (Subjective)**

Out of a total evaluation ranking (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 for the highest score), the course received an overall ranking of 4.6 for "How would you assess the overall quality of the course content?" and 4.5 for "Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment."

### ***General Comments***

Nineteen participants provided written comments along with their quantitative response to the first question. Most (11) expressed general appreciation. A sampling follows:

“It was a great course, with a good combination of examples, case studies and presentations.”

“Excellent material, well organized. Jim Hester’s presence was extremely useful.”

“The course was very good. Good presenters and excellent resource material. Both Blue Book [Environmental Procedures Training Manual] and Source Book are good documents.”

“Very thorough course documentation. The technical expert specialists were very good – especially having Jim Hester.”

“Overall very good course. Wes has excellent knowledge of background. Presence of Jim Hester added value to the course.”

### ***Areas for Improvement***

Several participants (8) provided comments that suggest general or specific areas for improvement. For example:

“The material is very good. It could be improved by focusing more [on] the process and use one case study and apply the process.”

“[Include] more group exercises and case studies.”

“Use more field examples; reduce number of course objectives; [add an] interactive session on real life challenges.”

“Course material is excellent; however, flow of presentations did not follow up with the material in hand.”

### ***Improvements Reported by Participants***

When asked to comment on the extent to which the course improved their understanding of environmental assessment, 17 participants responded with written comments. Most (15) described discernible improvements resulting from the course. For example:

“I did not understand clearly the special rules related to pesticides and GMO. This training was helpful to clarify the intent of following Reg 216.”

“Course improved my understanding of strategic and big picture issues.”

“I now know that the Program Office should get involved in monitoring compliance to Reg 216 requirements.”

“Understood the legal implications and the different roles and responsibilities of all parties within Mission and outside.”

Two participants used this opportunity to suggest improvements to the course:

“Increasing time – field trip should be included”

“It has improved my understanding; however, I wanted some practical exercise on how to prepare an EA (actual case study).”

### ***Enhanced environmental review capacity***

Eighteen participants provided written comments on the extent to which they felt prepared, as a result of the course, to undertake or assist in the preparation of an environmental review. To some extent, their responses to this question varied according to their prior experience and their current responsibilities. However, most comments pointed to an increased level of confidence and capability. Examples include:

“I feel very prepared to conduct environmental reviews in USAID.”

“I feel I can help in writing EA in our environmental projects.”

“I feel more confident than before and if I can’t do it I know whom to go to for help.”

“I really gained a lot. The training answered many questions I had. The course material will help me to find where I should go.”

### **Course Evaluation (Objective)**

A short questionnaire developed by Barney Popkin was used to evaluate changes in subject-matter knowledge resulting from the course. The same questionnaire was administered to participants before and after the course. Results are summarized in the table below:

Questions answered correctly	Pre-test February 15, 2005	Post-test February 17, 2005
Mean	74 percent	92 percent
Range	36 – 100 percent	84 – 100 percent

The mean improvement in grades was 16 percent. Individual improvement ranged from 4 to 64 percent. No one who took the test on February 15 scored lower on February 17. Nor did anyone score the same. That is, all participants improved, except for one participant who scored 100 percent on both days.

### **ANE/TS Support Services Task Order**

This course was supported through core funds and technical assistance under the USAID Asia and Near East Bureau Office of Technical Support (ANE/TS) Support Services Task Order. For more information on services available through this Task Order, please contact Barney Popkin (202-712-1063) or John Wilson (202-712-4633).

## Consultants' Final Report Environmentally Sound Design of Small-Scale Activities: Practical concepts and skills for Aceh reconstruction

28 September 2005

### A training course held 28–30 June, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

**To:**

Suzanne Billharz, USAEP Country Officer, USAID/Indonesia  
Theresa Tuano, MEO, USAID/Indonesia

**cc:**

Wes Fisher, Principal, The Cadmus Group  
John Pontius, Chief of Party, Environmental Services Program  
Barney Popkin, USAID/ANE/TS  
John Wilson, MEO, USAID/ANE

**From:**

Dean Pallen, Consultant to the Cadmus Group  
Mark Stoughton, Senior Associate



**Attachments**

Final training presentations

---

### Overview

On 28 and 29 June 2005, an Environmentally Sound Design (ESD) training was held in Banda Aceh for organizations involved in Aceh reconstruction. On June 30, an additional half-day training for USAID partners only was held regarding USAID environmental procedures.

The training was sponsored by USAID/Indonesia and USAID's Bureau for Asia and the Near East, and hosted by BAPEDALDA Propinsi NAD (the Aceh provincial environment agency). The Cadmus Group provided trainers and training materials development services. The USAID/Indonesia Environmental Services Program provided organization and logistics support in Banda Aceh.

This report

- Explains the contributions and role of The Cadmus Group consultants in the training.
- Presents participant evaluations and the consultants' assessment of the training.
- Summarizes the environmental capacity needs and issues in Aceh observed by the consultants, and suggests possible follow-up activities for USAID.

### 1.0 Background, contractual and logistical arrangements

There are a large number of organizations undertaking post-tsunami infrastructure reconstruction projects in Aceh, Indonesia. Housing and water and sanitation projects are the two main infrastructure priorities.

USAID/Indonesia believes that although the development organizations involved in the water and sanitation and housing sectors are capable and motivated, capacity-building is required to better

equip these organizations with the technical and conceptual skills to understand the long-term environmental consequences of their activities, and to proactively incorporate environmentally sound design (ESD) measures in their work.

USAID/Indonesia therefore contacted the Capacity for Impact Assessment and Management (CIAM) Program of The Cadmus Group, a Boston-based environmental consultancy. The Cadmus Group holds an environmental technical assistance contract with USAID/ANE. A primary purpose of the contract is to provide environmental technical assistance and training to USAID programs in the ANE region.

With the agreement of USAID/ANE, The Cadmus Group undertook development of the training curriculum and materials for a 2-day ESD course, with an additional half-day training on USAID environmental procedures for USAID partners. The Cadmus Group's USAID/ANE contract covered trainer LOE for materials preparation and course delivery, travel costs, and transport for the field visits.

Mark Stoughton was the task manager for The Cadmus Group, and lead trainer for USAID procedures. Dean Pallen, consultant to The Cadmus Group, was lead trainer for the 2-day ESD workshop.

Local logistics and field survey support were provided by the recently opened Banda Aceh office of the Environmental Services Program (ESP). ESP is a USAID/Indonesia-funded project to expand access to clean water and to improve watershed management. The venue was provided by BAPEDALDA Propinsi NAD (the Aceh Provincial Environment Agency).

## 2.0 Summary of tasks

The Cadmus Group undertook four general activities to support workshop development, delivery, and follow-up:

### 1. Development of curriculum & core materials.

An initial conference call was held on 19 May 2005 between Mark Stoughton, Suzanne Billharz and John Pontius. The call outlined the basic objectives of the course, and established the 2+0.5-day program.

Stoughton and Pallen collaborated to develop a draft training outline, which was provided for comment to USAID/Indonesia and ESP. Based on the outline, Stoughton and Pallen developed the basic course materials (PowerPoint presentations), which were finalized early during the advance field visit (see below).<sup>1</sup>

The ESD training program is summarized in Section 3, below.

### 2. Advance field visit.

With the support of ESP, Dean Pallen conducted a field visit the week prior to the training workshop. One primary purpose of this field visit was to identify appropriate locations for training exercises.

Under normal circumstances, identifying training field sites is not a difficult task. Even a vacant space can be very instructive and well-suited to a range of training exercises. However, the conditions in Aceh are unique. Repeated visits were required before it was understood where and how the training exercises could be conducted.

The difficulty in finding suitable training sites reflected the larger challenge of assuring that the training was responsive to the conditions in Aceh, where the environmental challenges now facing its people include the total destruction of local vegetation in some

---

<sup>1</sup> The Cadmus Group offers a 5-day Environmental Assessment and ESD training course for USAID staff and partners. The 2-day Aceh training (1 classroom & 1 field day) required a completely new training agenda and set of training materials. The key challenges in developing the Aceh training program were to (A) teach essential ESD tools and concepts relevant to Aceh while (B) avoiding teaching formal environmental impact assessment procedures and associated technical vocabulary.

areas, an altered shoreline, a distorted water table, and contaminated standing water.<sup>2</sup> Reconstruction and resettlement activities must contend with extensive and often hazardous debris fields.

A second primary purpose of the field visit was to ensure that the training material (not just the field exercises) was suitable given the unique field conditions in Aceh. Towards this end, Mr. Pallen met with representatives or staff of the International Organization of Migration, Habitat for Humanity, International Relief and Development, Concern International, and local USAID staff to discuss environmental issues relevant to their mandates.<sup>3</sup>

3. **Training delivery.** (see Sections 3.0 & 4.0)
4. **Development and submission of this report.**

### **3.0 Summary of the ESD training program.**

#### **Morning, Day 1.**

The first morning provided the participants with a basic grounding in the two key component concepts of ESD:

- “*environmental best practices*” whereby the best available knowledge and technologies are employed while not compromising the economic viability of an activity, and
- “*environmental review*”, the practice of assessing field conditions against the possible impacts of an activity and then identifying appropriate measures to reduce or avoid these impacts.

Insofar as possible, the training focused not on best practice and environmental review in the abstract, but on how these concepts can apply practically in Aceh. Group exercises were a key tool for linking concept to application. (For example, the participants developed their own criteria for environmental best practices in the water and sanitation sector in Aceh.)

#### **Afternoon, Day 1.**

The field exercises began the first afternoon with a visit to a Habitat for Humanity housing project. The site and its housing units typify the challenges faced by development organizations in Aceh. The water table is high, flooding is a problem, and there is little or no vegetation. This is in addition to the challenges of building homes that are suitable to these circumstances and are acceptable to the local population. The challenge of quickly obtaining building materials that are appropriate and legal was also explored.

#### **Morning, Day 2**

The first half of Day two was also spent in the field, visiting first an IOM project site and then an

---

<sup>2</sup> It is not uncommon to find large tracts of polluted standing water leftover from the tsunami, or rainwater or high tidal flows, just beside a resettlement housing project.

<sup>3</sup> In addition, Mr. Pallen spent a day at the “Green Conference” that took place the week before the ESD workshop. The Conference was organized by Greenpeace, UNEP, WWF, Flora and Fauna Indonesia, and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The conference was held at the University of Syiah Kuala in Banda Aceh. The purpose of the Green Conference was to raise awareness regarding environmental concerns in post Tsunami Aceh.

In addition to workshops on various topics, the conference included a “Green Expo” where the environmental capabilities of a number of NGOs and development agencies were on display (e.g. UNDP). The time was well spent, advancing the trainer’s understanding of the range of capabilities and approaches being explored in Aceh to promote sustainable development.

Mr. Pallen also attended the Health and the Water and Sanitation coordination meetings that bring together organizations active in those sectors each week. The coordination meetings are meant to keep organizations abreast of developments in the field.

IRD project/general settlement site. Participants were divided into four groups, each of which had responsibility for observing a particular issue (housing, water and sanitation, spatial planning).<sup>4</sup>

Thus, by the end of field visits, the participants had been exposed to a variety of housing and settlement models and conditions, and associated issues.

### **Afternoon, Day 2.**

At the end of the day the groups returned to the training center and were asked to make presentations outlining the environmental problems and possible mitigation measures identified by their groups.

## **4.0 Trainer's Assessment**

### **ESD Training**

The workshop was well attended with a good cross section of development organizations present. Also in attendance were BAPEDALDA staff.

On average, about 40 people attended the workshop each day. This is a high number of participants for this type of workshop. (Participant lists are being provided to USAID/Indonesia by ESP.)

#### **1. Participant response & participation.**

The overall response from the participants was positive, with the practical component of the training especially popular. A high level of participation and engagement was in general sustained over the workshop; the number of participants not actively participating during the field exercises and subsequent working groups was quite low. Working group sessions were characterized by energetic exchange.

Language was, however, a barrier to some participants, see item 4 below.

#### **2. Participant understanding.**

The primary measure of participant understanding were the eight presentations, two by each group, that were made at the end of end of Day Two. The presentations analyzed conditions observed in the field, and made recommendations to improve environmental soundness. The overall quality of the presentations was good given the limited time available to prepare, and indicated that participants had understood key course concepts.

#### **3. Government-NGO and working-level interactions.**

The training provided an opportunity for line staff in NGOs to interact with each other, and for these staff to interact with government officers. ESP and participants confirmed that such opportunities are rare. Significant exchange was observed among participants (e.g. exchange of phone numbers, experiences, and perspectives).

#### **4. CHALLENGE: Language.**

Planning for the workshop envisioned largely expatriate trainees, with the workshop therefore conducted entirely in English. However, in the days immediately before the workshop began, it became clear the participants would be mostly Indonesian.

During the first morning of the training, it seemed likely that many Indonesian participants were less active due to difficulty expressing themselves in English.

After the first day, key points were translated into Indonesian. In addition, the heavy focus on group exercises during the first morning and the subsequent field exercises helped to assure that the course delivered value even for participants with poorer English capabilities.

In the event that future training workshops are held, the language issue should be resolved in advance, if at all possible, and any necessary translation arrangements made.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In both the morning and afternoon sessions a splinter group was taken to a secondary site of interest such as the Canada Model House. This ensured that all four groups were active at both sites. It also allowed the groups to visit other sites and projects and bring another perspective to identifying and solving environmental challenges.

**5. CHALLENGE: Volume of Material Covered.**

With only two days, a late start, and necessary prayer breaks, some of the presentation material was not covered in the workshop. (The participants did receive a copy of the power point presentation, however.)

**USAID Procedures Training.**

The half-day USAID procedures training was attended by staff from 6 USAID-funded partners, ESP staff, and Suzanne Billharz of USAID/Indonesia. The training accomplished its basic goal of explaining to partners:

- the transition of USAID-funded activities from an “emergency” to a “development” basis, and the consequent application of USAID’s normal environmental procedures;
- the nature of these procedures; and
- the typical mitigation actions and conditions required by the new IEEs.

The small group format and presence of a trainer, a USAID/Indonesia representative, and ESP allowed in-depth discussions and exchange. Significant time was spent discussing several of the IEE mitigation actions and conditions, particularly sustainable timber requirements.

The trainer recommended that USAID provide its partners opportunity to comment on the draft IEEs, and that in transmitting both draft and final IEEs to partners, USAID make extremely clear to which activities the IEEs apply. (This is particularly critical for one partner operating with a mix of exempt and non-exempt funding.)

*Note: Following the training, USAID did request partner comments on their draft IEEs, and one set of comments was received. The comments were used in the final IEEs.*

**5.0 Participant evaluations**

USAID, ESP, and Cadmus devised three qualitative course evaluation questions for participants. Seven anonymous participant evaluations were received. The responses are reproduced verbatim:

#	What did you learn in the training that will be most useful for you/your organization?	How could the training be improved?	What follow-up activities would be most useful in helping you and your organization implement ESD principles?
1	<p>1. The USAID Environmental procedures (and background to those procedures), in particular the decision tree that leads to No action, undertake IEE or undertake full EIA.</p> <p>2. Being amongst and absorbing good ideas from other players who are passionate about sound environmental design.</p>	<p>I think sometimes the training strayed off into the realms of general design and planning issues related to small scale activities, and the environmental aspects were forgotten. Perhaps the workshop should be called Sustainable* Design in Small Scale Activities or simply Sound Design Principles?</p> <p>*Sustainable in the fullest definition of the word that embodies the environment, economics, social and natural resources.</p>	<p>1. Charettes/brain storming sessions to develop a non-prescriptive, simply laid out Best Practice Manual/checklist that can be handed out to USAID Partners/NGO world as a whole. (I recognize that the individual IEEs go some way to fulfilling this)</p> <p>2. Training sessions to a wider audience.</p>
2	<p>The training raised awareness of environmental issues to staff that may not have been involved in specific environmental monitoring.</p>	<p>Longer training for more comprehensive coverage.</p>	<p>Facilitate a “TOT” based environmental workshop so that “trainer” type staff can benefit from the multiple agency, field &amp; classroom, team approach.</p>

<sup>5</sup> A fully bilingual training is extremely difficult unless training materials are translated in advance, and formal translation arrangements made. In general, sequential translation is problematic: it limits to the volume of information that can be covered, and it is difficult to maintain the participants’ focus in either language.

#	What did you learn in the training that will be most useful for you/your organization?	How could the training be improved?	What follow-up activities would be most useful in helping you and your organization implement ESD principles?
3	As a beginner in WatSan activities for emergency response, I've [learned] a lot from the participants regarding [their] field experiences.	I suggest to identify the qualification of attendance to improve the training.	We will try to implement the [IEE conditions] on USAID-funded projects in our organization.
4	What high risk environmental impacts [are].	Facilitate participation by non-English as a first language speakers.	Direct advice on possible actions where guidelines are very difficult to meet.
5	Yes, it is very useful for our organization because one of our programs is agriculture activities.	Yes, I hope so.	In livelihood, especially Agriculture activities.
6	The training is very useful I think for the project's long-term benefits for the community.	Should be more communication with the participants, for instance [during] site visits and problem-oriented.	
7	Yes, it's so useful.	So far the training in good. More field visit.	Sector-specific guidance.

## 6.0 General observations regarding environmental capacity needs & issues

*These observations and the recommendations for follow-up in the previous section are based on desk research, personal communications, the advance field visit, and the training itself. They were developed per USAID/Indonesia's request during de-briefing meetings in Jakarta.*

### Environmental capacity needs are urgent.

There is an urgent need to build greater environmental capacity for both design and day-to-day implementation of activities<sup>6</sup> within organizations working in Aceh reconstruction. It is apparent that:

- Too many activities are being planned in isolation, or without proper integration of their component actions. (E.g., housing units are built before there are viable water and sanitation services. Installing such services is far more difficult after housing is already in place.)
- Too many activities do not properly take into consideration the conditions at and around the project site. For example, there are numerous housing projects that are well underway way that will be ultimately compromised by such problems as a high water table or flooding.<sup>7</sup>

### ESD innovation does exist.

While there is a clear need to build environmental capacity, there are also examples of innovative environmental practices in Aceh:

- Project Concern International (PCI) for example, made an interesting presentation on a traditional housing model making extensive use of senescent coconut palms as a building

<sup>6</sup> In housing, for example, increased environmental *design* capabilities would mean a better understanding of and capability to build a variety of housing models, the ability to match design characteristics to local circumstances, and the ability to integrate housing construction into the overall process of developing a resettlement site.

<sup>7</sup> Although some sort of environmental review of the space surrounding an infrastructure project is always required, this requirement appears even more important in the unique situations found in Aceh province.

material. The home has a number of attractive features including a very good thermal design and resistance to earthquakes.

- Aceh province is viewed as a center of innovative agro-forestry practices. There are numerous variations on five basic agro-forestry models that are practiced throughout the province.

**Constraints to innovative ESD are significant, but local demand does exist.**

Issues such as land tenure and the urgent need to quickly provide semi-permanent shelter do create serious obstacles to innovative and thoughtful approaches to ESD.

A sentiment frequently expressed was that communities—many of which had poor environmental health conditions and haphazard planning before the earthquake—had little interest in or patience for anything that delayed reconstruction or resettlement, particularly the “integrated planning” required for water and sanitation, reduction of vulnerability to future disasters, etc.

These sentiments are understandable, and no doubt accurately reported. At the same time, however, it is not accurate to say that local demand for ESD is absent:

- Housing design, settlement layout, drainage and access are issues of clear concern for community members. This was very clear during the advance site visit and training exercises. And while there is understandably little patience with delays in providing permanent and semi-permanent housing, many are already experiencing (and are acutely aware of) the consequences of building housing in areas without drainage or integrated water and sanitation facilities.]
- Individuals and families are planting plants and flowers in the areas devastated by the tsunami. This is largely a symbolic act—but it does show that the “greening” and environmental rehabilitation of the destroyed environment is important for those who live within it.

**Multiple standards and actors.**

As presented in the course, environmental review and environmental best practices are the two pillars of ESD. As various actors engaged in Aceh reconstruction attempt to address environmental issues, a number of different environmental review and best practice standards are emerging. For example:

- Indonesian officials have endorsed a set of WWF recommendations for environmentally sustainable reconstruction practices.
- The Green Conference organizers will be soon announcing their own set of recommendations.
- BAPEDALDA has begun implementing streamlined environmental review requirements derived from Indonesian national law.
- Donor government agencies, such as CIDA and USAID, as well as donor NGOs, are increasingly placing their activities onto a “normal” (rather than emergency) footing, and applying their regular environmental procedures.

These multiple standards are not necessarily conflicting, since some are broad, general guides, some are specific minimum technical standards, and some focus on sectoral best practices. However, multiple standards may be confusing for organizations that often must answer to donors, the Indonesian government, and their own organizational policies—to say nothing of the communities and beneficiaries with whom they are working.

## **7.0 Recommendations for USAID follow-up.**

The consultants believe that the following activities and initiatives would help to address the needs and issues discussed above. USAID could help support these activities, whether by direct funding, or by working with its development partners.

### **7.1 Further training.**

The participants were exposed to basic ESD concepts *only* during the workshop. In addition, a

very small portion of potential trainee organizations and individuals attended. Further environmental training for development organizations operating in Aceh Province should therefore both reinforce and broaden the reach of this ESD training. Such training should include:

- Additional general environmental training such as this ESD workshop.
- More in-depth, sector-specific training in the housing and water and sanitation sectors. Over 220 NGOs are working in the housing sector alone. Reaching out to as many of these NGOs as possible is desirable.
- Specialized environmental training in such areas as urban and rural planning and enterprise development.

Training, particularly sector-specific training, should make maximum use of the environmental innovation that can already be found Aceh (see section 5, above). Training will support and enhance two additional recommendations: 7.2 (exchange of information) and 7.4 (best practice promotion).

*Note: ESP Banda Aceh has maintained dialogues with interested participant organizations since the training was held. Discussions have led to planning for follow-up training based on identified needs.*

### **7.2 Exchange of information on environmental issues**

Development organizations in Aceh should have a mechanism—and encouragement—to share information on environmental issues in the same manner that information is now being shared in other sectors. The HIC web site (<http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/sumatra/>) could be a good starting point. Above all else, information sharing should facilitate the identification and promotion of innovative environmental practices that can be replicated by others.

### **7.3 Environmental guidelines**

For sectors for which multiple environmental standards/guidelines exist (see above), it may be useful to develop environmental sector guidance that synthesizes and reconciles the various standards and requirements, addressing the special environmental and reconstruction challenges faced in Aceh (above).

Similarly, where no concise guidance exists for ESD of particular sectoral activities *in the particular context of Aceh*, developing such guidance will be useful. In general, this could be adapted from existing guidelines such as those produced by ENCAP (USAID Africa Bureau's Environmental Capacity Building Program) ([www.encapafrika.org](http://www.encapafrika.org)) and for ANE (see [www.ane-environment.net](http://www.ane-environment.net)).

### **7.4 Best practice promotion**

Efforts should be made to promote environmental best practices. This could be done in part working through the office of BAPEDALDA; the Housing, and Health and Water and Sanitation Coordination meetings could serve as another platform. Best practice promotion should be linked to the exchange mechanism discussed above.

Pilot projects are a potentially valuable BP promotion mechanisms and training tool.

### **7.5 Sustainable timber**

Rebuilding with sustainably sourced timber is critical to the environmental soundness of the reconstruction effort. It is clear, however, that the sustainable timber conditions attached to the IEEs will be a significant challenge for USAID-funded partners. The reasons are complex, and cannot be efficiently—or effectively—addressed by a single partner.

USAID should assure that its partners have assistance on this issue, and work on behalf of its partners to make this procurement condition more achievable.

equip these organizations with the technical and conceptual skills to understand the long-term environmental consequences of their activities, and to proactively incorporate environmentally sound design (ESD) measures in their work.

USAID/Indonesia therefore contacted the Capacity for Impact Assessment and Management (CIAM) Program of The Cadmus Group, a Boston-based environmental consultancy. The Cadmus Group holds an environmental technical assistance contract with USAID/ANE. A primary purpose of the contract is to provide environmental technical assistance and training to USAID programs in the ANE region.

With the agreement of USAID/ANE, The Cadmus Group undertook development of the training curriculum and materials for a 2-day ESD course, with an additional half-day training on USAID environmental procedures for USAID partners. The Cadmus Group's USAID/ANE contract covered trainer LOE for materials preparation and course delivery, travel costs, and transport for the field visits.

Mark Stoughton was the task manager for The Cadmus Group, and lead trainer for USAID procedures. Dean Pallen, consultant to The Cadmus Group, was lead trainer for the 2-day ESD workshop.

Local logistics and field survey support were provided by the recently opened Banda Aceh office of the Environmental Services Program (ESP). ESP is a USAID/Indonesia-funded project to expand access to clean water and to improve watershed management. The venue was provided by BAPEDALDA Propinsi NAD (the Aceh Provincial Environment Agency).

## 2.0 Summary of tasks

The Cadmus Group undertook four general activities to support workshop development, delivery, and follow-up:

### 1. Development of curriculum & core materials.

An initial conference call was held on 19 May 2005 between Mark Stoughton, Suzanne Billharz and John Pontius. The call outlined the basic objectives of the course, and established the 2+0.5-day program.

Stoughton and Pallen collaborated to develop a draft training outline, which was provided for comment to USAID/Indonesia and ESP. Based on the outline, Stoughton and Pallen developed the basic course materials (PowerPoint presentations), which were finalized early during the advance field visit (see below).<sup>1</sup>

The ESD training program is summarized in Section 3, below.

### 2. Advance field visit.

With the support of ESP, Dean Pallen conducted a field visit the week prior to the training workshop. One primary purpose of this field visit was to identify appropriate locations for training exercises.

Under normal circumstances, identifying training field sites is not a difficult task. Even a vacant space can be very instructive and well-suited to a range of training exercises. However, the conditions in Aceh are unique. Repeated visits were required before it was understood where and how the training exercises could be conducted.

The difficulty in finding suitable training sites reflected the larger challenge of assuring that the training was responsive to the conditions in Aceh, where the environmental challenges now facing its people include the total destruction of local vegetation in some

---

<sup>1</sup> The Cadmus Group offers a 5-day Environmental Assessment and ESD training course for USAID staff and partners. The 2-day Aceh training (1 classroom & 1 field day) required a completely new training agenda and set of training materials. The key challenges in developing the Aceh training program were to (A) teach essential ESD tools and concepts relevant to Aceh while (B) avoiding teaching formal environmental impact assessment procedures and associated technical vocabulary.

areas, an altered shoreline, a distorted water table, and contaminated standing water.<sup>2</sup> Reconstruction and resettlement activities must contend with extensive and often hazardous debris fields.

A second primary purpose of the field visit was to ensure that the training material (not just the field exercises) was suitable given the unique field conditions in Aceh. Towards this end, Mr. Pallen met with representatives or staff of the International Organization of Migration, Habitat for Humanity, International Relief and Development, Concern International, and local USAID staff to discuss environmental issues relevant to their mandates.<sup>3</sup>

3. **Training delivery.** (see Sections 3.0 & 4.0)
4. **Development and submission of this report.**

### **3.0 Summary of the ESD training program.**

#### **Morning, Day 1.**

The first morning provided the participants with a basic grounding in the two key component concepts of ESD:

- **“environmental best practices”** whereby the best available knowledge and technologies are employed while not compromising the economic viability of an activity, and
- **“environmental review”**, the practice of assessing field conditions against the possible impacts of an activity and then identifying appropriate measures to reduce or avoid these impacts.

Insofar as possible, the training focused not on best practice and environmental review in the abstract, but on how these concepts can apply practically in Aceh. Group exercises were a key tool for linking concept to application. (For example, the participants developed their own criteria for environmental best practices in the water and sanitation sector in Aceh.)

#### **Afternoon, Day 1.**

The field exercises began the first afternoon with a visit to a Habitat for Humanity housing project. The site and its housing units typify the challenges faced by development organizations in Aceh. The water table is high, flooding is a problem, and there is little or no vegetation. This is in addition to the challenges of building homes that are suitable to these circumstances and are acceptable to the local population. The challenge of quickly obtaining building materials that are appropriate and legal was also explored.

#### **Morning, Day 2**

The first half of Day two was also spent in the field, visiting first an IOM project site and then an

---

<sup>2</sup> It is not uncommon to find large tracts of polluted standing water leftover from the tsunami, or rainwater or high tidal flows, just beside a resettlement housing project.

<sup>3</sup> In addition, Mr. Pallen spent a day at the “Green Conference” that took place the week before the ESD workshop. The Conference was organized by Greenpeace, UNEP, WWF, Flora and Fauna Indonesia, and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The conference was held at the University of Syiah Kuala in Banda Aceh. The purpose of the Green Conference was to raise awareness regarding environmental concerns in post Tsunami Aceh.

In addition to workshops on various topics, the conference included a “Green Expo” where the environmental capabilities of a number of NGOs and development agencies were on display (e.g. UNDP). The time was well spent, advancing the trainer’s understanding of the range of capabilities and approaches being explored in Aceh to promote sustainable development.

Mr. Pallen also attended the Health and the Water and Sanitation coordination meetings that bring together organizations active in those sectors each week. The coordination meetings are meant to keep organizations abreast of developments in the field.

IRD project/general settlement site. Participants were divided into four groups, each of which had responsibility for observing a particular issue (housing, water and sanitation, spatial planning).<sup>4</sup>

Thus, by the end of field visits, the participants had been exposed to a variety of housing and settlement models and conditions, and associated issues.

#### **Afternoon, Day 2.**

At the end of the day the groups returned to the training center and were asked to make presentations outlining the environmental problems and possible mitigation measures identified by their groups.

### **4.0 Trainer's Assessment**

#### **ESD Training**

The workshop was well attended with a good cross section of development organizations present. Also in attendance were BAPEDALDA staff.

On average, about 40 people attended the workshop each day. This is a high number of participants for this type of workshop. (Participant lists are being provided to USAID/Indonesia by ESP.)

#### **1. Participant response & participation.**

The overall response from the participants was positive, with the practical component of the training especially popular. A high level of participation and engagement was in general sustained over the workshop; the number of participants not actively participating during the field exercises and subsequent working groups was quite low. Working group sessions were characterized by energetic exchange.

Language was, however, a barrier to some participants, see item 4 below.

#### **2. Participant understanding.**

The primary measure of participant understanding were the eight presentations, two by each group, that were made at the end of end of Day Two. The presentations analyzed conditions observed in the field, and made recommendations to improve environmental soundness. The overall quality of the presentations was good given the limited time available to prepare, and indicated that participants had understood key course concepts.

#### **3. Government-NGO and working-level interactions.**

The training provided an opportunity for line staff in NGOs to interact with each other, and for these staff to interact with government officers. ESP and participants confirmed that such opportunities are rare. Significant exchange was observed among participants (e.g. exchange of phone numbers, experiences, and perspectives).

#### **4. CHALLENGE: Language.**

Planning for the workshop envisioned largely expatriate trainees, with the workshop therefore conducted entirely in English. However, in the days immediately before the workshop began, it became clear the participants would be mostly Indonesian.

During the first morning of the training, it seemed likely that many Indonesian participants were less active due to difficulty expressing themselves in English.

After the first day, key points were translated into Indonesian. In addition, the heavy focus on group exercises during the first morning and the subsequent field exercises helped to assure that the course delivered value even for participants with poorer English capabilities.

In the event that future training workshops are held, the language issue should be resolved in advance, if at all possible, and any necessary translation arrangements made.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In both the morning and afternoon sessions a splinter group was taken to a secondary site of interest such as the Canada Model House. This ensured that all four groups were active at both sites. It also allowed the groups to visit other sites and projects and bring another perspective to identifying and solving environmental challenges.

**5. CHALLENGE: Volume of Material Covered.**

With only two days, a late start, and necessary prayer breaks, some of the presentation material was not covered in the workshop. (The participants did receive a copy of the power point presentation, however.)

**USAID Procedures Training.**

The half-day USAID procedures training was attended by staff from 6 USAID-funded partners, ESP staff, and Suzanne Billharz of USAID/Indonesia. The training accomplished its basic goal of explaining to partners:

- the transition of USAID-funded activities from an “emergency” to a “development” basis, and the consequent application of USAID’s normal environmental procedures;
- the nature of these procedures; and
- the typical mitigation actions and conditions required by the new IEEs.

The small group format and presence of a trainer, a USAID/Indonesia representative, and ESP allowed in-depth discussions and exchange. Significant time was spent discussing several of the IEE mitigation actions and conditions, particularly sustainable timber requirements.

The trainer recommended that USAID provide its partners opportunity to comment on the draft IEEs, and that in transmitting both draft and final IEEs to partners, USAID make extremely clear to which activities the IEEs apply. (This is particularly critical for one partner operating with a mix of exempt and non-exempt funding.)

*Note: Following the training, USAID did request partner comments on their draft IEEs, and one set of comments was received. The comments were used in the final IEEs.*

**5.0 Participant evaluations**

USAID, ESP, and Cadmus devised three qualitative course evaluation questions for participants. Seven anonymous participant evaluations were received. The responses are reproduced verbatim:

#	What did you learn in the training that will be most useful for you/your organization?	How could the training be improved?	What follow-up activities would be most useful in helping you and your organization implement ESD principles?
1	<p>1. The USAID Environmental procedures (and background to those procedures), in particular the decision tree that leads to No action, undertake IEE or undertake full EIA.</p> <p>2. Being amongst and absorbing good ideas from other players who are passionate about sound environmental design.</p>	<p>I think sometimes the training strayed off into the realms of general design and planning issues related to small scale activities, and the environmental aspects were forgotten. Perhaps the workshop should be called Sustainable* Design in Small Scale Activities or simply Sound Design Principles?</p> <p>*Sustainable in the fullest definition of the word that embodies the environment, economics, social and natural resources.</p>	<p>1. Charettes/brain storming sessions to develop a non-prescriptive, simply laid out Best Practice Manual/checklist that can be handed out to USAID Partners/NGO world as a whole. (I recognize that the individual IEEs go some way to fulfilling this)</p> <p>2. Training sessions to a wider audience.</p>
2	<p>The training raised awareness of environmental issues to staff that may not have been involved in specific environmental monitoring.</p>	<p>Longer training for more comprehensive coverage.</p>	<p>Facilitate a “TOT” based environmental workshop so that “trainer” type staff can benefit from the multiple agency, field &amp; classroom, team approach.</p>

<sup>5</sup> A fully bilingual training is extremely difficult unless training materials are translated in advance, and formal translation arrangements made. In general, sequential translation is problematic: it limits to the volume of information that can be covered, and it is difficult to maintain the participants’ focus in either language.

#	What did you learn in the training that will be most useful for you/your organization?	How could the training be improved?	What follow-up activities would be most useful in helping you and your organization implement ESD principles?
3	As a beginner in WatSan activities for emergency response, I've [learned] a lot from the participants regarding [their] field experiences.	I suggest to identify the qualification of attendance to improve the training.	We will try to implement the [IEE conditions] on USAID-funded projects in our organization.
4	What high risk environmental impacts [are].	Facilitate participation by non-English as a first language speakers.	Direct advice on possible actions where guidelines are very difficult to meet.
5	Yes, it is very useful for our organization because one of our programs is agriculture activities.	Yes, I hope so.	In livelihood, especially Agriculture activities.
6	The training is very useful I think for the project's long-term benefits for the community.	Should be more communication with the participants, for instance [during] site visits and problem-oriented.	
7	Yes, it's so useful.	So far the training in good. More field visit.	Sector-specific guidance.

## 6.0 General observations regarding environmental capacity needs & issues

*These observations and the recommendations for follow-up in the previous section are based on desk research, personal communications, the advance field visit, and the training itself. They were developed per USAID/Indonesia's request during de-briefing meetings in Jakarta.*

### Environmental capacity needs are urgent.

There is an urgent need to build greater environmental capacity for both design and day-to-day implementation of activities<sup>6</sup> within organizations working in Aceh reconstruction. It is apparent that:

- Too many activities are being planned in isolation, or without proper integration of their component actions. (E.g., housing units are built before there are viable water and sanitation services. Installing such services is far more difficult after housing is already in place.)
- Too many activities do not properly take into consideration the conditions at and around the project site. For example, there are numerous housing projects that are well underway way that will be ultimately compromised by such problems as a high water table or flooding.<sup>7</sup>

### ESD innovation does exist.

While there is a clear need to build environmental capacity, there are also examples of innovative environmental practices in Aceh:

- Project Concern International (PCI) for example, made an interesting presentation on a traditional housing model making extensive use of senescent coconut palms as a building

<sup>6</sup> In housing, for example, increased environmental *design* capabilities would mean a better understanding of and capability to build a variety of housing models, the ability to match design characteristics to local circumstances, and the ability to integrate housing construction into the overall process of developing a resettlement site.

<sup>7</sup> Although some sort of environmental review of the space surrounding an infrastructure project is always required, this requirement appears even more important in the unique situations found in Aceh province.

material. The home has a number of attractive features including a very good thermal design and resistance to earthquakes.

- Aceh province is viewed as a center of innovative agro-forestry practices. There are numerous variations on five basic agro-forestry models that are practiced throughout the province.

**Constraints to innovative ESD are significant, but local demand does exist.**

Issues such as land tenure and the urgent need to quickly provide semi-permanent shelter do create serious obstacles to innovative and thoughtful approaches to ESD.

A sentiment frequently expressed was that communities—many of which had poor environmental health conditions and haphazard planning before the earthquake—had little interest in or patience for anything that delayed reconstruction or resettlement, particularly the “integrated planning” required for water and sanitation, reduction of vulnerability to future disasters, etc.

These sentiments are understandable, and no doubt accurately reported. At the same time, however, it is not accurate to say that local demand for ESD is absent:

- Housing design, settlement layout, drainage and access are issues of clear concern for community members. This was very clear during the advance site visit and training exercises. And while there is understandably little patience with delays in providing permanent and semi-permanent housing, many are already experiencing (and are acutely aware of) the consequences of building housing in areas without drainage or integrated water and sanitation facilities.]
- Individuals and families are planting plants and flowers in the areas devastated by the tsunami. This is largely a symbolic act—but it does show that the “greening” and environmental rehabilitation of the destroyed environment is important for those who live within it.

**Multiple standards and actors.**

As presented in the course, environmental review and environmental best practices are the two pillars of ESD. As various actors engaged in Aceh reconstruction attempt to address environmental issues, a number of different environmental review and best practice standards are emerging. For example:

- Indonesian officials have endorsed a set of WWF recommendations for environmentally sustainable reconstruction practices.
- The Green Conference organizers will be soon announcing their own set of recommendations.
- BAPEDALDA has begun implementing streamlined environmental review requirements derived from Indonesian national law.
- Donor government agencies, such as CIDA and USAID, as well as donor NGOs, are increasingly placing their activities onto a “normal” (rather than emergency) footing, and applying their regular environmental procedures.

These multiple standards are not necessarily conflicting, since some are broad, general guides, some are specific minimum technical standards, and some focus on sectoral best practices. However, multiple standards may be confusing for organizations that often must answer to donors, the Indonesian government, and their own organizational policies—to say nothing of the communities and beneficiaries with whom they are working.

**7.0 Recommendations for USAID follow-up.**

The consultants believe that the following activities and initiatives would help to address the needs and issues discussed above. USAID could help support these activities, whether by direct funding, or by working with its development partners.

**7.1 Further training.**

The participants were exposed to basic ESD concepts *only* during the workshop. In addition, a

very small portion of potential trainee organizations and individuals attended. Further environmental training for development organizations operating in Aceh Province should therefore both reinforce and broaden the reach of this ESD training. Such training should include:

- Additional general environmental training such as this ESD workshop.
- More in-depth, sector-specific training in the housing and water and sanitation sectors. Over 220 NGOs are working in the housing sector alone. Reaching out to as many of these NGOs as possible is desirable.
- Specialized environmental training in such areas as urban and rural planning and enterprise development.

Training, particularly sector-specific training, should make maximum use of the environmental innovation that can already be found Aceh (see section 5, above). Training will support and enhance two additional recommendations: 7.2 (exchange of information) and 7.4 (best practice promotion).

*Note: ESP Banda Aceh has maintained dialogues with interested participant organizations since the training was held. Discussions have led to planning for follow-up training based on identified needs.*

### **7.2 Exchange of information on environmental issues**

Development organizations in Aceh should have a mechanism—and encouragement—to share information on environmental issues in the same manner that information is now being shared in other sectors. The HIC web site (<http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/sumatra>) could be a good starting point. Above all else, information sharing should facilitate the identification and promotion of innovative environmental practices that can be replicated by others.

### **7.3 Environmental guidelines**

For sectors for which multiple environmental standards/guidelines exist (see above), it may be useful to develop environmental sector guidance that synthesizes and reconciles the various standards and requirements, addressing the special environmental and reconstruction challenges faced in Aceh (above).

Similarly, where no concise guidance exists for ESD of particular sectoral activities *in the particular context of Aceh*, developing such guidance will be useful. In general, this could be adapted from existing guidelines such as those produced by ENCAP (USAID Africa Bureau's Environmental Capacity Building Program) ([www.encapafrika.org](http://www.encapafrika.org)) and for ANE (see [www.ane-environment.net](http://www.ane-environment.net)).

### **7.4 Best practice promotion**

Efforts should be made to promote environmental best practices. This could be done in part working through the office of BAPEDALDA; the Housing, and Health and Water and Sanitation Coordination meetings could serve as another platform. Best practice promotion should be linked to the exchange mechanism discussed above.

Pilot projects are a potentially valuable BP promotion mechanisms and training tool.

### **7.5 Sustainable timber**

Rebuilding with sustainably sourced timber is critical to the environmental soundness of the reconstruction effort. It is clear, however, that the sustainable timber conditions attached to the IEEs will be a significant challenge for USAID-funded partners. The reasons are complex, and cannot be efficiently—or effectively—addressed by a single partner.

USAID should assure that its partners have assistance on this issue, and work on behalf of its partners to make this procurement condition more achievable.

**DRAFT STATEMENT OF WORK**  
 Support and Capacity Development for USAID/Afghanistan Mandatory Environmental  
 Documentation

**SECTION A – BACKGROUND/OBJECTIVE**

**BACKGROUND**

The Afghanistan Mission in the Asia and Near East (ANE) region of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is undertaking programs/projects involving various sectors, including (but not limited to) power and other energy resources, roads, dams, irrigation canals, agriculture, construction of schools and clinics, vertical structures and other major infrastructure with potentially adverse impacts on the environment. An illustrative list of projects is presented in Table 1 below.

In accordance with Chapter 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 216 (22 CFR 216) all new programs and projects require completion and approval USAID environmental documentation prior to obligation of funds. A number of projects will require full Environmental Assessments (EAs) in accordance with §216.2 (d) *Classes of Actions Normally Having a Significant Effect on the Environment* and §216.6 *Environmental Assessments*. Others will require Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) or lower level environmental reviews. Environmental documentation must also be completed for all upcoming projects in the portfolio.

**Table 1 Illustrative list of USAID/Afghanistan projects requiring USAID Environmental Documentation**

<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Amount (in thousands)</b>
306-001	Land O'Lakes Dairy Development Project	\$7,250
306-001	Canal, Local Governance and Alternative Crops Project in Nangarhar (grantee: International Foundation of Hope)	\$4,000
306-002	Immediate Needs Program	\$45,000
306-003	Chil Dukhtaran Housing Project	\$15,396
306-003	Schools and Clinics Construction and Refurbishment Program (SACCARP)	\$150,000
306-003.01	Rural Roads Construction – Public International Organization (PIO) Grant to United Nations Office of Project Services	\$218,000
306-003	Alternative Livelihoods Program (LAP)	\$300,000
306-003	Afghan Governance and Legal Reform Project	\$23,000,000

<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Amount (in thousands)</b>
306-001.01	Power Sector Program	\$120,000,000
306-003.02	Rehabilitation of Economic Facilities and Services (REFS) Program	\$665,000
306-004	Quick Impact Program (QIP)	\$130,000

USAID/Afghanistan is considering awarding a contract to a team of environmental impact assessment experts for assistance in completing required USAID environmental documentation. USAID/Afghanistan is also interested in procuring training for Cognizant Technical Officers, project design and implementation officials, and a select group of implementing partners from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and local partners.

The contractor will operate without direct USAID or Embassy logistic support to field teams who will complete Scoping Statements; conduct EAs; assist in preparing other required environmental documentation (IEEs, ADS 201 and 204 analyses, etc.); prepare and oversee environmental mitigation and monitoring plans (Environmental Management Plans); and oversee Environmental Management Plan (EMP) implementation and follow-up. Work will be accomplished over a five month period, as needed. Success will require an organization that can draw on a range of different skills and have the logistical and administrative capability to operate in Afghanistan.

## **OBJECTIVE**

USAID/Afghanistan envisions a Task Order which will provide the above services to meet Agency environmental requirements for programs and projects in the portfolio.

## **SECTION B – DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES AND DELIVERABLES**

### **Support for USAID environmental documentation preparation and follow-up,**

#### **SCOPE OF WORK**

Work related to this procurement will take place in Afghanistan, the United States and the Asia and Near East (ANE) region.

#### **TEAM COMPOSITION AND EXPERIENCE**

The Offeror shall propose a team with the skills and experience necessary to achieve the objective of this procurement. Capabilities to be provided include:

- Demonstrated experience in seeking out and fielding environmental assessment expertise and in provision of a range of environmental assessment technical assistance
- Demonstrated familiarity with USAID’s Environmental Procedures including Regulation 216, FAA 118 and 119 and ADS 201 and 204

- Previous experience leading or participating in USAID Scoping Exercises or in USAID EA field work and report preparation
- Previous experience with preparation of comprehensive mitigation and monitoring plans for EAs (EMPs) and in carrying out EMP Follow-up.
- Experience with management and coordination of field expertise and teams in Afghanistan
- A technical manager is required for this activity who must be fully familiar with USAID EA and IEE preparation, and have a minimum of ten years field experience with these processes
- A logistics manager is required for this activity who will be based in Kabul. This individual(s) must be fully familiar with operating conditions in Afghanistan and have demonstrated experience managing and coordination teams carrying out work at the Provincial level.

In addition, to these required capabilities, all individuals proposed must demonstrate previous experience working cooperatively in teams under difficult field conditions. USAID will be evaluating the strength of the proposed team based on previous experience leading Scoping Exercises, serving as EA team leaders or key technical EA team members, designing effective EMPs, and overseeing EMP follow-up.

Whenever feasible, the team will draw upon in-country EA expertise, especially Afghan professionals with training in environmental assessment processes.

Team members must have superior written and verbal communication skills; strong, recent, and relevant experience working in the ANE region; and a thorough understanding of the administration structure and function of USAID missions and mission processes.

The Offeror shall carry out the following tasks:

1. *Preparation of EA Scoping Statements.* The contractor shall prepare Scoping Statements in accordance with Agency guidelines outlined in 22 CFR 216.6 for those projects with positive determinations that require environmental assessments. Each Scoping Statement will include consultation with potential stakeholders to narrow the issues to be addressed in the EA and will be used to establish the expertise needed for the EA team. Detailed Scopes of Work for each EA Team member will also be included under each EA Scoping Statement along with workplans, required Levels of Effort, and timelines for EA completion. Examples of activities requiring this work include new infrastructure such as roads, dams, vertical structures, irrigation canals, and other major infrastructure projects with the potential to have a major effect on the environment. Currently eleven (11) USAID/Afghanistan projects have positive determinations requiring EAs. Additional details on projects with positive determinations requiring Scoping Statements are provided in Attachment [ ].
2. *Fielding and Coordination of EA Teams.* The Contractor will be responsible for:
  - recruiting and fielding the required EA expertise and for coordinating the Scoping and EA exercises;

- preparation and distribution of Scoping Statements and the EA documents for review; and
  - maintenance of quality control over draft and final products.
3. *Determination of professional and technical skills.* For each project, the contractor shall determine what professional and technical skills are required to prepare the appropriate environmental documentation, including IEEs, Scoping Statements, Environmental Assessments or other required documentation. For example, road projects involving major impact on soil and drainage will need to be reviewed by a soil scientist and a hydrologist. Major vertical structures will need to be reviewed by a structural engineer. For each project requiring an EA, both the Scoping Statement and the EA will require clearance from the ANE Bureau's Environmental Officer following clearance within USAID/Afghanistan. The point of contact within USAID/Afghanistan will be the Mission Environmental Officer. Draft reports will be shared within the Mission and forwarded to the ANE Bureau for review and comment.
  4. *Provision of support for Initial Environmental Examinations and other USAID Environmental Documentation.* Many USAID/Afghanistan projects or programs do not require full-scale scoping and environmental assessments. USAID/Afghanistan processes Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) on a rolling basis. Twenty-six such examinations have been processed since April 25, 2005. The contractor will be expected to support preparation of IEEs, IEE amendments and other Environmental Documentation, as needed. The Contractor will also assist the Mission Environmental Officer and Bureau Environmental Officer in ensuring that EA, IEE and other environmental documentation requirements are incorporated in new RFPs, RFAs, grant and cooperative agreements, and contracts for project activities.

The contractor will also establish a practical and user friendly *tracking system* for current and future USAID/Afghanistan required documentation actions under USAID Environmental Procedures, including a system for annual portfolio review of new, pending and completed actions.

5. *Environmental Management Plans (EMPs).* The contractor shall identify activities that have potential adverse environmental impacts and outline mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate impacts on the environment and monitoring required to ensure mitigation is taking place. This work will include the incorporation of specific requirements for mitigation and monitoring plans (Environmental Management Plans) outlining who will be specifically responsible for their implementation, monitoring and follow-up needs and timing, together with realistic EMP budgets. The contractor shall also work with implementing partners to ensure their application of 'best environmental management practice' including, but not limited to the sectoral best management practice guidelines and checklists found on the ANE website [www.ane-environment.net](http://www.ane-environment.net).
6. *Provision of logistical and administrative support.* The Contractor shall provide sufficient logistical and administrative support so that the activities involved in preparing required environmental documentation can be carried out, including Scoping exercises

and EAs. The logistical and administrative support provided by the Contractor shall include arranging for extensive field travel, providing for appropriate security, accommodation, and travel (international and domestic). The Contractor shall have demonstrated capability to operate and provide this support outside the Embassy and USAID Compound.

7. *Future USAID Environmental Documentation Support.* USAID/Afghanistan expects that in the future, contractor services will be required to complete full-scale Scoping and EAs for upcoming activities, as well as IEEs and other Environmental Documentation. The Contractor shall demonstrate flexibility to respond to these potential future needs in support of USAID/Afghanistan's portfolio, including the capacity to provide mitigation and monitoring follow-up for completed documentation.
8. *Provision of training services.* The Contractor shall provide training services to USAID/Afghanistan for meeting environmental Agency requirements. This training would include a course of 2-3 day formal classroom instruction with information provided by USAID's environmental office. The training would be aimed at Cognizant Technical Officers, project design and implementation officials, and a select group of implementing partners from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and local partners. A 2-day field exercise would also be included in the training as a complement to classroom instruction. The Contractor should demonstrate past experience with delivery of USAID EA and environmentally sound design courses with content as described on the ANE website [www.ane-environment.net](http://www.ane-environment.net) and at [www.encapafrika.org](http://www.encapafrika.org). USAID/Afghanistan expects that approximately 25-30 participants will be included in the training.

## **SECTION C – DELIVERABLES AND PERFORMANCE**

1. **Period of Performance:** This Order is effective as [insert date here] and shall remain in effect through [insert date here].
2. **Place of Performance:** Work on this purchase order shall be carried out in Afghanistan, the United States and the Asia and Near East (ANE) region.
3. **Deliverables:** The deliverables identified in the Statement of Work must be provided in accordance with the timeframes established therein.

The following deliverable are required and must be provided to the CTO:

- a. A minimum of 11 Scoping Statements, Environmental Assessments and EMPs
- b. A minimum of 26 IEE drafts or other USAID/Afghanistan environmental documentation for project and/or program approvals.
- c. A minimum of 11 EMP follow-up reports with recommended follow-up actions and budgets

- d. At least one standard ANE EA and environmentally sound design training course in Afghanistan for USAID Implementing Partners, preferably with case site visits. A evaluation report summarizing the results of the training (participant evaluation scores should be over 4.0 on a scale of 5.0).
- e. Establishment of a tracking system and data base for USAID/Afghanistan Environmental Documentation actions and USAID annual environmental documentation reviews.
- f. A report summarizing support services in EA capacity development provided to the Ministry of Environment under the contract.
- g. A final report summarizing all activities and Environmental Documentation support provided over the 5 month (120 day) period of performance under the contract and providing recommendations for further improvements to USAID Environmental Documentation Preparation and Management

### Estimated Level of Effort

Task	Estimated Days Level of Effort
In-country development of Scoping Statements (20 days x 2 persons x 11 EAs)	440
Environmental Assessment field work (20 days x 5 team members x 11)	1100
Environmental Assessment document prep (20 days x 5 team members x 11)	1100
IEEs and other USAID Environmental Documentation preparation for USAID portfolio (60 days x 2 persons)	120
Establishment of a user friendly Mission environmental documentation tracking system and annual environmental documentation review process	20
Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (Environmental Management Plan) Preparation and Best Management Practice Technical Assistance	60
EMP Follow-up	120
Training in USAID Env Procedures for USAID Implementing Partners (30 days x 2)	60
Technical Assistance support to Afghanistan's Ministry of Environment in EA capacity development	30
In-country Project Manager (5 months)	120
In-country Logistics Coordinator (5 months)	120
Senior Technical Specialist/Recruiter (U.S. based)	30
Technical Specialist SoW and budgeting/contracting (U.S. based)	90
<b>Total Estimated Level of Effort</b>	<b>3410 days</b>
<b>Accommodation and per diem</b>	<b>2130 days</b>
<b>International Travel</b>	

Scoping Statements (2 x 11 RT = 22 U.S.–Afghanistan–U.S.); EAs (5 x 11 RT = 55 U.S.–Afghanistan–U.S.); 2 RT Environmental Doc. Support Services; 4 RT Env. Capacity Development/Training; 2 x 5 RT = 10 EMP Follow-up. <b>Total RT airfares = 93</b>	
<b>Domestic Travel</b>	
<b>Document Publication and Printing</b>	
<b>Document Distribution</b>	
<b>Office Management</b>	
<b>Security Services</b>	
<b>Communications</b>	
<b>Insurance</b>	
<b>DBA</b>	
<b>Other Direct Costs</b>	
<b>Contingency (5%)</b>	

Electronic copies of all work products generated under this procurement must be presented to USAID on a diskette or CD-ROM in Microsoft Word. Twenty (20) copies are to be provided of all final documents produced under this procurement. All reports and materials produced in conjunction with this procurement are the property of USAID, not the consultants or Offeror, and are in the public domain. Any use of this material shall require the prior written approval of the CTO.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria. The point total is 500, with relative weights assigned to indicate level of emphasis.

1	Technical Approach	100 points (20 percent)
a	Technical feasibility, practical soundness, and responsiveness to program requirements	50 points
b	Understanding of country environment	25 points
c	Understanding of 22 CFR 216, FAA 118 and 119 and ADS 201 and 204 requirements	25 points
2	Corporate Capability	100 points (20 percent)
a	Ability to provide full managerial, financial, and technical recruitment support	30 points
b	Ability to meet in-country logistical and administrative needs and to operate independently of Embassy and USAID logistic support	40 points
c	Ability to recruit and retain qualified environmental assessment expatriate and local professional staff. I	30 points
3	Past Performance	50 points (10 percent)
a	Demonstrated success in providing similar services in (post-conflict) or difficult operational circumstances	25 points
b	Responsiveness to past clients regarding ability to adapt to the uniqueness of different country settings and host government priorities; client satisfaction	25 points
4	Personnel	150 points (30 percent)
a	Professional qualifications and relevant experience in application of USAID Environmental Procedures, including experience in post-conflict settings or difficult operating conditions	50 points
	Experience with preparation of USAID Scoping Statements and EA preparation	25 points
	Experience with preparation of Environmental Management Plans and EA follow-up	25 points
b	Appropriateness of the proposed technical positions (expatriate and local) to proposed technical approach and local conditions	25 points
	Experience with training and capacity development in EA and environmentally sound design for USAID Implementing Partners	25 points
5	Cost	100 points (20 percent)
a	Cost-effectiveness of approach as demonstrated by labor mix and rates and appropriate use of local professional staff	40 points

b	Realism of individual cost elements and overall balance in the design budget	60 points
---	--	-----------

**SUMMARY**  
**USAID Asia and Near East**  
**Regional IPM and Pesticides Course**  
**Amman, September 25–29, 2005**  
Prepared by The Cadmus Group, Inc.

This document summarizes the results of a course held from September 26–30, 2005, at the Dead Sea in Jordan. Training topics include USAID Regulation 22CFR 216.3(b) (also known as Reg 216) requires that all USAID activities that have pesticide use associated with them receive, at minimum, an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) to analyze and mitigate potentially dangerous impacts of the pesticides to human health and the environment. Training in safe pesticide use and integrated pest management is one of the most important mitigative measures available and recommended in all pesticide IEEs.

**Course Objectives**

USAID activities throughout the Asia Near East region focus on improving agricultural production, urban and greenhouse horticulture, and managing insect-borne human diseases. All of these types of activities require the input of pesticides to control pests. Training is highly recommended for all USAID project implementers who oversee policy and activities on pest control and pesticides so that they are used judiciously and safely. This SOW addresses such training, including integrated pest management, integrated management of vectors of human and animal diseases, pesticide hazards, safety measures, toxicology, environmental fate for pesticides, the regulation and disposal of pesticides and Pesticide Evaluation Reports and Safer Use Action Plans (PERSUAPs).

**Participants and Trainers**

Participants included 28 USAID staff and representatives from partner organizations. Names and affiliations are listed in Table 1 below, which also shows details for faculty who contributed to the course. Jim Hester, Agency Environmental Coordinator, and John Wilson, Bureau Environmental Officer, were present at the course. The principal trainer for was Dr Alan Schroeder. The participants were fortunate to have Dr. Buhssini from ICARDA teach at this training and provide cutting edge research results from IPM projects for the most important crops and pests in the region.

*Table 1: Participants and Facilitators*

No.	Name	Organization	Occupation	Country
<b>Participants</b>				
1	Azzad Aziz	Development Program for Iraq	Field Manager	Iraq
2	Alexandria Niewijk	USAID / Afghanistan	Population, Health and Nutrition Officer	Afghanistan
3	Shaif Al-Hamdany	USAID / Yemen	Senior Program Management Advisor	Yemen
4	Wadea Abdulsattar	USAID / Yemen	Economic Growth & Ag Specialist	Yemen
5	Paul Mason	USAID / Cambodia	Economic Growth & Development Officer	Cambodia
6	Eng. Zakaria Musallam	MOA	Agr Eng.	Jordan
7	Eng. Abdulla Musallam	MOA	Agr Eng.	Jordan
8	Eng. Maha Hadidi	MOA	Agr Eng.	Jordan
9	Eng. Na'el Kawaleet	MOA	Agr Eng.	Jordan
10	Eng. Shareef Al-Rawashdeh	NCARTT	Technology Transfer Specialist	Jordan

No.	Name	Organization	Occupation	Country
11	Eng. Hikmat Al-Tarawneh	NCARTT		Jordan
12	Eng. Amjad Al-Rawashdeh	NCARTT		Jordan
13	Eng. Mohammad Al-Kasasbeh	NCARTT		Jordan
14	Eng. Majeda Thneibat	NCARTT		Jordan
15	German Sabillon	Kafa'a		Jordan
16	Mohammad Sha'ban	Kafa'a	Agr Eng.	Jordan
17	Nabeel Maroun	Kafa'a	Agr Eng.	Jordan
18	Isam Nasr	Kafa'a	Agr Eng.	Jordan
19	Shadi El Azzam	Kafa'a	Agr Eng.	Jordan
20	Turki Saqer	Kafa'a	Agr Eng.	Jordan
21	Ahmad Al-Ulayyan	Kafa'a	Agr Eng.	Jordan
22	Ismail Twaissi	RIAL		Jordan
23	Hani Habbab	RIAL		Jordan
24	Ahmad Al-Khalidi	RIAL		Jordan
25	Nabal Qatan	RIAL		Jordan
26	Samer Bkearat	RIAL		Jordan
27	Ziad Ghzawi	RIAL		Jordan
28	Safwan Lubani	RIAL		Jordan
<b>Trainers / Facilitators</b>				
1	Alan Schroeder	The Cadmus Group	Pest and Pesticide Management	USA
2	John Wilson	USAID / Washington	ANE Bureau Environmental Officer	USA
3	James Hester	USAID / Washington	Agency Environmental Coordinator	USA
4	Barney Popkin	USAID / Washington	Water Resources and Environmental Management Consultant	USA
5	Kholoud Aranki	Ministry of Agriculture	Pesticide Registration	Jordan
6	Dr. Ayman Salti	Ministry of Agriculture	Medical Entomology, Parasitology	Jordan
7	Eng. Mahmoud Abu Shweimeh	Ministry of Agriculture	Pesticides and Bees	Jordan
8	Eng. Mazen Odeh	Farmer / IPM farm	Leading IPM Grower	Jordan
9	Dr. Marwan Abdul Wali	NCARTT	Toxicology & Environmental fate	Jordan
10	Dr. Madi Jaghbir	Free Lancer	Medical Doctor, Lecturer, Researcher	Jordan
11	Dr. Mustapha Buhssini	ICARDA / Syria	Entomology, Germplasm Program	Syria

## Course Methodology

The course combined group exercises, field visits, and presentations by visiting lecturers. All group exercises got people active and thinking. Field exercise visits were interesting and informative. The pre-travel lecture on EurepGAP principles and procedures was very useful for understanding one of the sites.

About 95 percent of course expectations as expressed on the first day of training were fulfilled. Some participants sought more detail than the lectures might provide; this was provided in the form of handouts in the course binder. The course binder provided a good list of concise handouts on each of the topics discussed during training, and should be used for future training courses. The book on safe pest and pesticide management, in Arabic, was very much appreciated, as were the USDA ARS-donated handbooks in Arabic and English on pests of greenhouse crops.

A group exercise on safety poster production was suggested by Jim Hester, and followed, with good success.

In addition, EPA Safety posters were produced in English and Arabic. Trainees commented that they have government-produced posters, but that none is as complete as the posters that were provided for trainees during this course.

## Course Evaluation

The training was considered a success by all who attended. Specific comments for improvement are included in the "Training Evaluations" that are being compiled by Cadmus, to be attached. Trainees and USAID/Washington appreciated the production of training posters produced and distributed based upon EPA posters for safety.

### *Pre- and Post-Course Self Knowledge Evaluations*

Participants were asked to evaluate their own knowledge in twenty-one areas related to pest management and pesticides. This method of determining progress was deemed superior to actual pre- and post-course exams of knowledge. Knowledge was self-evaluated on a scale ranging from 1 (none) to 5 (very good). Results of the pre- and post-course self-evaluations are summarized in Table 2 below. These evaluations show that the training improved trainees' understanding in each of the topic areas.

**Table 2: Pre- and Post-Course Self Evaluations**

Self-rating of participants' understanding of . . .	Class Average Before the Course	Class Average After the Course
USAID environmental requirements	2.4	3.9
International pops and PIC treaties*	1.7	3.6
Biological control of pests	3.1	3.9
Pest control by use of resistant plants	3.0	3.8
Pest control by agronomic methods**	3.0	3.8
Pest control by pesticides	3.5	4.1
Pest control by regulatory means	2.5	3.7
Integrated pest management method	3.4	4.3
Economic impact of pesticides use	3.0	4.0
Safer pesticide transport	2.9	4.1
Safer pesticide storage	3.6	4.3
Safer pesticide handling	3.5	4.2
Safer pesticide use	3.3	4.2
Safer pesticide clean up and disposal	3.3	4.0
Integrated pest management research	2.6	3.8
Pesticide hazards & toxicity to people	3.0	4.2
Pesticide poisoning medical care	2.4	4.1
Eurepgap	2.8	4.0
Where pesticides go in the environment	2.9	3.9
Vectors of animal diseases	2.2	3.7
Integrated vector management	1.9	3.7

\*POPs = Persistent Organic Pollutants; PIC = Prior Informed Consent

\*\*Agronomic methods = intercropping, trap cropping, crop rotation, cover crops, etc.

Out of a total evaluation ranking (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 for the highest score), the course received an overall ranking of 3.8 for both "How would you assess the overall quality of the course content?" and "Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment." For

“Course scheduling and organization” the overall response was 4.5; for “Course logistics and venue” the response was 4.3, and for “Content of participants’ sourcebook” the response was 4.3.

### ***General Comments***

Twenty-five participants provided written comments along with their quantitative responses. Several expressed general appreciation:

“The course was very professional.”

“It was full of new and important information.”

“Nice job--especially nice mix of practical and theoretical, of field and lecture and engaged group activities.”

“Thank you for a useful course.”

Two respondents praised the timing of the workshop, one noting that it fell at the beginning of the growing season.

Ten respondents specifically praised the organization/logistical aspects of the course.

### ***Areas for Improvement***

Many the respondents provided comments that suggest general or specific areas for improvement. For example:

Seven respondents suggested including more field and practical training outside the classroom. One suggested that it would be valuable to take participants to sites both inside and outside the country to gain a wider perspective. One thought the course was too short.

One respondent complained of “technical subjects,” while three thought the material was not advanced enough (“no new information”; “most of us know it”) or that it should include more pure science. Another respondent complained that “the course was given for professionals in IPM and some of us are not professionals in IPM.”

One respondent suggested doing a better job of selecting participants; another suggested screening participants for English skills, and complained that some presenters were just reading from slides. A third respondent appreciated the cultural sensitivity shown by the inclusion of local experts, but thought their presentations were “generally poor.”

One respondent suggested including a lecture about an ideal farm in a European country that applied EurepGAP; another suggested including more material that addresses “RDS/216 requirements” and “IEE conditionalities.” A third respondent suggested adding more material on Environmental Impact Assessments, and on “topics regarding environment & IPM policies and setup of programs”; the same respondent suggested repeating the course in another country.

Commenting on course scheduling and organization, one respondent thought that there was “much skipping around which could be confusing.” Another thought the material on medical aspects of poisoning and first aid should come first.

One respondent suggested that it would be valuable to arrange for group transportation and organize a cultural excursion after training hours.

### ***Improvements Reported by Participants***

Eleven participants commented that the course improved their understanding of environmental assessment. For example:

“As a nonspecialist in plant protection it improved my general knowledge about IPM and regulations.”

“It increased my awareness about IPM in terms of health.”

“Very good to understand that IPM is a policy of USAID. Gained new knowledge and understanding of POP, PIC, and EUREPGAP.”

### **ANE/TS Support Services Task Order**

This course was supported through core funds and technical assistance under the USAID Asia and Near East Bureau Office of Technical Support (ANE/TS) Support Services Task Order. For more information on services available through this Task Order, please contact Barney Popkin (202-712-1063) or John Wilson (202-712-4633).



# USAID/East Timor: Environmental Review Form for the Small Grants Program

**Note: Follow, but do not submit, the attached instructions.**

## A. Applicant information

Organization:	Parent grant or project:
Individual contact and title:	Address, phone & email (if available)
Proposed activity (brief description)	Amount of funding requested
Location of proposed activity	Start and end date of proposed activity

## B. Activities, screening results, and recommended determination

Proposed activities (continue on additional page if necessary)	Screening result (Step 3 of instructions)			Recommended Determinations (Step 6 of instructions. Complete for all moderate/unknown and high-risk activities)		
	Very Low Risk	High-Risk*	Moderate risk or unknown*	No significant adverse impact	With specified mitigation, no significant adverse impact	Significant Adverse impact
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						

\*These screening results require completion of an Environmental Review Report

## C. Summary of recommended determinations (check ALL that apply)

The proposal contains. . .	(equivalent Regulation 216 terminology)
<input type="checkbox"/> Very low risk activities	categorical exclusion(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> After environmental review, activities determined to have no significant adverse impacts*	negative determination(s)*

<input type="checkbox"/> After environmental review, activities determined to have <b>no significant adverse impacts, given specified mitigation and monitoring*</b>	<i>negative determination(s) with conditions*</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> After environmental review, activities determined to have <b>significant adverse impacts*</b>	<i>positive determination(s)*</i>

\*for these determinations, the form is not complete unless accompanied by Environmental Review Report

### D. Certification:

I, the undersigned, certify that:

1. the information on this form is correct and complete
2. the following actions have been and will be taken to assure that the activity complies with environmental requirements established for this Project:
  - Those responsible for implementing this activity have received training in environmental review AND training and/or documentation describing essential design elements and best practices for activities of this nature.
  - These design elements and best practices will be followed in implementing this activity.
  - Any specific mitigation or monitoring measures described in the Environmental Review Report will be implemented in their entirety.
  - Compliance with these conditions will be regularly confirmed and documented by on-site inspections during the activity and at its completion.

(Signature) \_\_\_\_\_

(Date) \_\_\_\_\_

(Print name) \_\_\_\_\_

### BELOW THIS LINE FOR USAID USE ONLY

#### Clearance record

USAID Project Officer	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given	Stephen Vance		
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			
USAID MEO	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given	Angela Rodrigues		
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			
USAID REO*	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			
USAID BEO*	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			

\*REO and BEO approval required for all "high risk" screening results and for determinations of "significant adverse impacts"

**Note: if clearance is denied, comments must be provided to applicant**

**Note to individuals adapting this form for use on a particular project:**

- These instructions accompany the generic "Environmental Review Form."
- The Environmental Review Form and these instructions are for use in the review and approval of subproject proposals that are (1) carried out under an "umbrella" project AND (2) defined and reviewed *after* approval of the overall or "umbrella project." Typical subprojects include microfinance activities or subgrants for small-scale development.
- Underlined/Highlighted text **MUST** be modified to reflect project and mission name.
- Both the form AND instructions should be reviewed and modified in general to reflect the needs of the specific umbrella project.
- Both form and instructions must be appended to the Initial Environmental Examination for the overall project.

**DELETE THIS BOX BEFORE MODIFYING/DISTRIBUTING THIS FORM**



**USAID/mission or bureau name  
Instructions for environmental  
review of activities under the XXX project**

**Note**

These instructions accompany the "Environmental Review Form for XXX Project Activities." Follow, but DO NOT SUBMIT, these instructions.

**Who must submit the Environmental Review Form?**

All organizations applying to implement activities on the XXX Project must complete the "Environmental Review Form" form UNLESS the project or activity is carried out to address an emergency (e.g., international disaster assistance). *Emergencies are determined by the US Ambassador or USAID, not by the applicant.*<sup>1</sup>

**Importance**

The proposed activity cannot be approved and no "irreversible commitment of resources" can be made until the environmental documentation, including any mitigation measures, is approved by the Mission Environmental Officer (MEO). Approval by other authorities in USAID may also be required.

NOTE: USAID may request modifications, or reject the documentation.

If the activities are found to have significant adverse impacts, a full Environmental Assessment must be conducted.

---

<sup>1</sup> See 22 CFR §216.2(b)(1). Most activities carried out under emergency circumstances are considered EXEMPT from USAID environmental procedures, except for the procurement or use of pesticides

**Step 1. Provide requested "Applicant information"** (Section A of the form)

**Step 2. List all proposed activities**

In Section B of the form, list all proposed activities. Include all phases: *planning, design, construction, operation & maintenance*. Include ancillary activities. (These are activities that are required to build or operate the primary activity. Examples include building or improving a road so that heavy vehicles can reach the project site, excavation of fill material or gravel for construction, provision of electricity, water, or sewage facilities, disposal of solid waste, etc.)

**Step 3a. Screening: Identify low-risk and high-risk activities**

For *each* activity you have listed in Section B of the form, refer to the list below to determine whether it is a listed low-risk or high-risk activity.

If an activity is specifically identified as "very low risk" or "high risk" in the list below, indicate this in the "screening result" column in Section B of the form.

<p align="center"><b>Very low-risk activities</b> (Activities with low potential for adverse biophysical or health impacts; including §216.2(c)(2))</p>	<p align="center"><b>High-risk activities</b> (Activities with high potential for adverse biophysical or health impacts; including §216.2(d)(1))</p>
<p>Provision of education, technical assistance, or training. (Note that activities directly affecting the environment, do not qualify.)</p> <p>Community awareness initiatives.</p> <p>Controlled agricultural experimentation exclusively for the purpose of research and field evaluation confined to small areas (normally under 4 ha./10 acres). This must be carefully monitored and no protected or other sensitive environmental areas may be affected).</p> <p>Technical studies and analyses and other information generation activities not involving intrusive sampling of endangered species or critical habitats.</p> <p>Document or information transfers.</p> <p>Nutrition, health care or family planning, EXCEPT when (a) some included activities could directly affect the environment (construction, water supply systems, etc.) or (b) biohazardous (esp. HIV/AIDS) waste is handled or blood is tested.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of water points for domestic household use, shallow, hand-dug wells or small water storage devices. Water points must be located where no protected or other sensitive environmental areas could be affected.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> USAID guidance on potable water requires water quality testing for arsenic, coliform, nitrates and nitrites.</p> <p>Construction or repair of facilities if total surface area to be disturbed is under 10,000 sq. ft. (approx. 1,000 sq. m.) (and when no protected or other sensitive environmental areas could be affected).</p> <p>Support for intermediate credit arrangements (when</p>	<p>River basin or new lands development</p> <p>Planned resettlement of human populations</p> <p>Penetration road building, or rehabilitation of roads (primary, secondary, some tertiary) over 10 km length, and any roads which may pass through or near relatively undegraded forest lands or other sensitive ecological areas</p> <p>Substantial piped water supply and sewerage construction</p> <p>Major bore hole or water point construction</p> <p>Large-scale irrigation</p> <p>Water management structures such as dams and impoundments</p> <p>Drainage of wetlands or other permanently flooded areas</p> <p>Large-scale agricultural mechanization</p> <p>Agricultural land leveling</p> <p>Procurement or use of <u>restricted use</u> pesticides, or wide-area application in non-emergency conditions under non-supervised conditions. (Consult MEO.)</p> <p>Light industrial plant production or processing (e.g. sawmill operation, agro-industrial processing of forestry products, tanneries, cloth-dyeing operations).</p> <p><b>High-risk and typically not funded by USAID:</b></p> <p>Actions determined likely to significantly degrade protected areas, such as introduction of exotic plants or animals</p> <p>Actions determined likely to jeopardize threatened &amp; endangered species or adversely modify their habitat</p>

**DISCUSSION DRAFT 10Feb03 • USAID Env Review Form for subprojects • 3/8**

<b>Very low-risk activities</b> (Activities with low potential for adverse biophysical or health impacts; including §216.2(c)(2))	<b>High-risk activities</b> (Activities with high potential for adverse biophysical or health impacts; including §216.2(d)(1))
<p>no significant biophysical environmental impact can reasonably be expected).</p> <p>Programs of maternal and child feeding conducted under Title II of Public Law 480.</p> <p>Food for development programs under Title III of P.L. 480, when no on-the-ground biophysical interventions are likely.</p> <p>Studies or programs intended to develop the capability of recipients to engage in development planning. (Does NOT include activities directly affecting the environment)</p> <p>Small-scale Natural Resource Management activities for which the answer to ALL SUPPLEMENTAL SCREENING QUESTIONS (attached) is "NO."</p>	<p>(esp. wetlands, tropical forests)</p> <p>Conversion of forest lands to rearing of livestock</p> <p>Planned colonization of forest lands</p> <p>Procurement or use of timber harvesting equipment</p> <p>Commercial extraction of timber</p> <p>Construction of dams or other water control structures that flood relatively undegraded forest lands</p> <p>Construction, upgrading or maintenance of roads that pass through relatively undegraded forest lands. (Includes temporary haul roads for logging or other extractive industries)</p>

(This list of activities is taken from the text of Regulation 216 and other applicable laws, regulations and directives)

**Step 3b: Identifying activities of unknown or moderate risk.**

All activities NOT identified as "very low risk" or "very high risk" are considered to be of "unknown or moderate risk." Common examples of moderate-risk activities are given in the table below.

Check "moderate or unknown risk" under screening results in Section B of the form for ALL such activities.

<b>Common examples of moderate-risk activities</b>	
<p><b>CAUTION: If ANY of the activities listed in this table may adversely impact (1) protected areas, (2) other sensitive environmental areas, or (3) threatened and endangered species and their habitat, THEY ARE NOT MODERATE RISK. All such activities are HIGH RISK ACTIVITIES.</b></p>	
<p>Small-scale agriculture, NRM, sanitation, etc. <u>define what is meant by "small-scale" for each project.</u></p> <p>Controlled and carefully monitored agricultural experimentation exclusively for the purpose of research and field evaluation of MORE than 4 ha.</p> <p>Moderate scale construction or rehabilitation of facilities or structures <u>surface area to be disturbed exceeds 10,000 sq. ft. (1,000 sq meters) but funding level is \$200,000 or less.</u></p> <p>Construction or rehabilitation of rural roads meeting the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Length of road work is less than ~10 km</li> <li>▪ No change in alignment or right of way</li> <li>▪ Ecologically sensitive areas are at least 100 m away from the road and not affected by construction or changes in drainage.</li> <li>▪ No protected areas or relatively undegraded forest are within 5 km of the road.</li> </ul> <p>Food for Development programs under Title II or III, involving small-scale infrastructure with the known potential to cause environmental harm (e.g., roads, bore holes).</p> <p>Quantity imports of commodities such as fertilizers.</p> <p>Technical studies and analyses or similar activities that could involve intrusive sampling, of endangered</p>	<p>Construction or rehabilitation of small-scale water points or water storage devices for domestic or non-domestic use. (Covers activities NOT included under "Very low risk activities" above.)</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> USAID guidance on water quality requires testing for arsenic, nitrates, nitrites and coliform bacteria.</p> <p>Support for intermediate credit institutions when indirect environmental harm conceivably could result.</p> <p>Institutional support grants to NGOs/PVOs when the activities of the organizations are known and may reasonably have adverse environmental impact.</p> <p>Small-scale use of USEPA-registered, least-toxic general-use pesticides. Use must be limited to NGO-supervised use by farmers, demonstration, training and education, or emergency assistance.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Environmental review (see step 5) must be carried out consistent with USAID Pesticide Procedures as required in Reg. 16 [22 CFR 216.3(b)(1)].</p> <p>Nutrition, health care or family planning, if (a) some included activities could directly affect the environment (e.g., construction, supply systems, etc.) or (b) biohazardous healthcare waste (esp. HIV/AIDS) is produced, syringes are used, or blood</p>

Common examples of moderate-risk activities	
<b>CAUTION: If ANY of the activities listed in this table may adversely impact (1) protected areas, (2) other sensitive environmental areas, or (3) threatened and endangered species and their habitat, THEY ARE NOT MODERATE RISK. All such activities are HIGH RISK ACTIVITIES.</b>	
species or critical habitats. (Includes aerial sampling.)	is tested.

#### **Step 4. Determine if you must write an Environmental Review Report**

Examine the “screening results” as they are entered in Table 1 of the form.

- If ALL the activities are “very low risk,” then no further review is necessary. In Section C of the form, check the box labeled “very low risk activities.” Skip to Step 8 of these instructions.
- If ANY activities are “unknown or moderate risk,” you MUST complete an ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REPORT addressing these activities. Proceed to Step 5.
- If ANY activities are “high risk,” note that USAID’s regulations usually require a full environmental assessment study (EA). Because these activities are assumed to have a high probability of causing significant, adverse environmental impacts, they are closely scrutinized. *Any* proposed high-risk activity should be discussed in advance with USAID.

In some cases, it is possible that effective mitigation and monitoring can reduce or eliminate likely impacts so that a full EA will not be required. If the applicant believes this to be the case, the Environmental Review Report must argue this case clearly and thoroughly. Proceed to Step 5.

#### **Step 5. Write the Environmental Review Report, if required**

The Environmental Review Report presents the environmental issues associated with the proposed activities. It also documents mitigation and monitoring commitments. Its purpose is to allow the applicant and USAID to evaluate the likely environmental impacts of the project.

For moderate risk activities, the Environmental Review Report is typically a SHORT 2–3 page document. The Report will typically be longer when (1) activities are of higher or unknown risk, and (2) when a number of impacts and mitigation measures are being identified and discussed.

The Environmental Review Report follows the outline below:

- A. **Summary of Proposal.** Summarize background, rationale and outputs/results expected. (reference to proposal, if appropriate).
- B. **Description of activities.** For all moderate and high-risk activities listed in Table 1 of the form, succinctly describe location, siting, surroundings (include a map, even a sketch map). Provide both quantitative and qualitative information about actions needed during all project phases and who will undertake them. (All of this information can be provided in a table). If various alternatives have been considered and rejected because the proposed activity is considered more environmentally sound, explain these.
- C. **Environmental Situation & Host Country environmental requirements.** Describe the environmental characteristics of the site(s) where the proposed activities will take place. Focus on site characteristics of concern—e.g., water supplies, animal habitat, steep slopes, etc. With regard to these critical characteristics, is the environmental situation at the site degrading, improving, or

stable? In this section, also describe applicable host country environmental regulations, policies and practices.

- D. Evaluation of Activities and Issues with Respect to Environmental Impact Potential.** Include impacts that could occur before construction starts, during construction and during operation, as well as any problems that might arise with abandoning, restoring or reusing the site at the end of the anticipated life of the facility or activity.

Explain direct, indirect, induced and cumulative effects on various components of the environment (e.g., air, water, geology, soils, vegetation, wildlife, aquatic resources, historic, archaeological or other cultural resources, people and their communities, land use, traffic, waste disposal, water supply, energy, etc.)

- E. Environmental Mitigation Actions (including monitoring).** Provide a workplan and schedule identifying the following:

**Mitigation measures.** Identify the means taken to avoid, reduce or compensate for impacts. (For example, restoration of borrow or quarry areas, replanting of vegetation, compensation for any relocation of homes and residents.) If standard mitigation or best practice guidance exists and is being followed, cite this guidance.

**Monitoring** Indicate how mitigation measures will be monitored to ensure that they accomplish their intended result. If some impacts are uncertain, describe the monitoring which will be conducted to identify and respond to these potential impacts.

**Responsible parties.** Identify *who* will undertake mitigation and who will conduct the monitoring, and at what frequency.

- F. Other Information.** Where possible and as appropriate, include photos of the site and surroundings; maps; and list the names of any reference materials or individuals consulted.

(Pictures and maps of the site can substantially reduce the written description required in parts B & C)

### **Step 6. Based on the environmental review, reach a recommended determination for each high-risk or unknown/moderate-risk activity**

For each high-risk or unknown/moderate-risk activity, the environmental review will help you decide between one of three recommended determinations:

- **no significant adverse impacts.** The activity in question will not result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. Special mitigation or monitoring is not required. Typically, this conclusion is not appropriate for high-risk activities.
- **no significant adverse impacts given specified mitigation and monitoring** With mitigation and monitoring as specified in the Environmental Review Report, the activities in question will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.
- **significant adverse impacts.** The activities in question is likely to cause significant adverse environmental impacts and cannot be mitigated with best practices or other measures. A full environmental assessment will be required.

**DISCUSSION DRAFT 10Feb03 - USAID Env Review Form for subprojects - 6/8**

For each high-risk or unknown/moderate-risk activity, indicate your “recommended determination” in Section B of the form.)

**Step 7: Summarize recommended determinations**

In section C of the form, summarize your recommended determinations by checking ALL categories indicated in Table 1.

**Step 8. Sign certifications** (Section D of form)

**Step 9. Submit form to USAID project officer**

Attach Environmental Review Report, if any.



**USAID/mission or bureau name:  
Environmental Review Form for **XXX**  
Project Activities**

**Note: Follow, but do not submit, the attached instructions.**

**A. Applicant information**

Organization	Parent grant or project
Individual contact and title	Address, phone & email (if available)
Proposed activity (brief description)	Amount of funding requested
Location of proposed activity	Start and end date of proposed activity

**B. Activities, screening results, and recommended determination**

Proposed activities (continue on additional page if necessary)	Screening result (Step 3 of instructions)			Recommended Determinations (Step 6 of instructions. Complete for all moderate/unknown and high-risk activities)		
	Very Low Risk	High-Risk*	Moderate risk or unknown*	No significant adverse impact	With specified mitigation, no significant adverse impact	Significant Adverse Impact
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						

\*These screening results require completion of an Environmental Review Report

**C. Summary of recommended determinations** (check ALL that apply)

<b>The proposal contains. . .</b>	<i>(equivalent Regulation 216 terminology)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Very low risk activities	<i>categorical exclusion(s)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> After environmental review, activities determined to have <b>no significant adverse impacts*</b>	<i>negative determination(s)*</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> After environmental review, activities determined to have <b>no significant adverse impacts, given specified mitigation and monitoring*</b>	<i>negative determination(s) with conditions*</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> After environmental review, activities determined to have <b>significant adverse impacts*</b>	<i>positive determination(s)*</i>

\*for these determinations, the form is not complete unless accompanied by Environmental Review Report

**D. Certification:**

I, the undersigned, certify that:

1. the information on this form is correct and complete
2. the following actions have been and will be taken to assure that the activity complies with environmental requirements established for this Project:
  - Those responsible for implementing this activity have received training in environmental review AND training and/or documentation describing essential design elements and best practices for activities of this nature.
  - These design elements and best practices will be followed in implementing this activity.
  - Any specific mitigation or monitoring measures described in the Environmental Review Report will be implemented in their entirety.
  - Compliance with these conditions will be regularly confirmed and documented by on-site inspections during the activity and at its completion.

(Signature) \_\_\_\_\_

(Date) \_\_\_\_\_

(Print name) \_\_\_\_\_

**BELOW THIS LINE FOR USAID USE ONLY**

**Clearance record**

USAID Project Officer	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			
USAID MEO	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			
USAID REO*	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			
USAID BEO*	(print name)	(signature)	(date)
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance given			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance denied			

\*REO and BEO approval required for all "high risk" screening results and for determinations of "significant adverse impacts"

**Note: if clearance is denied, comments must be provided to applicant**

**Note to individuals adapting this form for use on a particular project:**

- This supplement is oriented around major resource/issue clusters and asks "leading questions" about the actual potential for unintended harmful impacts of CBNRM/ECOTOURISM activities.
- Underlined/Highlighted text **MUST** be modified to reflect project and mission name.
- Questions should be modified to respond to the needs of individual projects. This is intended to be a "living" document subject to adaptation.

**DELETE THIS BOX BEFORE MODIFYING/DISTRIBUTING THIS FORM**



**USAID/mission or bureau name**  
**Supplemental screening questions for**  
**natural resources activities under the XXX**  
**project (or program)**

**Purpose**

This is a supplement to the "Instructions for Environmental Review under the XXX project." It is to be used for natural resources-based activities, including:

- Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)
- Ecotourism
- Natural resources-based enterprise development with micro- and small enterprises

This supplement provides additional questions to ascertain whether these proposed activities should be categorized as "very low risk:"

- If the answers to ALL the questions that follow are "NO," then the proposed CBNRM or Ecotourism activity is considered "very low risk."
- If the answer to ANY question is "YES," the activity CANNOT be considered "very low risk."

**Screening questions**

Will the activities...	YES	NO
<b>Natural Resources</b>		
Accelerate erosion by water or wind?		
Reduce soil fertility and/or permeability?		
Alter existing stream flow, reduce seasonal availability of water resources?		
Potentially contaminate surface water and groundwater supplies?		
Involve the extraction of renewable natural resources?		
Lead to unsustainable use of renewable natural resources such as forest products?		

## DISCUSSION DRAFT

Will the activities...	YES	NO
Involve the extraction of non-renewable natural resources?		
Restrict customary access to natural resources?		
Reduce local air quality through generating dust, burning of wastes or using fossil fuels and other materials in improperly ventilated areas?		
Affect dry-season grazing areas and/or lead to restricted access to a common resource?		
Lead to unsustainable or unnecessarily high water extraction and/or wasteful use?		
<b>Ecosystems and Biodiversity</b>		
Drain wetlands, or be sited on floodplains?		
Harvest wetland plant materials or utilize sediments of bodies of water?		
Lead to the clearing of forestlands for agriculture, the over-harvesting of valuable forest species?		
Promote in-forest bee keeping?		
Lead to increased hunting, or the collection of animals or plant materials?		
Increase the risks to endangered or threatened species?		
Introduce new exotic species of plants or animals to the area?		
Lead to road construction or rehabilitation, or otherwise facilitate access to fragile areas (natural woodlands, wetlands, erosion-prone areas)?		
Cause disruption of wildlife migratory routes?		
<b>Agricultural and Forestry Production</b>		
Have an impact on existing or traditional agricultural production systems by reducing seed availability or reallocating land for other purposes?		
Lead to forest plantation harvesting without replanting, the burning of pastureland, or a reduction in fallow periods?		
Affect existing food storage capacities by reducing food inventories or encouraging the incidence of pests?		
Affect domestic livestock by reducing grazing areas, or creating conditions where livestock disease problems could be exacerbated?		
Involve the use of insecticides, herbicides and/or other pesticides?		
<b>Community and Social Issues</b>		
Have a negative impact on potable water supplies?		
Encourage domestic animal migration through natural areas?		
Change the existing land tenure system?		
Have a negative impact on culturally important sites in the community?		
Increase in-migration to the area?		
Create conditions that lead to a reduction in community health standards?		
Lead to the generation of non-biodegradable waste?		
Involve the relocation of the local community?		
Potentially cause or aggravate land-use conflicts?		

## **Technical Changes to the ANE Environment Website**

July–December 2005

Prepared by The Cadmus Group, Inc.

---

### **Website conversion and additions**

The ANE Environment website was converted website from Cold Fusion to ASP.Net technology. The conversion allowed many of the pages and functionality of the site to be consolidated into single pages, reducing code duplication and making site administration and editing much more efficient. The conversion involved porting the server-side programming to the .Net platform by replacing the dynamic .cfm (Cold Fusion) pages with .aspx (.Net) pages, and re-writing the code to duplicate and streamline the existing functionality. These changes were made in tandem with major changes to the database structure. The website has been deployed to two places: a staging server where edits are made and reviewed prior to making them live and a production server where the live site resides.

### **Database conversion and normalization**

The existing database was converted to SQL Server format, and normalized to improve data integrity, and to streamline the editing process when editing data and uploading documents for the website. For example, instead of typing in the names of countries, program types, etc for each record, a list of countries, program types, etc is maintained in the database and each record is associated with items from the list. This process helps avoid duplicates, misspelled entries, etc, and also helps maintain the accuracy of searches from the search page.

### **Administration page**

A password-protected administration page was created that allows an administrator to add and edit activity records, upload documents, and maintain the lists of countries, program types, etc. When the changes are reviewed and approved as ready for deployment, the changes are deployed via an automated script that quickly transfers the content to the live site.

### **Additional website changes**

In addition to normalizing the information about activity records, a new system of storing information about documents associated with activity records was created, allowing multiple document types and file formats to be selected when adding or editing documents through the administration page. For example, rather than being limited to PDF and Word formats, other file formats can be added as well. The same is true for document types: new types can be added in addition to the previously existing ETD and IEE types. The lists of formats and types are maintained through the administration page. The search functionality was changed to allow a search on any of the criteria from the same page, instead of being limited to one search criteria at a time.

### **Site Modifications**

Bureau Environmental Officers tracker information, received from Barney Popkin and Julie Fossler, was uploaded into the database system and deployed to the live site. All

corresponding documents (Initial Environmental Examination, Environmental Threshold Decision, etc.) were also uploaded.

In addition, the photograph that appears on the home page was replaced with a picture from a more recent course, which took place in Cairo in early 2005.

#### **Training Page Modifications**

The training page was rearranged so that more recent course information appears at the top of the page. Africa Bureau-related materials were moved toward the bottom of the page. A new page was created to display the PowerPoint presentations that were given during the Integrated Pest Management and Safer Pesticide Use training that took place in Jordan on September 25-28, 2005. The new page, [http://www.ane-environment.net/Training/IPM\\_Amman\\_Jordan/amman.htm](http://www.ane-environment.net/Training/IPM_Amman_Jordan/amman.htm), is linked to the training page. The PowerPoint presentations that were uploaded include:

- IPM of Cereal and Food Legume Insect Pests in North Africa, West and Central Asia
- Overview of Course and Why it is required by USAID: Regulation 216 Introduction
- What are the POPS and PIC initiatives?
- What is safe pesticide use and how can it help reduce harm in ANE region?
- Pesticide hazards classifications, registration
- Safe pesticide transport, handling, storage, mixing, use, and cleanup
- The EurepGAP initiative
- Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Overview as USAID Policy, including Cultural, Mechanical, Biological, Genetic, Natural Product, and Regulatory Means for ANE The Economic cost of Pesticide
- Pesticides in USAID Projects: Environmental Requirements and Considerations
- Medical aspects of poisoning and First Aid—first-hand experience of a health clinic doctor
- Insect Vectors of Arboviruses, Rickettsia, Protozoa and Bacteria diseases of people and livestock
- Pesticides and bees
- Integrated Vector Management (IVM) Overview for Major Near-East Pests, Malaria and bednets
- Toxicology and environmental fate of pesticides
- PERSUAPs as a tool toward environmental compliance for USAID and project partners
- Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides, Enormity of the Problem
- Success Story in Integrated Pest Management

### **Other Issues Addressed**

A temporary Web site was created to address problems (now solved) that were encountered at the time by USAID representatives on temporary duty in Afghanistan. Access to BEO information and related documents were made available through this Web site at <http://www.cadmusdev.com/ANEDocs/Barney/>.

The documents that were uploaded correspond to the following activities:

### **AFGHANISTAN**

- 05-03 Bagrami Industrial Park , Kabul Province , Afghanistan , Environmental Assessment ( EA)
- 05-197 A Thriving Economy Led by the Private Sector
- 05-198 Agro-Meteorological (Agromet) Data Project
- 05-199 Strategic Objective (SO4) Synergistic Use of Linkages and Tools to Support Cross-Program Components
- 05-200 Vertical Structure Construction/ Renovation – Power Sector Program
- 05-204 Power Sector Program – Construction of Sheberghan Gas-Fired Power Plant
- 05-207 A Democratic Government with Broad Citizens' Participation
- 05-217 Afghan Primary Education Program

### **EAST ASIA and SOUTH ASIA**

- 05-176 Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System (IOTWS) Program

### **EAST TIMOR**

- 05-222 Special Objective (SpO) 472-006, Improved Health of the Tim orese People, Especially Women and Children at Greatest Risk
- 05-223 Strategic Objective (SO) 472-005, Key Foundation of Governance Strengthened
- 05-224 Consortium for Elections and Political Process Strengthening (CEPPS) – National Electoral Support and Local Governance
- 05-225 Public International Organization (PIO) Grant, United Nations Development Program (UNDP)/ Institutional Capacity Development Support (ICDS)

### **EGYPT**

- 05-167 Healthier Planned Families (HPF), Activity Approval Document (AAD) Amendment No. 2
- 05-201 Secondary Cities Project (SCP, 263-0236)
- 05-209 Egypt Utilities Management Results Package (EUM, 263-0270)
- 05-236 Financial Sector Modernization Program (FSMP), Competitive Environment for Investment (CEI) Second Amendment to the Activity Approval Document

### **INDIA**

- 05-205 Operational Lighthouse (OPL) Project
- 05-206 Quality Education and Skills Training (QUEST) Activity
- 05-208 Indian Business Alliance in Water
- 05-210 Trafficking Prevention, Joblessness and Multi-Fiber Agreement (MFA) Termination
- 05-211 Inter-faith Religious Leaders Forum (IRLF)

## **INDONESIA**

- 05-124 Reconstruction of Banda Aceh to Meulaboh Road, Indonesia , in Response to the South East Asia Tsunami of December 26, 2004 , Record of Decision (ROD) for Scoping Statement for Environmental Assessment (EA)
- 05-154 Support for the Development and Production of a Culturally Tailored Indonesian Version of Sesame Street
- 05-155 Livelihood Support for Disaster-Affected and Local Communities in Nangroe Aceh Darusallam (NAD)/ International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- 05-156 Managing Basic Education (MBE)
- 05-157 Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) 1: More Effective Decentralized Education Management and Governance
- 05-158 Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) 2: Improving the Quality of Teaching and Learning
- 05-213 STI (Sexually Transmitted Infection)/ HIV (Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus)/ AIDS (Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome)
- 05-214 Malaria, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Maternal Neonatal and Child Health (MNCH) Program

## **LEBANON**

- 05-235 Small Villages Wastewater Treatment Systems Project for the Upper Litani River

## **NEPAL**

- 05-219 Special Objective (SO) 8, Promoting Peace through Improved Governance and Incomes in Targeted Areas

## **PHILIPPINES**

- 05-130 SO12, Conflict Reduced in Mindanao and Other Areas Vulnerable to Violence
- 05-212 Strategic Objective (SO) 4, Management of Productive Life-Sustaining Natural Resources Strengthened: Environmental Media and/or Human Health Potentially Impacted

## **RDMA**

- 05-202 Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Biodiversity Conservation Program
- 05-203
  - 1) Improving Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services for Urban Poor
  - 2) Improving Urban Air Quality
  - 3) Promoting Environmental Governance and Transboundary Cooperation

## **WEST BANK/GAZA**

- 05-137 Al Badhan-Al Far'a- Tubas Road Environmental Assessment (EA), Record of Decision (ROD)
- 05-161 Sustaining Health Inforum Achievements and Further Development
- 05-162 Partnership for Expanded Access to Quality Maternal and Neonatal Health Care for Palestinian Women and Infants
- 05-220 Phase II Public Outreach Program
- 05-221 Youth Empowerment Project
- 05-237 Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) – Occupied Palestinian Territory
- 05-243 Feasibility Study for the West Bank-Gaza Link

## **YEMEN**

- 05-218 United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Strengthening National Capacity in Human Rights