USAID FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE | Africa Bureau

Environmental Management Workshop for USAID Africa Bureau Staff: MEOs, CTOs, SO Team Leaders, and PDOs

USAID Environmental Procedures and Mainstreaming Environmental Considerations in Development Programs

WORKSHOP REPORT

Hosted by USAID's Regional Center for Southern Africa
Cosponsored by USAID/RCSA, USAID/REDSO and AFR/SD
Kasane, Botswanta
May 17-20, 2005

Cover Photo

Chobe River, Botswana (May 2005). Weston A. Fisher, The Cadmus Group, Inc.

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **i**

LIST OF ACRONYMS ..... **iii**

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES **1**

INTRODUCTION **2**

WORKSHOP SUMMARY **3**

LESSONS LEARNED **4**

SAMPLE COMMENTS: 5
SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS: 5

DAILY SUMMARY **6**

DAY ONE SUMMARY 6
DAY TWO SUMMARY 8
DAY THREE SUMMARY 10
DAY THREE (CONT'D) – WRAP-UP PRESENTATIONS 14
DAY FOUR SUMMARY 15

ACTION PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION **18**

BUILDING AWARENESS 18
HOW TO OBTAIN INCREASED USAID STAFF COMMITMENT AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE VALUE OF USAID ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES 18

ACTION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MISSION SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE **20**

LEGAL AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FUNCTION **23**

WORKSHOP EVALUATION **25**

SAMPLE COMMENTS: 25
SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS: 25
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM KEITH KLINE, NRM PROGRAM MANAGER 26

SPECIAL TOPICS **27**

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE 27
PUBLIC/PRIVATE ALLIANCES: SEE FAQ SHEET IN SOURCEBOOK 27
SPECIAL TOPIC: USAID SUDAN FIELD OFFICE & NEW SUDAN'S NEEDS 27

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS: SUMMARY NOTES **28**

DAY 1: WHY DOES USAID HAVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES AND HOW DO I RESPOND? 28
DAY 2: ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES AS STRATEGIC SUPPORT 38
DAY 3: CHALLENGING ESD ISSUES AND HOW TO DEAL WITH THEM AS AN MEO OR SOT MEMBER -- FOCUSING ON THE *SPIRIT* OF REG. 216 42
DAY 4: ADDRESSING CHALLENGING ESD ISSUES AS AN MEO OR SOT MEMBER: FOCUSING ON THE *SPIRIT* OF REG. 216 (CONTINUED) 47

ANNEXES **A-1**

ILLUSTRATIVE MISSION ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER (MEO) WORK OBJECTIVES & ELEMENTS: REVISED & UPDATED OCTOBER 2004 ..... A-1
WORKSHOP AGENDA A-5
PARTICIPANTS A-10

Acknowledgments

The course organizers wish to acknowledge a number of important contributors to the Environmental Management Workshop for USAID Staff, including the active support of Ms. Dawn Thomas, Acting Mission Director, USAID RCSA, and her participation in the course.

Several course participants enriched the course program by providing interesting presentations. Erika J. Clesceri, Ph.D., a USAID AAAS Fellow and Environmental Specialist with the Disaster Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) Bureau's Food for Peace Office, provided a succinct and well-received talk on *USAID Food for Peace Environmental Management of Loud and Silent Disasters.* Bob Buzzard of USAID/Kenya put together an informative set of slides on a very practical, real-world application of ground-level environmental screening and environmental review reporting for a project in northern Kenya entitled *"Economic Support Funds in an SO Framework – The Sera Conservancy."* Nantamu Nightingale, NRM Program Specialist of USAID/Uganda, spoke on the *Potential Environmental Impacts associated with Cotton Demonstration Plots bordering Uganda's Queen Elizabeth National Park.* Jody Stallings, NRM Team Leader and MEO, USAID/Uganda, provided an innovative case study on the development of baseline for assessing environmental impacts from *"Environmental Changes in northern Uganda as a result of the 'Lords Resistance Army (LRA) Conflict."* Michael Chase, a wildlife researcher based in Botswana, was invited by Keith Kline (USAID/RCSA) to speak on his fascinating work on transboundary movement of elephants tracked by satellite across Zambia, Botswana, Angola and Namibia.

In addition, we wish to recognize with gratitude, several individuals who helped make the case study visits successful and instructive. Hayley Adamski, an African Wildlife Foundation researcher, prepared an excellent background piece – *the Chobe Riverfront cumulative impact review case site description*. Gosiame Neo-Mahupeleng, AWF Project Officer, directing AWF's Large Predator Research program, provided important background documents on environmental issues and environmental impacts associated with development in Chobe District and around Kasane. Mbathera Samakena, Vector Controller, Department of Environmental Health, Northwest District Council, helped set up the case site visit to the pesticide store of the Northwest District Council as well as the visits to the Kasane sewage treatment ponds.

Deserving special thanks is Mbathera's supervisor, Mr. MacDonald Sambo, who as Environmental Health Officer for the North West District Council's Department of Environmental Health, provided key background documents on the District's future development as well as alternative landfill sites for Kasane. Mr. Sambo also approved Mbathera's voluntary participation as a case site facilitator.

Kobus Mostert, General Manager, Chobe Farms and Dairies in Kasane, made himself available to meet with the participants after work hours on the farm and was very open in discussing environmental issues affecting his operations, providing the farm's pesticides store as a an additional case site module.

We also benefited from the frankness and hospitality of Agrippa Mbulawa, Deputy General Manager of Cresta Mowana Safari Lodge who guided us on a tour of the Mowana Lodge grounds and the lodges environmental issues and efforts to mitigate them.

Session Moderators included: Wes Fisher (The Cadmus Group), Jody Stalling (USAID/Uganda), Camilien Saint-Syr (USAID/RCSA), Walter Knausenberger (USAID/REDSO), Erika Clesceri (USAID/DCHA/FFP), Jim Walsh (USAID Sudan Field Office), Ephantus Wahome (REDSO/ESA) and Keith Kline (USAID/RCSA).

Notetakers included Ian Kline of the Cadmus Group, Ginger Waddell (USAID/RCSA), Nico Tchamu (USAID/DRC), David Mutazindwa (USAID/Uganda), Keith Kline (USAID/RCSA), Josefa Gomes (USAID/Angola), Bob Buzzard (USAID/Kenya), Sheila Roquitte (USAID/South Africa), and Candace Buzzard (USAID/Zimbabwe, now USAID/REDSO).

Appreciation is expressed to Ian Kline, Vice President (now President) of the Cadmus Group, for consolidating the workshop minutes.

The Mowana Lodge General Manager, Mr. John Gray, graciously accepted a lunchtime invitation to speak to the attendees on the current cumulative impacts of hotel and lodge operations on the Chobe Riverfront, particularly Mowana's own impacts and the limits of acceptable change that may affect both wildlife behavior and visitor experience in the Park and on the river. Mr. A. Lebonetse, District Wildlife Coordinator for Chobe National Park also provided an informative luncheon presentation to the group on the Limits of Acceptable Change within the Park and on the Chobe River Front.

We also extend special thanks to Ms. Alison Notley on behalf of the RAPID/Chemonics project, who provided cheerful and steady logistics coordination for the course, with additional assistance from Florence Chaunga (RAPID/Chemonics, Gaborone) and Dorcus Masego Mooketsi, RCSA/RPIO Administrative Assistant.

Walter I. Knausenberger, Ph.D.
Senior Regional Environmental Advisor
U.S. Agency for International Development
Regional Economic Development & Services Office (REDSO/ESA)
P.O. Box 629, Village Market
00621 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel. (+254-20) 862 2000, direct 862-2267 Fax: (+254-20) 862 2682 /3
E-mail: waknausenberger@usaid.gov & WIJK@aol.com
Cell: (+254) (0) 733 896 956
www.usaidredso.org

Camilien Jean W. Saint-Cyr
Regional Environmental Advisor
U.S. Agency for International Development
Regional Center for Southern Africa (RCSA)
Plot 14818 Lebatlane Road
P.O. Box 2427
Gaborone, Botswana
Tel. Direct (+267) 363-1404, Fax: (+267) 392-4404
Cell: (+267) 713-200-51
E-mail: csaint-cyr@usaid.gov
http://www.usaid-rcsa.org

Weston A. Fisher
Principal
The Cadmus Group
57 Water Street
Watertown, MA 02472
o: 617.673.7114 (direct)
o: 617.673.7000 (general)
cell: 978.239.1063
fax: 617.673.7001
www.cadmusgroup.com

List of Acronyms

AAD	Activity Approval Document
ADS	Automated Directives System (USAID's Directives Management Program)
AEC	Agency Environmental Coordinator
AEF	Annual Evaluation Form
AFR/SD	USAID Bureau for Africa/Sustainable Development
ANE	USAID's Asia and the Near East Bureau
APHIS	United States Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
APS	Annual Program Statememt
BEO	Bureau Environmental Officer
BMP	Best Management Practice
CE	Categorical Exclusion
CS	Cooperating Sponsor
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer
DAP	Development Activity Program
DCA	Development Credit Authority
DCHA/OFDA	Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance/Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
DCHA/OTI	Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance/Office of Transition Initiatives
DRP	Development Relief Programs
EA	Environmental Assessment
EGAT	Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade Bureau
EGSSAA	Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP	Environmental Management Plan (also Mitigation and Monitoring Plan)
ENCAP	**EN**vironmentally Sound Design and Management **CAP**acity for USAID Partners and Programs in Africa
ENRM	Environmental Natural Resource Management
EP	Emergency Programs
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EPTM	Environmental Procedures Training Manual
ESDM	Environmentally Sound Design and Management
ESR	Environmental Status Report
EU	European Union
EUREGAP	Euro-Retailer Workgroup for Good Agricultural Practice
EXO	Executive Officer
FAA	United States Foreign Assistance Act
FFP	Food for Peace
FHI	Food for the Hungry International
FSN	Foreign Service National
GC	General Council
GCC	Global Climate Change
GDA	Global Development Alliance
IAIA	International Association for Impact Assessment
IDI	International Development Intern
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination (Reg 216 term for a preliminary assessment)
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IRBM	Integrated River Basin Management
ISEAL	International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labeling
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
M&M	Mitigation and Monitoring

MEO	Mission Environmental Officer
MSE	Micro- and Small Enterprise
MYAPs/ SYAPs	Multi Year Assistance Program/ Single Year Assistance Program
NEP	New Entry Professional
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
O&M	Operation & Maintenance
PDO	Program Development Officer
PEA	Programmatic Environmental Assessment
PERSUAP	Pesticide Evaluation Report and Safer Use Action Plan
PIN	Presidential Initiatives
PMP	Performance Management Projects
PSC	Personal Services Contractor
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
RALF	Recommended Acceptable Language and Formats
RCO	Regional Contracts Officer
RCSA	Regional Center for Southern Africa
REA	Rapid Environmental Assessment
REDSO/ESA	USAID Regional Economic Development Support Office for East and Southern Africa
Reg 216	22CFR216, USAID's basic environmental procedures regulation
REO	Regional Environmental Officer
REQMS	Regional Environmental Quality Management Support
RFA	Request for Application
RFP	Request for Proposals
RLA	Regional Legal Advisor
RSSA	Resources Support Services Agreement
SAR	Strategic Activity Report
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SFO	Sudan Field Office
SIP	Sudan Infrastructure Program
SO	Strategic Objectives
SOAG	Strategic Objective Agreement
SOT	Strategic Objective Team
SPHERE	Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response and Interaction
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDH	USAID Direct-Hire
WARP	West African Regional Program
WFP	World Food Program
WRI	World Resources Institute
WTO	World Trade Organization

Workshop Objectives

The objectives of this workshop were to help USAID staff to:

1. Better understand and apply USAID Environmental Procedures (22 CFR 216, ADS 204), and documentation and review requirements.
2. Design and implement environmentally sound activities to improve program and project sustainability.
3. Assess reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts and mitigate and monitor to minimize adverse impacts and design errors.
4. Review how USAID procedures are to be applied in the context of evolving host country policies and emerging private sector practice in environmental impact assessment (EIA) and environmentally sound design and management.
5. Consider answers to the questions: "How can environmentally sound design processes be strengthened within our Missions and the Agency?" and "What are some state-of-the-art approaches to mainstreaming environmental considerations into USAID regional and bilateral programs?"
6. Discuss capacity building needs, options and approaches.
7. Review new approaches to knowledge management and their potential application to Agency and Mission responsibilities to promote environmentally sound design.

Introduction

The Environmental Management Workshop for USAID Staff: MEOs, CTOs, SO Team Leaders, PDOs on USAID Environmental Procedures and Mainstreaming Environmental Considerations in Development Programs was held at the Mowana Lodge in Kasane, Botswana, 17–20 May 2005. This 4-day course was attended by 17 staff members, most from East and Southern Africa Missions. A second workshop is planned for West and Central Africa Missions for early 2006.

This document provides a summary of the workshop content and the follow-up Action Plan Recommendations. Readers are invited to go to the Web site www.encapafrica.org/MEO_Course/index.htm for the full set of materials used in the course and the complete set of workshop minutes. We believe the course materials on the Web site constitute a very useful reference for Mission Environmental Officers and Mission staff who are convinced that environmentally sound design and management (ESDM) and USAID environmental procedures need to be more fully integrated into the USAID program cycle to improve program and project design and the long-term success of USAID interventions.

Workshop Summary

Improved application of environmentally sound design processes. Over the 4 days, participants were given background information on their responsibilities and instruction in how to engage their **entire Mission staff** in improving sustainability assurance for the Mission's programs and projects by systematically applying environmentally sound design and management (ESDM) methodology under USAID's Environmental Procedures.

The workshop began with an introduction to environmentally sound design, key concepts in environmental impact assessment (EIA), and information requirements and tools used in EIA. Participants were then briefed on USAID Environmental Procedures, and later they took part in a practice exercise in environmental screening. The course leaders reviewed current deficiencies in mitigation, monitoring, and follow-up and suggested approaches to addressing these problems through the development of effective Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). They also emphasized the use of the Environmental Procedures Training Manual (EPTM) for the preparation of environmental documentation.

Field-based training. The practice exercise gave participants first-hand experience in conducting environmental reviews. They formed three teams, each focusing on a different set of activities. One team reviewed the Kasane solid waste dumpsite and alternatives for a new landfill site. Another team addressed the Kasane sewage treatment ponds and the need for their expansion. The third team examined the pesticide stores for the District vector control unit and a nearby farm where vegetables and fruit are grown. After visiting their assigned sites, the teams prepared IEE outlines for the proposed new activities. The outlines were presented and critiqued in a plenary session of the workshop. Afterwards, the teams developed mitigation and monitoring plans (also known as environmental management plans, or EMPs) for the proposed new activities.

Special Topics. The course touched on a wide range of critical environmental issues facing Missions and on the sources of information and support available to address those issues. Among the issues discussed were biosafety and biotechnology, water quality testing, rapid environmental assessment in emergencies, the SPHERE Environmental Standards for Humanitarian Assistance, and HIV/AIDS and the environment. Sources of information and support included the new guidance for Title II programs (MYAPs/SYAPs), the Bureau's Recommended Acceptable Language & Formats (RALF) for Environmental Documentation, Style Tips, *The Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa*, and IPM/Pesticides and Pesticide Evaluation Reports and Safer Use Action Plans (PERSUAPs).

Emerging Issues. The workshop drew attention to important trends and new initiatives which the Agency needs to support and capitalize upon, including: corporate environmental and social responsibility as a competitiveness strategy; trade, environment, and the WTO; public/private alliances including the Global Development Alliance (GDA); Development Credit Authority (DCA); Private Environmental and Social Management Standards; ISO 14001; Euro-Retailer Workgroup for Good Agricultural Practice (EUREGAP); International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labeling (ISEAL); Medium/Small/Micro-enterprise Cleaner Production; Financial Intermediation and Environment; USAID Environmental Review of Multilateral Development Banks; State-USAID Joint Strategic Planning Implications; The Millennium

Challenge Corporation; Environmental Justiceand Advocacy; and Presidential Initiatives.

Improving Integration of USAID Environmental Procedures in Program/Activity Cycle and Environmental Mainstreaming. This portion of the course covered MEO and Mission staff responsibilities in greater depth. It proposed a *Regional Environmental Quality Management and Support Service* vehicle to help Missions improve their ESDM capacity and the effective application of USAID environmental procedures to increase program and project sustainability and reduce potentially costly errors.

Lessons Learned

Logistics. Don't hold such workshops in venues that are as tricky to get to as Kasane, potentially involving up to five different visas and too many options and opportunities for confusion in actually getting there. This caused quite a few people to drop out at the last minute.

Training style: content of the course material. This training showed that more emphasis needs to be placed on the use of dynamic interaction methods. Out-of-class learning methods (actual issues in field visits) are much more valuable than being seated in class talking about the Reg. 216 issues, although some time naturally is needed to deliberate and report out.

Team work. Trainers/resource persons needed to work better as a team. Opportunities to involve participants were not maximized, but those contributions that were made by participants were highly valued by the group.

Best Practices. More time is needed for participants to share best practices of all sorts, from technical interventions to integration of ESDM in USAID internal management. It is especially valuable to tap the experience of the CTOs and the PDOs who are not MEOs. Erica Clesceri's presentation was well received because it was particularly succinct and responded to an actual situation and needs in Title II programming and Rapid EA.

Two-part workshops – beginner and advanced. One overarching recommendation from the group is to conduct two separate trainings in one: the first 2 days for those who haven't been exposed to 22CFR216 and a second, more in-depth training for more advanced MEOs or Environmental Natural Resource Management (ENRM) officers.

Proportion of funds for environmental mitigation and monitoring. Overall Project Monitoring and Evaluation costs are higher than for Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring. A rule of thumb of 5 to 15 percent for project M & E is generally considered acceptable. There is no "right" answer, but the preponderance of advice and experience suggests this range is reasonable. Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring costs vary, but are typically only 1 to 10 percent of total project costs. If costs for Mitigation and Monitoring rise above 10 percent, it may be wise to consider project or program redesign.

Developing local ESDM support services for Missions and Partners. Strong support was expressed for providing these services for improved quality assurance in the preparation of USAID environmental documentation by Missions and Partners and especially to ensure effective implementation and follow-up for Environmental Management Plans (i.e., mitigation and monitoring).

Action Plan Recommendations. This session was devoted to obtaining recommendations from the participants on short-term and longer term steps that might be taken to enhance environmentally sound design in Mission programs and projects. The action items presented during the session were recorded on a flip chart. Action items also were solicited through a Mission self-assessment questionnaire. The results are appended here, followed by a summary of

topics and comments made during each day.

Workshop Evaluation. The workshop received an overall score of 3.7 out of 5.0 for "How would you assess the overall quality of the course content" and 4.0 out of 5.0 for "Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment." The scores were highly variable; some participants were very pleased with the course content, while others criticized the amount of material presented, especially in the sourcebook, and the limited time for participants to ask questions or to interact with one another. [Participants ranged from those new to the MEO role, to highly experienced E/NRM officers; optimally meeting the expectations of both is always a challenge. Eds.]

Sample Comments:

How would assess the overall quality of the course content?

- Well done. It was a good idea to have an open forum. With the materials, consider requiring participants to bring a laptop…so you can put the white binder into a CD and only hand out the EPTM and agenda, thank you.
- It is clear there's been a lot of work in course preparation. Suggest fewer sub-topics – more prioritization. A free time for scheduling extra topics of sharing of good NRM practices
- Excellent training team. Great participant involvement. Dialogue on improving agency practices very fruitful and relevant.
- The training & reference materials are outstanding; thanks for the CDs. I feel more time could be devoted to analysis of sectoral IEEs – comparing best examples with those, which, although approved, are of lower quality.

Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment.

- Very good, mostly helped me with understanding USAID processes for environmental assessment and gave me an action list for getting our systems in shape in USAID/Sudan
- Introduced topic of non-DA coverage also sense of range of issues.
- Had not had a sense of lack of compliance being a problem. Dah!
- Vastly improved understanding of process and sequence. This dialogue should be continued.

Suggested Improvements:

- Make it more succinct.
- Field visits good.
- There should be more than one course for ENV training (one in basic MEO responsibilities and bureaucratic procedures; one more advanced for ENV people and those who have received the basic course.
- Some of the presentations, especially day 1, were very general.
- Time management, especially Day 1, morning was not well managed.
- Agenda changes, while adaptive management is important, it seemed excessive at times.
- Course Planning: Pre-course instructions were confusing, contradictory & responses to questions were slow and not complete.

- Could be greatly improved:
  - Too much 'talking at' participants, especially given the high caliber of the group. — Too much paper and material used/wasted
  - Sets very poor example of minimizing and mitigating environmental impacts.
  - Networking with others is most valuable part. However, this workshop was terribly designed and extremely constrained opportunities for productive networking. - Breaks must be a minimum of ½ hour.
  - Evenings must be free for participants to organize socially.

DAILY SUMMARY
Tuesday–Friday, May 17–20, 2005

Day One Summary

Camilien Saint-Cyr welcomed all participants to the workshop and introduced Dawn Thomas, Acting Mission Director, USAID, RCSA, who addressed the group.

Next, the training facilitators and all participants introduced themselves and provided short summaries of their backgrounds.

The principal topics discussed at the workshop follow. Rather than duplicate the extensive notes presented in the Workshop Notes section, we have highlighted a few of the questions and comments discussed on each day in order to provide the reader with a concise view of the proceedings.

Presentation: "Environmentally Sound Design and Management"

- Stakeholder involvement can be very valuable in establishing baseline conditions, narrowing in on the most significant environmental issues, and developing a commitment to EIA follow-up and to implementation of mitigation and monitoring (i.e., Environmental Management Plans).

- Stakeholder involvement tends to be limited in IEE preparation, although it is highly desirable. However, there are explicit mandatory requirements for stakeholder involvement in a formal scoping and comment process prior to the initiation of environmental assessments.

Case study examples of environmentally unsound design

- Providing incentives to reforest can have an undesired effect. Putting incentives in place without defining the land to be reforested can give people an incentive to cut down trees in forested areas so that they can get money to reforest. This is an example of not thinking far enough ahead.

- In Zimbabwe there are food-for-work programs, and one activity was a small dam. USAID

didn't supply materials for the dam, but did supply food. Because the dam was poorly conceived, designed, and constructed, it created a number of problems. There is no spillway, and goats and kids often use the same areas of the reservoir, which results in clear public health concerns. The dam also causes significant erosion problems. This is an example of stakeholder/community consensus on need that didn't lead to the right solution. Everyone in the community agreed they needed water, but the idea they implemented was not a good one.

Presentation: "Economic Support Funds in an SO Framework: The Sera Conservancy"

- Robert Buzzard provided an informative presentation on a practical, real-world application of lower level environmental screening and environmental review reporting.

Presentation: "Information Requirements and Tools for Screening and Preliminary Assessment"

- Checklists jog our memories to help us consider a full set of direct and indirect impacts and potential mitigation measures. However, checklists can create "tunnel vision."

- Matrices (e.g., the Leopold matrix in table 4.4 of the *Environmental Procedures Training Manual* [EPTM]) are useful in linking activities to potential impacts in a clear fashion that allows the ranking of priority impacts requiring mitigation. But matrices are only one of many tools and approaches.

- Network diagrams are useful for showing interrelationships among activities and impacts in a spatial form, but they may oversimplify complex situations.

- Maps, overlays and geographic information systems help EIA specialists understand activities and impacts spatially. They also are quite useful to EIA reviewers.

Presentation: "Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring"

- Effective mitigation and monitoring can be achieved by tying specific mitigation and monitoring measures to contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements through the RFA and RFP process and by making them part of the specific contract requirements. The more specific the recommended measures the better, including the accompanying budgetary requirements. Implementation reviews of these environmental management plans (EMPs) can be tied to annual work plan reviews. Also key to EMP effectiveness is specifying exactly who will be responsible for mitigation and monitoring and how it will be accomplished.

- Typically, EIA mitigation and monitoring should be about 1 percent of total project cost, but this amount varies with the complexity and significance of impacts. If costs exceed 10 percent, it may be wise to consider redesigning the project or program.

Presentation: "Title II Guidelines"

- What is the SYAP/MYAP Process? [The Food for Peace Office's new food aid proposal process for emergencies (Single Year Action Proposal) and development food aid (Multi-year Action Proposal)]

- Why does Title II have its own environmental status report (ESR) process?

Background Briefing: Limits of Acceptable Change in Chobe National Park and on the Chobe Riverfront

During lunch on Tuesday, Day One, the group received a background briefing from Mr. A. Lebonetse, District Wildlife Coordinator, Chobe National Park, on the Limits of Acceptable Change within the Park and on the Chobe River Front as outlined in the *Management Plan for Chobe National Park (Draft 2001)* and with special reference to the Chobe Riverfront Management Plan.

Day Two Summary

Presentation: "22 CFR 216—A Brief Walkthrough"

- It is important to be familiar with the host country environmental review process. Regulation 216 gives us the flexibility to conform to local country requirements.

- How do USAID environmental procedures apply to Global Development Alliance (GDA) programs?

Review Questions: Mitigation and Monitoring

Issue: What proportion of funds should go to environmental mitigation and monitoring?

Overall Project Monitoring and Evaluation costs are higher than for Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring. A rule of thumb of 5 to 15 percent for project M & E is generally considered acceptable. There is no "right" answer, but the preponderance of advice and experience suggests this range is reasonable. Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring costs vary, but are typically only 1 to 10 percent of total project costs. If costs for Mitigation and Monitoring rise above 10 percent, it may be wise to consider project or program redesign.

Group Case Site Review: Chobe Riverfront Lodge Development: Cumulative Impact Assessment

On Day Two Mr. John Gray, Mowana Lodge General Manager, gave a luncheon presentation on the current cumulative impacts of hotel and lodge operations on the Chobe Riverfront, particularly Mowana's own impacts and the limits of acceptable change that may affect both wildlife behavior and the visitor experience in the Park and on the river.

Case Site Walk of Mowana Lodge:

After lunch on Day Two, the group was given a tour of the Mowana grounds by Agrippa Mbulawa, the deputy general manager. The group was asked to assess the environmental impacts associated with the existing operations and to suggest possible mitigation strategies. These are summarized below.

A simple matrix was used to list activities associated with design, construction, and operation of a new lodge on the Chobe River Front (using Mowana's as an example of likely activities and their associated impacts). The group focused on three activities that might have the most significant adverse impacts:

Activities / Environmental Parameters	Soil	Water	Land	Health	Aesthetics
Construction					
1) Wood use	X	X	x	none	X
2) Clearing	M	M	M+	none	L or B
Disposition of construction waste	S	M	M	x	S
Operation					
1) Solid waste disposal	L	L	L	L+	L+
2) Sewage/wastewater disposal	L	L	L	L+	L
3) Provision of water	X	M	S	none/B	none
4) Maintenance of golf course	S	S	S	S	S/B

Note: x=unknown, S=small potential adverse impact, M=medium potential adverse impact, L=large potential adverse impact, B=beneficial impact

Case Site Visits (Wednesday afternoon, Day Two)

The participants were organized into three case-site teams. Although all the teams visited the same sites, each of the three teams focused on a different set of issues.

One team concentrated on solid waste disposal and the new Kasane-Kazangula landfill development to replace Kasane's existing open dump. The Design and Construction Consultancy for the Kasane Landfill Feasibility Report EH/02/99, prepared by Burrow and Binnie for the Botswana Northwest District Council, was referred to in the examination of potential alternatives to the current open dump.

A second team focused on the Kasane Sewage Treatment Plant, its existing impacts, and its future expansion.

The third team concentrated on the Chobe District Health Vector Control Program and on the Chobe Farm's storage and use of pesticides.

During the dinner on Day Two, Keith Kline introduced Michael Chase, who gave a slide presentation on transboundary movement of elephants that are tracked by satellite ranging across Botswana, Namibia, Angola, and Zambia.

Day Three Summary

On Thursday, Day Three, the teams developed EIA and EMP outlines based on what they had observed in the field. The results of this exercise were presented in plenary session.

Case Site Team Assessment: District Council Vector Management

IPM/Pesticides Team

Ginger Waddell
Candace Buzzard
Daniel Mutazindwa
Jim Walsh
Jody Stallings

Facilitators: Walter Knausenberger
Mbathera Samakena, vector controller, Department of Environmental Health, North West District Council

District Council Vector Management Store Room and Pesticide Use

Activities	Impacts	Mitigation
Storage of spray crew gear	• Pesticide containers, sprayers not segregated from bedding, tents, generators and other travel equipment/materials	• Protective gear, bedding and other personal gear should be stored elsewhere • Security company has key
Storage Room	• Lack of ventilation has health impacts • Room attached to office building	• Crack windows to allow air flow • Find storage in self-standing building
	• Health of Workers	• Find new Separate Storage • Provide proper disposal budget • Signs up for proper disposal of residuals
Operations, Physical	• Contamination of clothing • Contamination of lungs	• Regular washing of protective gear • Single use and disposal of gloves and masks • Regular testing of staff
Operations, Chemical	• Kerosene used for vector control on water bodies – not approved – only for paint • Use of a powerful insecticide to kill bats in homes	• Use IPM alternative or less toxic and appropriate chemical for bat control • Training to be strengthened, provide latest techniques

Activities	Impacts	Mitigation
Spraying, Interior Residual - old technology for bed net treatments (barrels of pesticide)	• Adverse heath impacts on vector control staff • Potentially severe impacts on residents	• Provide appropriate training • Training in proper use of protective gear
Disposal	• Bats, containers, masks are a hazard and are probably disposed of at open dump sites	• Burn bats • High-temperature incineration

Mowana Lodge Pesticide Use

Activities	Impacts	Mitigation
Storage	• Health	• Segregate Chemicals
	• Health (wildlife, human) ▪ Storage area locked? ▪ Multiuse Room ▪ Risky Chemical – • Fertilizers on ground near area	• Hotel to provide signs advising on correct disposal • Store under lock and key
Operation, Physical	• Health • Reported protective gear – no masks	• Appropriate training and protective gear, • Application and use of backpack sprayers
Operation, Chemical	• Probable impacts on human health • Inappropriate chemical choice-Malathion • Probable impacts on biodiversity • Probable contamination of Chobe River	• Appropriate training of hotel workers in appropriate IPM/Pesticide storage, application and disposal • Minimize runoff
Disposal	• Health (human and wildlife) • Collection? Disposal?	• Procedures in place for disposal, instruction signs up, monitoring to ensure proper disposal

Chobe Farms Pesticide Use

Activities	Impacts	Mitigation
Storage	• Heath	• Segregates chemicals • Stored under lock and key Cleaned up for visit • Ventilation • Provides warning signs • Needs signs advising on correct storage and disposal
Operation, Physical	• Probable impacts on human health • Reported protective gear – no masks • Apparently application personnel remove the protective gear in fields	• Appropriate training and protective gear for special cadre of workers • Application and use of backpack sprayers
Operation, Chemical	• Health • Inappropriate chemical choice—Paraquat—acutely toxic herbicide easily misused • Probably impacts on biodiversity • Possible contamination of Chobe River. Potential chemical impacts on riverfront • No apparent consideration of IPM	• Appropriate training of workers in pesticide storage, application and disposal • Treat orchards and vegetable crops based on scouting/monitoring, not regularly scheduled treatment • Minimize runoff • Consider IPM alternatives
Disposal	• Government picks up and then? • Collection? Disposal?	• Procedures in place for disposal, instructions signs up, monitoring to ensure proper disposal

Case Site Team Assessment: Kasane Sewage Treatment Pond Expansion: Sewage Pond Expansion (doubled size by 2010)

<u>Sewage Treatment Ponds Team</u>

Tchamou Nicodeme
Robert Buzzard
Aminita N. Badiane
Sheila Roquitte
Kim Robinson
Camilien Jean W. Saint-Cyr

Facilitators: Keith Kline
Ian Kline

Alternatives:

1. No action
2. Rehabilitate/expand existing facility

Activities	Impacts	Mitigation
Sewage pond treatment Land control/tenure/access	• Untreated Sewage in the Chobe River ▪ (HIGH RISK TO Health and ENV) migration to urban areas • Land use change – disturbing wildlife corridor – Disturbing traffic demand – decrease air quality	• Alternative 1. N/A • Alternative 2. ▪ Sustainable management of the facility – users pay for service) ▪ Water quality testing device installed to determine health risk ▪ Better water management – ▪ Ensuring O&M – Develop sound business plan – Capacity building for local govt (Tech Op + Financial Management ▪ Use of BMPs – Water conservation reuse – Better systems to improve water quality ▪ Build a constructed wetland – Enhance full wildlife corridor – ▪ upgrade road access to ponds - ▪ Educational Visitor's Center (wildlife viewing) ▪ Better vector control – IPM principles adopted

Threshold Decisions
1 – Cat. Ex. →Training – TA- Business plan development – Project design
2 – ND/Conditions → construction activities
Road improvement – improving wildlife corridor

Case Site Team Assessment: Development of New Kasane Landfill

Kasane Landfill Site Team
Josefa Gomes Mateus
Martins Jose Agosto
Zoelimalala Remanase
Nightingale Nantamu

Facilitators: Wes Fisher
Ephantus Wahome

Three alternatives were considered by the team:
1. No action (considered unacceptable)
2. Location of new landfill 200m to 500m beyond the Kasane sewage treatment ponds.
3. Convert the existing open dump site into a landfill.

Activities	Impacts	Mitigation
Operation Rubbish disposal	• Health, odor, eyesore	• Communication with community on need to address problem • Address inefficiencies and misuse of funds Raise the rates for garbage collection • Regular burning (?) • Training of bulldozer and disposal personal • Push in & cover waste site with bulldozer
	• Adverse effects on wildlife health and migration corridor	• Electric fencing, standard fencing does not withstand elephants • Explore other natural fencing alternatives
	• Loss of potentially useful materials	• Source separation • Training community garbage pickers

Monitoring: To be carried out by local representatives.

Decisions
Categorical Exclusions: training of garbage pickers and waste disposal personnel
Negative Determination: Source separation and recycling
Negative Determination with Conditions: See mitigation above
Positive Determination: Site selection
Beneficial impacts: Reduced health risks, odors, eyesore, reduced health risks to wildlife, reduced interference with wildlife corridors.

Conclusion: The Team selected conversion of the existing dump site as the preferred alternative

Day Three (cont'd) – wrap-up presentations

Pesticides

- Regulations apply to any assistance for "procurement or use," a very broad definition that includes credit and guarantees.

- Integrated Pest Management should be used whenever practical. When the use of pesticides is anticipated in a USAID program or project, a Pesticide Evaluation Report and Safer Use Action Plan (PERSUAP) must be prepared.

- "Exemptions" are not applicable to assistance for all aspects of procurement or use of pesticides. Although under Reg. 216 there are "exceptions" for the use of pesticides in emergencies, they should not be used as loopholes. Safer use practice should still be applied.

- Pesticides should be the choice of last resort and, when pesticides are needed, the least toxic approach should be used.

Presentation: Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) (slides will be in final CD)

- An REA consolidates and prioritizes environmental issues under emergency conditions based on level of threat to life, welfare, and the environment.

- For REAs, timing is more important than perfection. REAs provide the initial information that will help inform subsequent IEEs. They help to avoid problems subsequent projects would have to fix. They prioritize issues and avoid unintended consequences.

- An REA can take anywhere from hours to a few weeks to prepare.

- SPHERE Standards (guidelines and best practices) for disasters can be valuable. They include standards for water/sanitation, food, shelter, health, etc., in multiple languages.

Over lunch, USAID/Uganda's Nightingale Nantamu gave a background presentation on the potential environmental impacts associated with Cotton Demonstration Plots bordering Queen Elizabeth National Park.

USAID/Uganda's Jody Stalling gave a presentation on the development of a baseline for assessing environmental impacts from "Environmental changes in northern Uganda as a result of the 'Lord's Resistance Army (LRA)' Conflict.

Day Four Summary

Environmental Review

- Lower level environmental reviews for subprojects aren't always the best way to determine the mitigating conditions. For example, it's not always best to do screening on wells when clear guidance on wells is already available. Environmental review is best used when there are no design or management guidelines for a particular activity.

- The screening process should provide a paper trail to show that a review has been done and to demonstrate how it links to the IEE. The MEO is responsible for signing off on

environmental review reports and for ensuring that activity managers and partners are implementing recommended environmental management (mitigation and monitoring) plans. Environmental review reports do not need to be seen by the Bureau Environmental Officer, unless they identify a potentially high-risk "significant" adverse impact.

Mission Orders

- Example: Environmental Mission Order for Zambia interprets ADS 204. This is a good way for the MEO to clearly articulate the responsibilities of Mission staff in applying USAID's environmental procedures to the sustainable design of projects and programs. It can be used as the focal point for short Mission staff training sessions. The schematic on page 11 is a starting point for MEOs to convey what needs to be done by SO teams.

Mission Environmental Officer (MEO) Appointment Letters

- Helpful in orienting the MEO to specific work objectives and responsibilities and to the MEO's relationship to the responsibilities of Activity Managers, CTOs, and SO Teams. A set of *Illustrative Mission Environmental Officer (MEO) Work Objectives & Elements* are appended to this report as a reminder of MEO responsibilities versus Mission responsibilities.

Brainstorming on Integrating Environmental Considerations into our Program

- What's the best approach?

- Develop a list of activities that that CTOs can take on themselves, reinforced by the MEO and REO. The Mission Order should incorporate those responsibilities and strengthen that thought process.

- Is the MEO part of the SO Team? No, but the MEO should be in direct dialogue with every SO team to guide them in meeting their ADS responsibilities and to help them prepare their IEEs.

- No "one size fits all," but most MEOs will have special expertise relative to one or two SOs. They should be part of those SO teams, but not of every SO team. They should engage in dialogue with other SO teams. (In Uganda, it wouldn't work to have the MEO be part of SO teams. What would work would be for someone to come to Uganda to give briefings and make it mandatory for the whole Mission to participate.) The activity road map is difficult to follow, but the CTO manual has its own map, and we should probably show how and where USAID environmental procedures and considerations apply on the CTO map.

- This is an opportunity to introduce the concept of the core and extended SO team.

- What we're hearing from all of these comments is the need for short in-Mission training for all Missions.

- You should circulate a syllabus for that short course to all of these participants to get their feedback.

- Succinct text, good graphics, and good visuals should get these issues across in less than an hour. It's a matter of somebody sitting down and actually doing it.

- We need to make it compelling and accessible.

Market-led Environmental Performance – non-regulatory standards, certification, etc.

- WTO can be a major driver in environmental improvement (e.g., dolphin-safe nets).

- Example of a hotel business operation: In northern Mozambique, the establishment of a National. Park spurred development of lodges, etc. that are important to the new economy. However, environmental impacts must be addressed. Isle de Mozambique is a world heritage site of high cultural significance, but sanitation problems have stopped development of this area (where the beaches are used as toilets), hindering tourism. Public sector and private sector concerns intersect on this issue. Only a national body can create standards and put in place effective regulatory controls and incentives.

- Voluntary certification and standards are useful. For example, the voluntary EPA ENERGYSTAR program labels the energy requirements of various tools, equipment, etc. and sets energy efficiency standards that are aggressive yet technically feasible. Creates market for new products; workshop-based development.

Environmental Policy Dialogue: Which Missions are tracking environmental policy issues?

- **Senegal:** Certification in private sector for European standard; APHIS; lots of discussion; Are US APHIS advisors aware of the European standards? Not capitalizing on existing certification systems.

- **Zimbabwe:** Land reform; wildlife; Zimbabwe Environmental Lawyers Association — advocacy from WRI; lessons learned from land reform; ongoing natural resources forum.

- **Kenya:** Streamlining environmental practices; environmental guidelines for districts.

- **Madagascar:** Monitoring environment; titanium exploration, should have done EAs; 0.4 percent profit back to environment.

- **Regional:** Trade, transportation corridors, etc.

Workshop Closing (Module 13 – Wrap up)

The workshop concluded with an Action Planning session, participant post-test, submission of Mission self-assessment questionnaires, and completion of course evaluation forms. These materials are summarized in the final workshop report.

Action Planning Recommendations from the Open Forum Discussion

Building Awareness

1. Find the points of penetration, "pulse points" in USAID business practice.
2. Strategic Objectives' planning, achieving, and learning requirements can serve as a vehicle.
3. Define the individuals who should be responsible.
4. Do the homework and package the message. (Make it short, short!!)
5. Get influential professionals to deliver the message on responsibility; managers set the tone!
6. Where do we get the budget for this? Build into Procurement Plans.
7. Need better tools to address the perennial struggle to convince others of the importance of USAID environmental procedures as a design tool for sustainability assurance.
8. How to do we get the Message out – need to develop a strategy. A bit of a "Barnum & Bailey" approach is needed.
9. Develop concise concept piece(s).

How to obtain increased USAID staff commitment and understanding of the value of USAID environmental procedures[1]

1. Obtain a slot at Mission Directors' Conferences.
2. One-hour trainings.
3. CTO Trainings.
4. Be careful who you hire — high motivation and experience are key.
5. Better internal communication, clarity.
6. Leadership — Mission Director involved.
7. Provide Model Documents.
8. Provide sample IEEs in various sectors.
9. Develop model contract Language.
10. Develop model RFP Language.
11. Develop model RFA Language.
12. Create easy checklists.
13. Improve NEP Training .
14. MEO and CTO Guidebook (But don't overwhelm them with too much material) Guidebook—body of things MEO must do—so that we don't need to reinvent the wheel. There used to be a PDO Guidebook. As a PDO I (Dawn) had my own toolkit, which I still use.

[1] Developed independently at the workshop as a presentation by participant and RCSA RLA Kim Robinson. See full Proceedings report.

15. Increase Program Officer knowledge.
16. Check-listing to ease remembering “pulse points.”
17. Reach more of the staff.
18. Engage the non-technical people on what their responsibilities are.
19. Remember different levels of percent time engagement are needed for different staff.
20. Pull out IEE reminders.
21. Remember to take advantage of individual commitment to sound environmental design, the “heart” factor.
22. A committed Program Development Officer can be the key to success.
23. Locally hired staff need to be trained in environmental issues and natural resource management.
24. Think about incentives, i.e., provide the motivation to not make a mess.
25. Reward/Awards matter.
26. Empower FSNs and be aware of their key importance to the Mission Env/NRM Program.
27. Showcase examples.
28. Effective communication through slides, pamphlets, short “nuggets.”
29. Provide model documents and apply/add to the Recommended Acceptable Language and Formats “RALF.”
30. One-day CTO Training — Buy-in from Missions. Do the same thing for staff training in USAID environmental procedures and environmentally sound design.

Action Plan Recommendations from Mission Self-Assessment Questionnaire: Suggested next steps to enhance Mission capacity in environmental management and program sustainability as drawn from Operating Unit and Mission Self-Assessment of Capacity in Environmentally Sound Design and Management (ESDM)

Introduction

The following suggested next steps to enhance Mission capacity in environmental management and program sustainability are drawn from Operating Unit and Mission Self-Assessment of Capacity in Environmentally Sound Design and Management (ESDM) administered during the Workshop.

They reflect growing recognition that USAID project environmental failures and costly remediation of design errors are not uncommon to USAID development interventions. Much greater attention to sustainability assurance is called for from Senior Mission and Africa Bureau management, Mission Environmental Officers and Mission staff through ESDM and systematic application of USAID's Environmental Procedures. The recommendations strongly support a new thrust in the application of ESDM to USAID programs and projects.

Action Plan Recommendations

1. **Prepare and implement Environmental Mission Orders.** Sample Mission Orders for Environmental Compliance and Management are available http://www.encapafrica.org/MEO_Course/Module11--Prog_and_Activity_Cycle_Integration/ZambiaEnvCompMissionOrderdraft-12-2-03wik.pdf, but innovation and tailoring to specific Mission needs are encouraged.

2. **Establish a simple screening/review/monitoring system**, with a simple **guidebook, for all contractors and grantees**. Sudan Field Office comments: [SFO will] pay careful attention to **highest risk activities** such as road and dikes work; Sudan Infrastructure Program (SIP) construction management; electrification; water and sanitation.

3. **Form a Mission Environmental Review Committee** with representatives from different offices/SO Teams.
   - Reg. 216 committee established by the MEO.
   - Hold regular meetings of the committee, and develop a **timeline** for what's to be done.

4. Raise Mission staff awareness on the relevance and importance of environmental management issues:
- MEO should meet frequently with SO Teams on program design, implementation, and monitoring.
- Develop and provide MEO Guidebook, a toolkit that should help anyone in the office apply ESDM principles, meet mandatory environmental compliance requirements, and provide sustainability assurance monitoring.

5. **Provide training of Mission Staff and partners:** Need to **tailor basic training** on environmental compliance and considerations for **Mission Activity managers** and **CTOs.** This would in turn empower them to demand compliance and accountability on environmental issues from partners who implement activities.

- ENCAP **training** events for **staff** and **partners**.
- Provide "spot training" for staff, followed by sit-down sessions with SO teams and EXO/contracting staff.

5. **Provide training** like this more often.

- Organize trainings to provide technical expertise to people who deal with environmental issues, such as ENCAP's Cleaner Production for MSEs, Pesticide Evaluation and Safer Use Action Plans, etc.

6. **Have REA give Reg. 216** presentation **to entire mission**, just like the RLA and RCO do at least once a year.

7. **Prepare an MEO appointment letter**, with support from Mission Director, and distribute to REA and BEO.
   - Mission Director empowers and monitors MEO performance.
   - Supervisors incorporate MEO roles in Work Plan, Performance Criteria.

8. **Budget for Environmental Capacity Development**: Obtain Mission commitment to:
   - Budget for environmental training and related capacity building (including ENCAP Compliance and ESDM sectoral best practice training, e.g., cleaner production for MSEs, etc.) at least every 2 years.
   - Ensure budgeting for ESDM training and capacity development is incorporated in annual procurement plans.

9. **Seek opportunities for effective advocacy to senior management groups**. Include well-crafted advocacy piece on ESD&M in Mission Director, Regional, and Program Officers' Conferences:
   - Develop a **1-slide/1-hour /1-day suite of training for Mission Director/Senior Management**, program/activity managers, and others.
   - Tailor to specific audiences.

10. **Integrate environmental soundness values into decision-making processes at USAID**. Add ESD&M and compliance review as an **agenda item** in post-award briefings, **portfolio reviews**, and **status reports** by **CTOs**.

11. **Promote and incorporate "green procurement" processes and policy** for acquisitions and assistance contracts/procurement staff, including working with CTOs and activity managers to develop evaluation criteria where appropriate for environmental considerations:
    - Include Environmental Compliance considerations in APSs, RFAs, RFPs, etc.
    - Ensure MEO has copies of all IEEs for all SO Teams, and that CTOs/activity managers know and understand the essential content of the IEEs.

12. **Include more environmental considerations in NEP and IDI training, (e.g.,** Planning, Achieving & Learning (PAL), CTO training, supervision, etc.) and Foreign Service Officer's training.

13. **Support and capitalize upon m<u>arket-led environmental performance, non-regulatory standards, certification,</u> corporate environmental and social responsibility trends.** Where appropriate, do so as a part of competitiveness strategy; trade, environment, and the WTO; public/private alliances including the Global Development Alliance (GDA), and the like.

14. **Recognize importance within the Agency of maintaining technical expertise and performance in "Environment."** Provide annual awards and recognition opportunities for outstanding MEO and Mission staff performance in ESDM.

15. **Develop list of "Steps I as MEO will take** over the next few months following the workshop," such as:
    - Brief PDO office on actions needed (and timing).
    - Team up with Mission staff responsible for ensuring gender requirements are followed.
    - Brief Senior staff and all SO teams.
    - [See lists below]

16. **Develop pilot demonstration programs on environmentally sound practices**. For example, for "energy saving," "wetland management," ecologically sound tourism, or other unique programs that show how ESDM results can be achieved at lower cost through ESDM and cleaner production education, communication, and public participation, etc.

Legal and Policy Considerations for Environmental Review Function: Outline of Presentation by Kim L. Robinson, Regional Legal Advisor, RCSA

I. The problem
   A. No compliance
   B. Minimum compliance
   C. Environmental issues not integrated into activity design and implementation

II. The solution
   A. No single bullet
   B. Incremental change: it will not happen overnight, but let's begin in earnest
   C. Multi-faceted: by many people, in many ways, everyday
   D. Simultaneously
      i. One person's job – need a point person, champion, accountability
      ii. And everyone's job – like gender, ethics, core values: we all have to do it

III. Concrete ways forward
   A. Good intent is insufficient
   B. Some options
      i. Quick trainings: one hour long
         1. For missions
         2. A mission directors' conference
         3. A NEP training
         4. A program officers conference
         5. A CTO training
         6. Get folks in a conference room and just ask them to read ADS 204 and the relevant sections of ADS 201& 202.
            a. Do not present; let folks read and then be available for questions and discussion.

      ii. Be careful who we hire
         1. W need people who can and will own the rules
         2. Technical skill without the ability to own and apply the rules and is not very helpful
         3. We need people who can write, conceptualize, communicate outside their technical area, keep files, apply administrative skills, work a bureaucracy

      iii. Better communication among and between teams

      iv. Clarity of roles and responsibilities: folks need to know who does what, when

      v. Leadership: try to get the Mission Director on board

      vi. AEF accountability: a performance measure

vii. Put model documents (for example, a sample Initial Environmental Examination) on Web sites for everyone's use

viii. Urge people to own the regulatory documents: whether they are assistance checklists, pre-obligation checklists, Initial Environmental Examinations: folks must treat them as living documents to be used, applied, and complied with.

ix. Post award conferences with USAID partners

x. Regional Environmental Officers to give an annual training

xi. On-the-spot award for those who integrate environmental considerations in design and implementation

xii. FSN staff: empower them, leverage this key source of institutional memory

xiii. Strike the correct balance between: environmental compliance and integration is not another horrible regulatory hurdle *and* it is also not as easy and unthinking as a box check.

- This is very hard. We want it easy enough so people do it. But not so easy that only the bare minimum is done.

- Need to make it easy for people to do the right thing. By easy = streamlined. Right thing = more than a box check.

- How to make it easy
    - Systems are only as good as the people using them (see III B ii above).
    - Easy checklists
    - Mission Orders (but they can also become shelf furniture like Initial Environmental Examinations)
        i. design
        ii. approval
        iii. environmental procedures
    - Create an easy guidebook

Workshop Evaluation

The workshop received an overall score of 3.7 out of 5.0 for "How would you assess the overall quality of the course content" and 4.0 out of 5.0 for "Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment." The scores were highly variable; some participants were very pleased with the course content, while others criticized the amount of material presented, especially in the sourcebook, and the limited time for participants to ask questions or to interact with one another.

Sample Comments:

How would assess the overall quality of the course content?

- Well done. It was a good idea to have an open forum. With the materials, consider requiring participants to bring a laptop…so you can put the white binder into a CD and only hand out the EPTM and agenda, thank you.

- It is clear there's been a lot of work in course preparation. Suggest fewer sub-topics – more prioritization. A free time for scheduling extra topics of sharing of good NRM practices

- Excellent training team. Great participant involvement. Dialogue on improving agency practices very fruitful and relevant.

- The training & reference materials are outstanding; thanks for the CDs. I feel more time could be devoted to analysis of sectoral IEEs – comparing best examples with those, although approved, are of lower quality.

Please rate and comment on the extent to which this course improved your understanding of environmental assessment.

- Very good, mostly helped me with understanding USAID processes for environmental assessment and gave me an action list for getting our systems in shape in USAID/Sudan

- Introduced topic of non-DA coverage also sense of range of issues.

- Had not had a sense of lack of compliance being a problem. Dah!

- Vastly improved understanding of process and sequence. This dialogue should be continued.

Suggested Improvements:

- Make it more succinct.
- Field visits good.
- There should be more than one course for ENV training (one basic MEO responsibilities and bureaucratic procedures; one more advanced for ENV people and those who have the basic course.
- Some of the presentations, especially day 1, were very general.

- Time management, especially Day 1, morning was not well managed.
- Agenda changes, while adaptive management is important, it seemed excessive at times.
- Course Planning: Pre-course instructions were confusing, contradictory & responses to questions were slow and not complete.
- Could be greatly improved:
  - Too much 'talking at' participants, especially given the high caliber of the group. — Too much paper and material used/wasted
  - Sets very poor example of minimizing and mitigating Env. impacts.
  - Networking with others is most valuable part. However, this workshop was terribly designed and extremely constrained opportunities for productive networking. - Breaks must be a minimum of ½ hour.
  - Evenings must be free for participants to organize socially .

Recommendations from Keith Kline, NRM Program Manager Regional Center for Southern Africa

> ***To achieve better compliance and implementation of mitigation measures we must involve partners in IEE preparation and make it easier to understand and implement recommended mitigations.*** *–A conclusion from participant discussions*

Observations: The workshop had 17 "participants" plus 3 facilitator/organizers and some contracted admin support. The majority of attendees were already well versed in Reg. 216 and MEO roles and procedures. An enormous amount of information was shared and briefly presented, and many items such as the model IEE documents and recommended language for addressing potential impacts of typical USAID development activities were relevant and useful. Based on experience to date with PL-480 programs, many participants concluded that the best way to improve compliance would be for partners to be trained to draft IEEs and be held explicitly responsible for implementing and reporting on mitigations.

The ambitious agenda (8 AM–9 PM each day) allowed minimal opportunity for attendees to participate and "network." Approximately 20 pounds of paper/participant were delivered. Since important materials are available on the Web and can be presented electronically (and many are in a constant state of improvement anyway) this paper-based approach should be eliminated.

Recommendations:
- Clarify and shorten training and IEE documents.
- Structure more time for active participation and networking in future events.
- Training events should be paperless and designed to minimize environmental impacts.
- Share short modules on IEE process (one slide, one hour, and one-day training) that could be used by MEOs and tech staff at the Mission level and with partners.
- Establish a clear, concise, plain English executive summary for each IEE so a reader can quickly understand what the key issues are and what must be done about it.
- Review agreements to ensure partners are accountable for implementation and regular reporting on IEE mitigations; the very important ones should be incorporated in Performance Monitoring Plans.

- Review USAID guidance and required training modules (e.g. CTO) to ensure that environmental compliance is an integral component (there is no mention of it in ADS 203 and the new "USAID Primer")
- Investigate potential collaboration between IRBM and CI wildlife monitoring and conservation activities.

Special Topic: Global Development Alliance

Public/Private Alliances: See FAQ Sheet in Sourcebook

CRITERIA: Corporations Must Be Proven to Be Environmentally Socially Responsible

Some recent models:

- **SENEGAL:** APHIS

- **MADAGASCAR:** New Titanium mining project; 4 percent of revenues devoted to environmental management

- **ZIMBABWE:** Land Reform:and Wildlife Forums

- **KENYA:** Forestry, Range Rehab, Env. Management, Strengthening Guidelines at District Level, Simplified a very elaborate process using our Screening Form

Special Topic: USAID Sudan Field Office & New Sudan's Needs

- Millions of dollars in oil revenues will soon flow to New Sudan for rehabilitation of existing infrastructure and new infrastructure projects (e.g., roads, dikes, irrigation, schools, clinics). EIA is critical to avoiding potential costly errors and possible failures.
- The Sudan Field Office has responded by supporting EIA trainings through ENCAP even though the new Government has no EIA structure in place. With this delayed government response to environmental issues, SFO is supporting development of cadre of future EIA experts for New Sudan by cultivating and further enhancing the EIA experience ENCAP course 'alumni."
- Project Quarterly reports to the SFO include reports on environmental compliance
- Add PMP element for environmental performance?

Workshop Proceedings: Summary Notes
Day 1: Tuesday, May 17

Welcome—Opening Remarks

Camilien Saint-Cyr welcomed all participants to the workshop and introduced Dawn Thomas, Acting Mission Director, USAID, RCSA.

The following is a summary of Dawn's opening remarks:

- I spent much of my career as a PDO, mostly as an Ag officer. In my case, when it came to Reg 216, it used to be just a matter of checking the box and getting on with "the real work."
- For environmental practitioners, their lament is that for some it's just a box to check. They'd like to see it become an integral part of the whole process, including design. I've come to understand that they are right.
- The other lament of the practitioners is that the recommendations made by MEOs are only partially implemented or forgotten altogether. Everyone needs to better understand how valuable a strategic tool Reg. 216 can be for addressing economic and environmental sustainability.
- I did an informal survey of some of my colleagues to find out what raised their consciousness about Reg 216. The most frequent answer was that it was a career's-worth of seeing screw-ups and environmental damage resulting from poorly conceived projects that didn't fully utilize Reg 216.
- I trust this training will leave you with a sound sense of how to make Reg 216 real in your work and with an appreciation of the importance of following up on resulting recommendations. On behalf of RCSA, welcome to Botswana. You are in one of Africa's very special places.

Opening, Introductions, Expectations (Module 1)

Opening

Walter Knausenberger opened by explaining that the intent of the training is to empower all of the participants to become better able to mainstream environmental consciousness into their daily work. This is about more than just complying with the regulations.

Walter asked for a show of hands to identify roles and found among the participants 7 MEOs, 8 CTOs, 3 PDOs, 0 who are in a formal monitoring and evaluation role, and 1 participant in the role of a food for peace officer. All participants were on an SO team. Mr. Knausenberger stated that one goal of this training was to get beyond the thought that it's only the MEO's responsibility to think about these issues.

Walter asked if any participants had brought anything they'd like to share with the group. Nightingale Nantamu, Bob Buzzard, Tchamou (Nico) Nicodeme, and Jody Stallings volunteered. Mr. Knausenberger encouraged anyone else who has something to share to let the facilitators know.

Introductions

The training facilitators and all participants introduced themselves and provided short summaries of their backgrounds. Participants and facilitators will be identified in Workshop Discussion sections of the notes by their initials (as follows) to the extent possible.

Aminata Badiane (AB)	Tchamou Nicodeme (TN)
Candace Buzzard (CB)	Alison Notley (AN)
Robert Buzzard (RB)	Zoelimalala Ramanase (ZR)
Erika Clesceri (EC)	Kim Robinson (KR)
Wes Fisher (WF)	Sheila Roquitte (SR)
Josefa Gomes (JG)	Camilien Saint-Cyr (CS)
Ian Kline (IK)	Jody Stallings (JS)
Keith Kline (KK)	Dawn Thomas (DT)
Walter Knausenberger (WK)	Ginger Waddell (GW)
Jose Martins (JM)	Ephantus Wahome (EW)
David Mutazindwa (DM)	Jim Walsh (JW)
Nightingale Nantamu (NN)	

Objectives
Mr. Fisher reviewed the course objectives. They are provided in detail on the cover page of the course agenda.

Workshop Discussion:

Walter asked how many participants know the status of their country's EIA policies. A few participants raised their hands. Mr. Knausenberger pointed out that understanding the country's policy is an important part of doing the job right. Participants should also be aware of environmental management efforts (and standards) initiated by the private sector (e.g., corporate sustainability) and should coordinate with them when possible to advance these efforts.

Agenda
Mr. Fisher reviewed the course agenda in detail.

Participant Expectations

- Understand different environmental review procedures for Title II and non-Title II and to understand how we might develop a single cohesive approach for the USAID Mission.
- Get a big picture understanding of the entire process, i.e., roles of each party (including partners), responsibilities across parties, the steps that needs to be taken, the timing of those steps, etc.
- Understand how to apply the procedures to avoid negative impact; e.g., mitigation measures. Understand how to ensure the mainstreaming of Environmentally Sound Design and environmental assessment with implementing partners. Understand how to get them beyond simply following the regulations to understanding the value of ESD and EA to ensuring project sustainability.
- Identify the points of leverage that technical officers can use to enforce implementation of recommendations. Understand how to make it a "must" instead of a "shall".
- Learn more about the art of negotiation, between theory and reality. And how to overcome resistance to effective use of the procedures.

Understand the overall approval process and IEE writing for different funding type/appropriations accounts. Develop a standard approach for all types of funding.

Recognize that we need to get to compliance before we get to mainstreaming. We're not even at compliance right now. Conditions get drafted with an IEE and never looked at again. The money isn't supposed to flow, which gives us the ultimate leverage, but we don't use it.

Identify or develop a simplified environmental review process that encourages partners rather than discouraging them.

Understand how to influence acceptance of environmental considerations among stakeholders.

Take a step backwards and make sure we don't have programs that are not environmentally sustainable in the first place. Avoid non-sustainable programs.

Provide examples of disaster stories or "bloopers". Shouldn't be a product of the training, but would like to see these developed.

Identify and understand operating procedures. People need to understand their roles and responsibilities. We need to improve skill utilization. We need an understanding of the reality of the overworked CTO. We need mechanisms to prioritize environmental issues and Reg 216.

Need one-day, high-quality training course for high-level management. We also need to move toward a near-paperless version of the course. Four days is too long for many to consume.

Understand how to use procurement instruments. We need to insert Reg 216 into RFAs/RFPs, contracts and grants, ensuring that responsibility is placed on contractors and partners, up front.

Motivation and Rationale for Environmentally Sound Design (Module 2)

The first two presentations in this section (Module 2) of the agenda were not delivered in full, but were briefly summarized by the facilitators.

- "Why Assess Environmental Impacts?"
- "22 CFR 216: Environmental Impact Assessment"

Presentation: "Environmentally Sound Design and Management"

Workshop Discussion:

Q (DM): In terms of stakeholder commitment, whom are we targeting? How do you get very poor farmers living in land-stressed areas to not farm wetlands, for example?

A (CS): The project typically comes from the community, so they are engaged, which makes it easier to work with them. We might redesign the activity to achieve their goals but we must also help reduce and minimize possible negative impacts as much as possible. Stakeholder participation and involvement is a key component of the EA process.

Q (KR): How do you get stakeholder input in IEE preparation? How do you get beneficiary input? How do you make it happen in real life?

A (WK): IEE doesn't require the same level of stakeholder involvement as a full EA. However, we would like to see more stakeholder involvement in IEEs and for that to be incorporated in design.

Comment (ZR): Here's one example from Madagascar. We have a program called "Alternative to slash and burn". As part of that program, we help with agricultural techniques. A community found it needed compost and pesticides. They asked for help, so it wasn't difficult to get their input because they came to us or help. We were able to provide them with best management practices (BMPs), etc.

Comment (GW): Providing incentives to reforest can have a perverse effect. Putting the incentives in place without defining the land to reforest gave people an incentive to cut down trees in forested areas so that they could get money to reforest. This is an example of not thinking far enough ahead.

Comment (CB): In Zimbabwe, we have food for work programs. One activity was small dam. USAID doesn't supply materials for dam, but did supply food. Because it was poorly conceived, designed, and constructed, the dam caused all sorts of problems. There was no spillway and goats and kids often used the same areas of the reservoir, which resulted in clear public health concerns. The dam also caused significant erosion problems. This is an example of where stakeholder/community consensus on the need didn't lead to the right solution. Everyone is community agreed what they needed was water, but that didn't mean the idea they implemented was good.

Comment (WK): The IEE is just a thought process for setting the big picture. The IEE should allow those involved to think through the issue and put mitigating measures in place.

Comment (RB): The screening process is critical to what we're doing here.

Comment (WF): Title II programs in particular seem to fall short in the area of engineering, because they are often completed quickly involving local food for work labor and identification of local needs.

Comment (ZR)—There is a bridge in Madagascar that sits in the middle of a river and is not connected to either side. USAID funded a bridge and the EU was supposed to fund the road. USAID money came through, but EU money did not, so the bridge is now an island. Proper assessments also hadn't been carried out on the geology of the site, which led to additional problems.

Comment (WK): To be fair, this is an example where an IEE likely would not have solved the whole problem. There are coordination problems out there that extend beyond the reach of an environmental assessment.

Q (DT): Are there lesser requirements in emergency situations?

A (EC): Reg. 216 does not apply, but we should still use sound environmental design principles. We'll touch on the REA approach later; it can be applied to many emergency projects.

Key Concepts for EIA (Module 3)

Presentation: "Basic Concepts for Assessing Environmental Impacts"

Workshop Discussion:
Q (GW)—Has there ever been any attempt to do a one-hour session on EIA/Reg 216 at the Mission Directors' meetings in DC?

A (WK)—That's a perfect opportunity that we'd like to take advantage of.

Q (SR)—Under what circumstances do you need to do a full EIA?

A (WF): There is a specific list under Reg. 216 that indicates typical kinds of projects requiring a full Environmental Assessment. We'll get to that later—it's a judgment call about whether the issues are significant to warrant a comprehensive detailed study.

Comment (KK): (In response to Slide 14 of the presentation) We had an example of "no project decision" with some proposed Guatemalan Ranger stations. Building them would have created communities (because of the water and lodging) where there were currently no communities. We used the environmental assessment to make the case for taking no action.

Q (JM): How do you deal with cultural and historical (also archeological) aspects?

A (WF): When doing an assessment, you need to include that as part of your checklist and you need to figure out how you're going to mitigate those impacts. If you can't mitigate, you may need to decide against the project.

A (KK): There are 2 different dimensions of culture—moving dirt is one. The other dimension is associated with an area that might have a cultural/spiritual significance for a certain people even if no one is there. We need to survey for that kind of impact, because it's not always obvious.

Presentation: "Information Requirements and Tools for Screening and Preliminary Assessment"

Workshop Discussion:
Q (SR): Where in the big picture does this process (Screening and Preliminary Assessment) happen? After the money has been obligated? Before?

A (WF): Before you obligate any of the money, a screening and preliminary assessment must be done.

A (WK): You're given an SO and obligate funds into a SOAG. At this point, you try to lay out the landscape of issues that might arise with the types of work that could be done. The language that's in the preliminary assessment should be incorporated into the RFP. There should be evaluation factors built into the RFP that provide points based on the responsiveness of the bidder to the IEE-related language. When the award is made, there are post-award briefings. You then remind the respondent (because the IEE would have been part of the proposal package) that the analysis has to be done for the specific activity before the funds are obligated. We'll get back to this. This is where mainstreaming happens.

A (EC): For Title II, it's our implementing partners that are doing the IEE.

Presentation: "Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring"

The facilitators did not deliver this presentation in full, but briefly touched on the topic with the participants. Participants were encouraged to look to pages E-13 through E-28 of EPTM for examples of mitigation tables and the monitoring sheet and to Module 3 of the Source Book for the full presentation.

Workshop Discussion:
Q (SR): Who's responsible for mitigation and monitoring?
A (WF): Assume you're implementing a large SO without actually knowing what specific activities will be done. When the SO team and contractor know what will be done, you need to come up with an amendment that includes these activities. The extended SO team is responsible for doing this. Assigning specific responsibility is essential to ensuring that mitigation and monitoring follow-up actually occurs.

Q (JW): I read that the EIA is supposed to be 1 percent of total cost. Does that include mitigation and monitoring?
A (WF) Generally it should be below 10 percent. When the costs get as high as that you probably should be considering redesign of the project or program.
A (WK): The whole process, including mitigation and monitoring, should cost between 1 percent and 5 percent of total cost. In some cases, between 5 percent and 10 percent might be appropriate.

Comment (SR): It's up to the SO team leader to make sure that someone is responsible for doing this work.

Comment (EW): If the SO teams are not aware of their responsibilities here, then they have not read the IEE. It says in the IEE that the SO team is responsible.

Comment (SR): The reality is that the IEE is often shoved aside. We need to make sure that people understand their responsibilities if we want to be in compliance.

Comment (DT): To my mind, it's the Activity Manager or CTO who is fundamentally at the heart of making sure these things happen. The Activity Manager is the catalyst. It also sounds from the discussion like it's not clear who's responsible for what and when. Perhaps we should put together a timeline and list of responsibilities.

Basic USAID Environmental Procedures (Module 4A)

Presentation: USAID Environmental Procedures

Workshop Discussion:
Q (SR): (in response to Slide 15) What is considered small scale for potable water and sewage?
A (WF): It's not absolutely defined. That's where experience and professional team judgment come into play.

Basic USAID Environmental Procedures continued (Module 4B)

Group Exercises: Screening process
Each Group reported out on its screening exercises.

Group 3:

1. Training in rodent control. Negative Determination with Conditions
   Q: What if no pesticides are to be used?
   A: You should have full range of control techniques in the training, including pesticides, so it not advisable to give this form of training a Categorical Exclusion.
2. Road rehabilitation, 20 km through wetlands. A positive determination.
   The trigger in this case is that the rehabilitation involves wetlands. If it was just rehabilitation, you could get by with a Negative Determination with Conditions. The distance alone is not enough to kick it into full EIA. The question is just how sensitive the area is, which needs to be a team judgment. If sensitive, it would likely result in a positive determination. Context is important.
   Comment (WK): None of the figures or rules of thumb, such as 10 km or 4 hectares, is an absolute – these are guiding figures.
3. Open-ended grants for rehab activities. The group said Deferral. Negative Determination with Conditions is probably a better option (the condition being that a specific Environmental Review Report process will be followed once the specific activities can be defined and their impacts assessed. These activities do not proceed without review).
4. Sinking 200 boreholes. Negative Determination with Conditions, with the conditions being the application specific environmentally sound design principles and best management practices for boreholes.

Group 4:

1. Wool dying operation. Negative Determination with Conditions.
2. Plans and site layouts for lodges. Categorical Exclusion because it's planning. There was some debate over this, as the planning implies that these plans will lead to environmental impacts. However, it is assumed that actual design process will have to include the IEE for the construction. Environmentally sound design principles and mitigation and monitoring (Environmental Management Plans) get built into the contract.
3. NGO training for soil conservation, teacher training, and pesticides application. Negative Determination with Conditions.
4. New IDP camp in Angola. Do full EA.

Group 2:

1. NGO training in school construction. Categorical Exclusion because it's training.
2. Introduction of bio-engineered Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) squash. Positive Determination because this is new bio-engineered squash.
   Comment (WK): Another review process would be triggered. A Biosafety review, requiring the direct immediate involvement of the EGAT biosafety officer in Washington, D.C. -- Josette Lewis. After the Biosafety review is done, you'd go back and amend the IEE.

3. Training for midwifes, training in nutrition, immunization programs, and construction of 200 health posts. Training gets Categorical Exclusion; immunization gets Negative Determination with Conditions (defining how medical waste, sharps, etc. will be handled); and construction gets a Negative Determination with Conditions or a Positive Determination, depending on context.
4. Nursery. Positive Determination, due to use of non-indigenous species. If behavior of species is well known, this could be a Negative Determination with Conditions.

Group 1:

1. Land reclamation. Positive Determination, because of the use of fire and herbicides.
2. Dam. Positive Determination.
3. Farmer training, including demonstration plots. Negative Determination with Conditions.
4. Microcredit program. Reg. 216 indicates a Categorical Exclusion, because the program will be run by an international organization, and USAID has no direct control over the program. However, there was some discussion within the class on this decision because due diligence on USAID's part should be to ensure that the microcredit programs incorporate sound environmental design, cleaner production and other BMPs in the loan application process.

   Q: Do microfinance institutions do their own IEEs?

   A (WK): They're getting TA and other assistance, with some environmental risk.

   Q: Because microfinance, does the scale provide some mitigating factor?

   A (WK): yes, the scale of these activities lowers the risk. The level of risk, however, depends upon the nature of the industry.

USAID Environmental Documentation (Module 5)

Presentation: "Required Documentation (EPTM Chapter 3)"

The facilitator also showed the participants required documentation and forms in the EPTM.

Workshop Discussion:

Q: Why does the facesheet cover both CE and IEE?

A: The facesheet allows you to report both decisions, but only the relevant decision(s) would be included. These forms are not standardized across the Agency; ANE uses a slightly different format.

Q: Can we assume that if funding is coming from AID/W for Title II, that they're also going to do this?

A: Yes.

Q: When do you stop amending the original IEE?

A: You don't. But if enough has changed in that SO, that you're going a new direction, you should probably a full an amendment that is self-standing. Clarification: In other words, if the change to the SO is simple, then you just do a simple amendment that attaches to the original. If the change is complicated, you do an amendment that is a new self-standing document.

Q: Is AFR the only bureau that sends IEEs to GC?

A (WK): ANE does it, too. It's not usually done for Categorical Exclusions. The GC likes to see them, especially if they are complex or controversial.

Presentation: Title II Guidelines

Workshop Discussion:

Q: Why does Title II have its own Environmental Status Report (ESR) process?

A: Title II must submit annual reports, and so it was quite easy to add the ESR requirement to it.

Q (KR): Is an IEE really a streamlined process?

A: Compared to an EA, yes. Most IEEs are straightforward and simple.

Comment (KR): We should be careful about the word "streamlined." That could lead partners to think of it as nothing more than a regulatory checkbox. We want more to come out of it than that. The process is important and the inputs from it are critical.

Q: How many years can you have the single year program (SYAP) going on in a row?

A: Until there's no longer an emergency. But if the Ambassador continues to declare an emergency, then a SYAP can go on indefinitely.

Q: Can these mechanisms be used for a regional vs. a single country emergency? For example, a potential transboundary Anthrax outbreak.

A: Yes, if the emergency is affecting food security or causes people to become food insecure. We determine food insecurity based on specific assessments, such as nutrition indicators.

Q: Can these mechanisms be used if the disaster is politically caused, i.e. civil strife (instead of a natural disaster)?

A: Yes.

Q: Can you give money as opposed to just food commodity?

A: Yes, through the monetization process, which allows the sale of a US commodity to a third country (sometimes controversial) or to wealthier people in the same country, as long as the return on the sales is put back into the PVO operating budget. But monetization is having many difficulties with the WTO, with ongoing talks in Geneva and elsewhere, so monetization is at risk of disappearing altogether. Certainly FFP can not allow 100 percent monetization anymore, as it had for some countries (Mozambique). A cash-only initiative is being pushed by Andrew Natsios, however, the $300M will be only for local procurement of food, not programming, since it is trying to appease some of the WTO issues, in part.

Comment: While the new FFP guidelines clearly state that the PVOs have responsibility for the IEE, generally it is rather poor on environmental compliance. Erika Clesceri is working on amending the language for the guidelines, which are interim until August.

Q: Who prepares TII IEEs?

A: PVOs, FFP cooperating sponsors (CSs), not the Mission.

Q: Where can we find ESRs?

A: Copy is sent to AID/W Bureau Environmental Officer for DHCA. Ask your CTO for your country program in WDC.

Q: WFP – how do we get their environmental regulation information or reports? They claim that they have ENV regs or guidelines in place, but do they implement them?

A: It would be good for USAID staff working in the field with emergency programs to ask them for their procedures; you should also ask your CSs. It would be good to get some inquiries from the field.

Comment: REOs provide guidance in a voluntary capacity, i.e., they do not need to sign the ESRs. They must only send a copy of the ESR to your country program CTO in WDC and the bureau BEO.

Q: Do you see DCHA/OTI moving towards requiring Reg. 216 compliance??

A: There seems to be some movement, but there's a lot of resistance from DCHA generally. DCHA/ OFDA has funded the development of the Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA), which is not as complete as an IEE, but they are not requiring it as part of their assessments.

Comment: In Iraq, contractors are being required to do IEEs, but there is much resistance to this practice. OTI is being told that they need to come into compliance, but it does not seem to be the case that they are. The REA is a shorter, less comprehensive process than the IEE, but it is useful for an emergency situation where timing rather than perfection is of the essence. Timescales in OFDA are so much shorter than USAID. They have to react very quickly to an emergency, often in a matter of hours. They even have their own website outside of USAID.

Q: How do they decide where they are going to work?

A: FFP decides where to work based on nutrition indicators and declarations of emergency. No RFPs or RFAs – PVOs/NGOs come to them saying what they want to do and FFP decides whether to fund it.

<u>Presentation: "The Environmental Status Report for Title II Activities"</u>

The facilitator summarized the key points of this presentation, but did not deliver it in full.

Workshop Discussion:

Q: What percentage of total IEEs have Environmental Review Report requirements?

A: Not so many for purpose of subgrants per se. There are other types of interventions that would expect you to invoke best practices for their implementation.

Q: If we have NGO grant-making activity, with screening going on, are they supposed to be sending us these reports?

A: Yes.

Comment: There should always be a monitoring process in place to make sure best practices are being used.

Day 2: Wednesday, May 18

Tech Review/Logistics

Logistics
Ms. Notley reviewed a number of logistical issues.

Tech Review
Camilien Saint-Cyr asked for feedback on yesterday's session. Comments included the following:

- "Yesterday's session was a very interesting and productive day. We got a better understanding of what environmental review is for. We also learned how Reg. 216 can be used strategically."
- "It was useful to hear a lot of familiar things so that I know I'm not the only one dealing with these issues. This should help us come up with a reasonable and workable process for getting done what needs to be done."
- "It was less daunting than I thought it would be."
- "I would have liked to have more time for Q&A and discussion. The material was well-known to most, so it would have been more valuable to discuss experiences than to go over the material in detail."
- "I particularly enjoyed Erika's presentation because it has specific relevance to what I do."
- "The screening exercise was really helpful; good case study exercises helped clarify issues that were unclear from the presentation and quiz."
- "The discussion of IEEs is very important. We're trying to get MEOs to play a bigger role by increasing their role in developing IEEs. We have observed that in many cases the partners have not even seen the IEEs. It's important that SOT members and partners understand the whole approach. My sincere hope after this workshop is that MEOs will play a bigger role in developing the first draft of IEEs."

Expectations
The facilitators walked through the highest priority expectations of the participants:

Understand different environmental review procedures for Title II and non-Title II.
Understand the overall approval process and IEE writing for different funding type/appropriations accounts. Develop a standard approach for all funding types.

Get a big picture understanding of the entire process, i.e., roles of each party (including partners), responsibilities across parties, the steps that need to be taken, the timing of those steps, etc.

Identify or develop a simplified environmental review process that encourages partners rather than discouraging them.

The facilitators will make adjustments to the agenda to ensure that these high-priority expectations are met to the extent possible.

Working Groups: Basic Concepts and Reg 216 (Module 7)

Presentation: 22 CFR 216—A Brief Walkthrough (presentation and review of regulation text in EPTM Annex B)
Workshop Discussion:
Comment (EW): It is important to be familiar with the host country environmental review process. Reg 216 gives us the flexibility to conform to local country requirements.

Comment (WK): The one exception is pesticides, where Reg 216 is stricter than most host country requirements. Reg 216 also deals to a greater degree with small-scale, community-directed activities. This goes beyond what most host country procedures have tried to grapple with. This will come, but it is not here yet.

Comment (WK): At USAID, an EIS is only used for activities that affect global environment. EIS means something different to other donor organizations.

Q: How do USAID Environmental Procedures apply to GDA programs?
A: There is a due diligence process that's stated within the GDA guidance. Reg. 216 doesn't affect it directly, but it expects that the partners will take the principles into account.

Q (EC): Could you go over a little how USAID came up with the Negative Determination and Negative Determination with Conditions concept? It doesn't seem to be explicit in the Regulations.
A (WK): Negative Determination is mentioned in 216.3 (p. B-8 of the EPTM), but only as the alternative to a Positive Determination. It is not otherwise defined. The specific phrase "Negative Determination with Conditions" is never used. Negative Determination is never defined except as an alternative to positive determination. In practice, we introduced the concept of "conditions" so we could get more mileage out of this determination to ensure mitigating and monitoring measures are met as conditions.

Comment (WK): Records can be requested under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (offered in the context of 216.10). It's critical to keep good records.
Review Questions: Regulation 216
Dr. Knausenberger led the class through the questions.

Workshop Discussion:
(WF): Q6 is another due diligence issue. Jim Hester (Agency Environmental Coordinator) has said not to try to find an escape hatch for these kinds of things.
-- Q11—Class discussed that while the answer is "True" they'd prefer that it be "False." The state of practice has moved beyond the current language in the regulation.

Review Questions: Mitigation and Monitoring
Mr. Wahome led the class through the questions.
Workshop Discussion:
(EC): I have been told that the cost of environmental M&M for Title II programs should be on the order of 15 percent. This seems high. Fifteen percent for overall project monitoring and evaluation, including capacity-building and environmental mitigation and monitoring might be acceptable. Five percent to 10 percent for environmental M&M alone seems more reasonable.

(WF): With respect to Q5, the baseline provides the history needed so that you have something to compare no action against various alternatives. The baseline includes past trends. Trend projections into the future are not considered part of the baseline; but rather estimates of what might happen should past trends continue. The baseline gives you the basis for estimating the projection.

Writing the IEE (Module 8A)

Presentation: Writing the IEE (EPTM Chapter 4)
No class discussion.

Presentation: What if I Have to Go Beyond an IEE?
Slide 2: Concept of SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) added to this slide (not in the presentation in the source book). One does an SEA if the EA focuses on development policies, plans, and programs. SEAs are becoming an important tool.
(WK): Offered a number of examples of PEAs being done in Africa, e.g., road improvements in Tanzania's National Parks and small scale irrigation in Ethiopia. EAs are a very useful tool for public engagement in development and for strengthening processes of governance. It reinforces the host country's own environmental regulations and policies.

Review of IEE Examples (EPTM Annex D)
Dr. Knausenberger walked the class through several example IEEs in Annex D of the EPTM.

Workshop Discussion:
Q: How would you find electronic copies of IEEs?
A They can be located and selected through the BEO Action Tracker which can be found by clicking on the BEO Action Tracker link at www.encapafrica.org or by going directly to www.afr-sd.org/iee . The search function allows you to locate IEEs by country, date, etc.
Q: Is there a way to search the database for activity type?
A: Yes, but it is not really set up to do that particularly well. You can do a keyword search, however.
Tribute to Paul Des Rosiers, former BEO of EGAT& DCHA Bureaus, who passed away suddenly in late May 2005.
Walter, Wes, and others spoke about Paul. He was a strong advocate for the environment at USAID and filled innumerable gaps. He was proud of his role as Bureau Environmental Officer for DHCA, and EGAT, and that role was central to professional life. He leaves a profound vacuum and will be much missed by his many colleagues and friends.

Sample Environmental Documentation (Module 8B)
(WK): Pointed out the Style Tips handout in the Module (following Module 8 presentation in Source book)
(WK): Directed participants to RALF (following the Style Tips sheet and green divider in Module 8 of the Source Book). RALF was developed by Brian Hirsch and Walter to capture model language so that IEE preparers would not have to continually re-invent the wheel in writing standard IEE language. It provides language used in many IEEs. While very useful, RALF language should not be applied in boilerplate fashion without using your own professional judgment, but it does give you recommended language to use in given situations. It's helpful

after you've identified activities and makes IEE preparation more efficient. The whole point of RALF is to make your job easier..

Special Topics—New Topics

Presentation: SYAP/MYAP issues

- You are not required to do an IEE in the first year of a SYAP, but if the SYAP is extended longer than 1 year at same site and with the same players, then following Reg. 216 is required.
- We have just started receiving first SYAP IEEs and they were uniformly poor.
- SYAP IEEs are generally kept under 6-10 pages. They still do the tables of activities.
- What we've worked out with FFP program is a process for minimizing the number of approvals—FFP Officer and Mission Director, and DCHA BEO/EGAT BEO for Title II IEEs.
- The second year of a single-year assistance program activity needs an IEE. It's still an emergency situation, with the same players and the same site, but they may now be doing all of the things a development project would do (using Food for Work, etc.).
- If the same partners are proposing a MYAP and a SYAP for the same situation, the MYAP IEE can cover the SYAP needs.

(EC): The nature of the activity is very important. If it's a different activity, then it's different scenario. The site matters less than the activity. WK agrees. For example, if FHI works in collaboration with WFP, then engages in a new SYAP activity on their own, they wouldn't need an IEE for the first year SYAP.
(WK): The type of dialogue we're having here is how the EPTM was developed. We need productive dialogue on implementation issues to work through the practical implications of the work we're doing.

Selected Mission Presentations—Lunch (presentations in final CD as available)

Local Environmental Management Example (module 8A)

Case Site Walk of Mowana Lodge:
WF demonstrated a simple matrix for listing activities associated with design, construction, and operation of a new lodge on the Chobe River Front (using Mowana's as an example of likely activities and their associated impacts. The group focused on three activities that might have the most significant activities:

Construction:	Soil	Water	Land	Health	Aesthetics
Wood use	X	X	x	none	X
Clearing	M	M	M+	none	L or B
Disposition of construction waste	S	M	M	x	S
Operation:					
Solid waste disposal	L	L	L	L+	L+
Sewage/wastewater disposal	L	L	L	L+	L
Provision of water	X	M	S	none/B	none
Maintenance of golf course	S	S	S	S	S/B

Note: x=unknown, S=small potential adverse impact, M=medium potential adverse impact, L=large potential adverse impact, B=beneficial impact

Q for class (WF): What would the scope of a cumulative assessment look like?

A: You'd answer the following questions:

1. Within the geographic area, what is the overall set of activities?
2. Which are most significant impacts?
3. How would you mitigate them?

Case Site Visits
The class visited all four case sites in the afternoon.

Day 3: Thursday, May 19

Special Topics (Module 9)

Introduction to ENCAP website: www.encapafrica.org

- Includes courses, links, IEEs, other resources.
- Environmental Guidelines for Small-Scale Activities in Africa (EGSSAA)

  Q: What is "small scale"?

  A: A judgment call, but the EGGA focuses on the types of infrastructure that are typically undertaken by USAID Partners.

  - Note that "Annexes" under sector topics are where most useful material is often hidden: templates and examples, etc.
  - A hard copy of the EGSSA is being mailed to each Mission.
- ENCAP services include a five-day course for partners, where IEE or Environmental Review outlines and M&M plans (Environmental Management Plan) outlines are developed based on case site visits for case study topics.
- ENCAP has core funds to support pre-planning for these courses but looks for Mission buy-in/funding support for the actual course presentation.

ENCAP history

- There is an agreement with GC to devolve more IEE responsibilities to partners through the guidelines and courses/training. LAC had similar approach. EPTM (training manual) and other materials are in development (micro enterprise course). There is an EIA Professional Development Program that puts local counterparts into real applied EIA work with mentoring and training support.

Pesticides

- There are strict regulations because pesticides are dangerous. Reg. 216 focuses on the problem.
- Safer use is a more appropriate term than "Safe use"
- Regs apply to any assistance for "procurement or use" in very broad definition. This includes credit, guarantees, etc.
- "Exemptions" are not applicable to assistance for all aspects of procurement or use of pesticides; Wile under Reg. 216 there are "exceptions" for use of pesticides in emergency situations, but these should not be used as a loophole. Safer use practice should still be applied.
- Pesticides should be choice of last resort, and when needed, one should use the least toxic approach.

PERSUAP

- Includes emphasis on mitigation responses in Safer Use Action Plan:
    a. Pesticide registration status,
    b. Basis for selection,
    c. How IPM is incorporated,
    d. Other options available;
    e. Host country capacity to regulate pesticides use, sale, and disposal;
    f. Provisions for training and monitoring.
- Must comply with all local laws.

Program/Activity Cycle Integration and Environmental Integration (Module 11A)

Environmental Considerations in Program Activity Planning: ADS 201, 202, 204 (excerpts are in Annex B of the training manual)

- Environmental analyses for strategic plans: are mandatory under FAA for tropical forests and biodiversity (FAA 118 and 119). Reg. 216 also requires review of endangered species issues prior to obligation of funds for program or project implementation. Note: this is often done as an afterthought after an activity if fully designed. This negates the value of these analyses and the application of USAID Environmental Procedures for sustainable project design. USAID is now revising the ADS and apparently streamlining required analyses.
- ADS 201: Environmental Review should include local participation, recommended mitigations, analysis of proposed activities. Missions must budget to ensure this is done well. It also requires clearly designated and empowered MEOs.
- ADS 204 lays out USAID staff, MEO, BEO and Operating Unit responsibilities in implementing Reg. 216 with periodic ADS updates that stress "environmental sustainability" as integral to the achievement of USAID's development goals. SO teams and Activity Managers play a key role. See slides for details on MEO responsibilities under ADS 204.

- Use the REOs (quality control and gate keepers) and the BEO (Brian Hirsh) to obtain objective review approvals, guidance on adherence to rules and support/guidance as needed, etc.
- Agency Environmental Coordinator, Jim Hester, is the liaison with other federal agencies, etc.
- The ADS provisions are revised regularly..
- If there is a conflict between Reg. 216 and ADS, Reg. 216 is controlling.
  Q: What is mandatory versus suggested guidance, in the ADS?
  A: This is defined within ADS and is obvious based on language used (e.g., "shall" is a requirement, "recommended" is a suggestion).
- Paris Declaration on AID effectiveness has environmental sustainability clauses that are supportive. Natsios supported this declaration.

Panel discussion
(KR): Environmental compliance is lacking. We need a single responsible, accountable person in each mission, but we also need management support in making this "everyone's job"– just as adhering to USAID ethical standards and core values is everyone's job. Suggestions:

1. Quick training and short, clear interventions. For example, use a single slide on the importance of Regulation 216 at Mission Directors' conferences. Integrate this issue into all other training, e.g., CTO training, Contracts Officers' training, training for Program Officers, Senior Management, etc. Don't use separate, week-long trainings..
2. Be careful about who we hire and ensure people are not stove-piped. We need people who can write, conceptualize, manage, administer and communicate effectively.
3. Clarify roles and responsibilities
4. Get buy-in from leadership: have your Mission Director on board
5. Include Environmental Compliance in AEFs (Annual Evaluation Forms)
6. Make it easy to access "model documents" that reflect best practice.
7. Strike a balance between "Keep It Simple Stupid" (KISS) and doing a good job of considering environmental issues.
8. Make it easy for people to do the right thing: simple checklists; allowing budget and staff time to do the job; hold post-award conferences to discuss and assign responsibilities.

Mission Orders are not necessarily a solution. You want "ownership," and for that the audience must be able to internalize it and it must be clear and accessible.

Workshop Discussion:
(WF): The BEO is overwhelmed, as are other staff, so many recommendations remain to be acted upon and as well as efforts to improve and streamline the materials, manual, procedures, etc.
(GW): Annual Reports, Office of Presidential Initiatives (PIN) Reports, and Activity Approval Documents (AADs) all incorporate this. But there's big difference between fulfilling requirements and actually applying principles to every-day work. Activity managers need to know the "art" of incorporating this. Do Strategic Activity Reports (SARs) incorporate review of Environmental compliance? Activity managers have too many things to track, too many requirements. They are also overwhelmed by demands for reports, issues from management, and no time to do their jobs.

(DT): An MEO guidebook may be particularly useful if it's well designed, has good models, is clearly tabbed, etc. You don't have to reinvent wheel every time and you don't have to be a technical expert if you have a good guidebook. We need to ask ourselves, "What should be the content and most salient chapters for a guidebook?"
(KK): My experience from LAC is that Reg. 216 was a success in most cases. The PPO/PDO role was often key to the successful application of environmental considerations. And FSNs were key in field implementation—perhaps the most important part.
(WK): We have some "star" FSN MEOs, such as in Madagascar and Namibia. Note that in Namibia, an FSN is in the PPO.
(DM): There are many reasons why FSNs often don't speak out. Some of these reasons are cultural, and sometimes they don't feel like they have the support needed to speak out. Africans are not like Americans, who often interrupt others. Africans wait their turn to speak and often don't get a turn. As a result, a lack of respect develops both ways.
(NN): FSNs often know their roles well and are very competent, but get ignored by USDH when they come in, they just do it. And they often do it alone.
(EC): We all need to understand cultural differences and learn to work productively together.
(DT): The tone is set by the people in charge (of technical offices and the Mission).
(SR): If you are designated MEO, then you ARE empowered to speak directly to the Mission Director and staff on environmental issues and staff responsibilities.
(JW): How do we provide incentives for environmental compliance and environmentally sound design in our programs? In Sudan, there are risks of big messes as a result of major donor pledges for infrastructure projects ($1.5 billion from USA alone), combined with an extremely undeveloped rural economy. Absorptive capacity, environmental impacts, and sustainability are all issues. Incentives will be different for different people. There is pressure to move quickly based on the present large funding opportunities. People are motivated now to get things done, but we need to include environmental sustainability. How do we do this?
(EC): The National Science Foundation (NSF) has "nuggets" one page/one slide presentations for best practices.
(KR): Our legal office already distributes model documents to every Mission. Send me models and I can share them.

<u>Presentation: Proposed Regional Environmental Quality Management Support Program (REQMS)</u>
Workshop Discussion:

- Mr. Knausenberger would like to see the Regional Offices in Africa provide core support and

individual Missions commit resources, and/or buy-in for training, and various forms of technical assistance and training to support the application of USAID's environmental procedures, compliance and environmentally sound design He requests feedback from missions on the REQMS concept.
(JW): We need to think creatively. For example, two weeks of CTO training was synthesized into a two-day course for supervisors; we should consider approaches like that to bring about more effective application of the procedures. .
(CB): We need to integrate this idea into the existing scopes of large formal training contracts.
(KR): You can also just sit in on other trainings that take place and make sure the issue is covered at the appropriate time.

(DT): We need to target individuals responsible and complement this with a high level message to Mission Directors. Identify the SO team and explain why this will help them do their job better and avoid problems. Package the message. Make it short.
(JS): We wanted to dedicate some funding for training and this type of activity, but when we arrived all of the funds had already obligated. Even so, we were able to identify some funding to get started. Next year will be better. It only took ONE PAGE to explain why this initial funding was needed and to convince the Mission to fund training next year.
(WK): A second MEO and Mission staff training is planned for West Africa later this year; another for PL480, Title II partners, likely in Senegal.

(JW): Sudan has had DA since 1998, but the Sudan field office is a brand new Mission. With the peace agreement, OFDA resources and Food Aid has been scaled up—these make up a majority of funds. But we need to build the capacity of Southern Sudanese to administer and operate the local economy. For these multimillion dollar programs, OFDA has one monitor (a second to arrive soon). Food Aid has one monitor. DA has been small but has 25 staff. The big challenge is to have a single cohesive process to apply environmental screening and sustainability to programs. Ephantus worked with Walter on the 1st training and also did a second. Increasing emphasis is being placed on the issues Southern Sudan faces in establishing a government. We're pursuing the idea of an "alumni association" that could form the nucleus of an NGO or advocacy body at the local level.

One example of the types of environmental issues that require attention is a major Emergency road repair program that was initiated without an IEE or EA. The program was approved under "notwithstanding" authority. Similarly, a major effort is underway to reclaim land along the Nile flood plain (obvious environmental issues). A long-term EA will be developed (IUCN) with public participation, but it's off to a SLOW start and being done at arms length from the Mission.

Special Topics (Module 9C)

Presentation: Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) (slides will be in final CD): Erika Clesceri

- Environmental management in emergencies (OFDA). An IEE is not required, but OFDA and others engaged in addressing emergencies are trying to encourage the application of impact assessment principles and best environmental management practices. The process tries to examine the costs associated with ignoring potential environmental consequences (siting under emergency resettlement, etc.).
- An REA consolidates and prioritizes issues based on level of threat to: 1) Life, 2) Welfare, 3) Environment.
- For REAs, timing is more important than perfection. The REA provides the initial information that will help inform subsequent IEEs. They help to avoid problems subsequent projects would have to fix. They prioritize issues and avoid unintended consequences.
- An REA can take anywhere from hours to a few weeks.
- SPHERE Standards (guidelines and best practices) for disaster situation can be valuable. These include standards for water/sanitation, food, shelter, health, etc., in multiple languages.

(WK): The hierarchy and typology are useful: Life, Welfare, Environment.
(EC): This process forces people to talk to each other in emergency situations, where otherwise this often does not happen. Creating a framework for communication is important.

Day 4: Friday, May 20

Tech Review/Logistics

WF reviewed expectations from the first day, identifying which had been covered, and still needed to be addressed.

Special Topics (Module 9D)

Facilitators walked participants through the remaining topics in Module 9

Fertilizer:

- (WK) We want people to invest in soil fertility. This fact sheet prepared by Rob Clausen of WARP, provides best practice tips for improving soil fertility, effective use of fertilizers (both natural and chemical) and potential problems to avoid. Keep in mind that fertilizers are different from pesticides, so they are not subject to special USAID environmental procedures the way pesticides are.
- Wise use of organic fertilizers should be encouraged.

SPHERE:

- Contact Erika if you want a copy of the SPHERE Field Operator's Guide. It is being updated by OFDA.
- Comment: EXOs need to think about ENV-friendly procurement and need to be trained.
- Ambassador's self-help funds haven't had to abide by USAID's standards, and sometimes they get involved in things that could impact the environment. Sometimes we've been able to influence how they address environmental issues.

Q: Are there Environmental officers in each of the Embassies?

A: No. There is a regional person in Botswana, but that's because it's a regional position. Most Embassies have an Economic Officer who also wears the environment hat. Think about inviting them to environmental trainings or helping them with environmental issues.

- The Democracy and Human Rights manual may have some environmental guidance in it, and it should be in-line with the standard guidelines. Ginger Waddell to follow-up.
- Tools for Alliance Builders FAQs provides the most useful background on environmental issues and compliance related to the Development Credit Authority (DCA).

Program/Activity Cycle Integration and Mainstreaming (Module 11B)

Environmental Review

- This section provides a generic Environmental Review Form & instructions, typically used for subprojects under an umbrella agreement. Use of the Environmental Review screening process helps you identify level of risk. It's a simple streamlined approach for identifying 'no or minimal risk" "high risk" or "moderate risk" small scale activities, with tables to help you identify and determine risk level. This environmental review and reporting (ERF) process is explained in Annex G of the EPTM and is also at http://www.encapafrica.org/resources.htm#ComplianceForms..

- Facilitator comment: Screening isn't always the best way to determine the conditions. For example, it's not always best to do screening on wells, when there is clear guidance already exists on wells. This is best used in situations in which there aren't design or management guidelines for a particular activity.
- Comment: The screening process should provide a paper trail to show that a review has been done and to demonstrate how it links to the IEE. The MEO is responsible for signing off on Environmental Review Reports, and ensuring that activity managers and partners are implementing recommended environmental management (mitigation and monitoring) plans.
- Strategic Management-Interim Guidance: deals with State-AID Strategic Plans and their impact on environmental issues.
- MEO Work Objectives (handout). Ms. Robinson commented that this 3-page document should be reduced to 1-page and given to everyone, because it's everyone's responsibility to enforce environmental procedures. Ms. Robinson gave examples of how she has used a similar approach for ethics training.
- The MEO must assist SO teams and help them update their IEEs. It is strongly recommended that MEOs formally track the status of environmental documentation in the Mission. A tracking table used in the Ethiopia Mission was discussed as an example. The basic expectation is that the MEO have a current list of what's been done, what is still pending and what will be coming up in the next year. In order to write the paragraphs necessary for the Annual Report, you really need to have the full environmental procedures tracking list. It is highly desirable for the SO teams to assist the MEO in preparing the list and to take responsibility for tracking and addressing outstanding actions.
- All MEOs are expected to carry out the Core Duties (listed on the new handout), and are encouraged to carry out the additional responsibilities listed for those who can devote more time to the MEO position.
- Statutory Checklist: all the lists that must be checked before obligation of funds, including compliance with Reg. 216, ADS 201, 204 and other requirements under USAID's Environmental Procedures.
- The MEO should look at procurement plans to anticipate whether there are environmentally related actions that must be addressed (changing or amending an IEE).

Environmental considerations for contracting (can be found in RALF).

- Example: Environmental Mission Order for Zambia – it interprets ADS 204. This is a good way for the MEO to digest environmental roles and responsibilities and clearly articulate them to the Mission staff. It can be used as the focal point for short Mission staff training sessions. It includes a schematic on pg 11 that is a starting point for MEOs to convey what needs to be done by SO teams.
- Environmental information should also influence other Mission Orders such as: pre-obligation, delegation of authorities, etc.
- Other opportunities for the MEO to help to mainstream Environmental issues include: Mission orders, statutory checklists, post-award briefings, EXO procurements, etc.

Strengthening Environmentally Sound Design (Module 12)

Q: Is last-minute planning unique to environmental issues?

A: NO. We all need to start planning earlier and better.

Q (EC): Who should write IEEs, the MEO/USAID or partners?

A: Partners writing IEEs:

Pros

- People doing the work need to understand what the potential impacts are and how to mitigate them.
- Less burdensome on the Mission, but the Mission still must approve it.

Cons

- Conflict of interest
- Failure of Mission staff to engage in the systematic application of the procedures in sound design of programs, SOs and activities.

Discussion: SO teams should be responsible for writing and drafting IEEs, and they need to be conversant in these issues. The view was expressed that all USAID partners wouldn't have the capability of writing the IEEs. However, it was noted by others that USAID partners have adapted to myriad bureaucratic procedures without problem—that's what they're paid for. Others supported the idea that IEEs need to be done by the people who are closest to the activities (the partners). Part of the problem is that we're getting too caught up in the term IEE—the content needs to be written and developed by those closest to the activities, USAID should have quality reviewers who can determine whether what is proposed makes sense for the particular program/project. Nothing definitive was decided by the group, but most seemed to agree that the partners need to be involved in the development of the IEE (whether they write them or not is still up for debate).

It's true that Implementing Partners are responsible for following through with environmental compliance; however, there are also other ways to introduce and mainstream environmental issues into the process—e.g., through the procurement process, etc.—and not just leave it to the IEE, which is the document that needs to be signed by Washington.

Whether or not partners do the IEEs, it was argued that Washington BEO sign-off is critical, so that Partners and Mission Directors will take the approval process seriously.

Again, it was argued that by having the partners draft the documents, USAID MEOs and SO team members can spend more time reviewing the document and seeing the sites.

<u>Operating Unit and Mission Self-Assessment of Capacity in Environmentally Sound Design and Management</u>

WF asked participants to fill out the Mission Self-Assessment Questionnaire and submit it.

Special Topics

REQMS concept

- Make the case for the funding and make a case for the mechanics. This could be done on a regional basis.
- It might help to think about applying this concept more broadly than for just environment; for example, include gender and other issues.
- What are the areas that are creating the most demand in environmental review and best management practice? In those areas, go out and find a top expert for whom there would be great demand and place this person in the region.. That would be viewed as a real service.
- The concept calls for the development of local capacity in environmental review, both FSNs and local contractors. REQMS is to move Missions and Partners toward Regional and locally based support in ESDM and USAID environmental procedures.
- Comment: This concept piece suggests training yet a third party to do IEEs that would cost us more money; not the MEO, not the SO Team, not the implementing partner. Goes back to earlier point that we should just have our partners prepare the environmental documentation.
- Comment: Support services and mitigation and monitoring follow-up could be significantly improved using local and Regional based ESDM and EIA consultants.

Brainstorming on Integrating Environmental Considerations into our program

- What's the best approach?
- Develop a list of activities that that CTOs can take on themselves, reinforced by the MEO and REO. The Mission Order should incorporate those responsibilities and strengthen that thought process.
- Is the MEO part of the SO Team? No, but the MEO should be in direct dialogue with every SO team to guide them in meeting their ADS responsibilities, and in helping them prepare their IEEs.
- No one size fits all, but most MEOs will have special expertise relative to one or two SOs. They should be part of those SO teams, but not all. They should engage in dialogue with other SO teams. In Uganda, it wouldn't work to have the MEO be part of SO teams. What would work would be for someone to come to Uganda to give briefings and make it mandatory for the whole Mission to participate.
- The Activity road map is difficult to follow, but the CTO manual has its own map and we should probably show how and where USAID environmental procedures and considerations apply on the CTO map.
- This is an opportunity to introduce the concept of the core and extended SO team.
- What we're hearing from all of these comments is the need for short in-Mission training for all Missions.
- You should circulate a syllabus for that short course to all of these participants to get their feedback.
- Succinct, good graphics, good visuals that get these issues across in less than an hour. It's a matter of somebody sitting down and actually doing it.
- We need to make it compelling and accessible.

Community of Practice

EOKX – Environmental. Officers Knowledge Exchange: Sharepoint site for working documents
Comments:
ENCAP should serve as a portal into this site.

Special Topics—Market-led Environmental Performance (Module 9D)

Market-led Environmental Performance – non-regulatory standards, certification, etc.
Comments:

- WTO can be a major driver in environmental improvement (i.e., dolphin-safe nets)
- Certification, especially horticultural markets; increasingly higher standards; EUREPGAP,(now FoodPlus; ISO; Smartwood, etc.); more common stewardship for certified sustainable forestry in Latin America; one sale only in Guatemala. Serious sustainability issues – investment in getting communities up to par – how to recover money. Illegal logging undermines prices.
- Example of a hotel business operation – In northern Mozambique, establishment of a National. Park has spurred development of lodges, etc., which is very important to the new economy, but environmental impacts must be addressed. Isle de Mozambique is a world heritage site of high cultural significance, but sanitation problems have stopped development of this area (where the beaches are used as toilets); hindering tourism. Public sector and private sector concerns intersect on this issue. Only a national body can create standards and put in place effective regulatory controls and incentives.
- Voluntary certification and standards are useful. Example: The EPA EnergyStar program – labeling of energy requirements of various tools, equipment, etc. This voluntary program also sets standards of energy efficiency which are aggressive yet technically feasible. Creates market for new products; workshop-based development.

Public/Private Alliances

- USAID should ensure that GDA alliance partners are environmentally and socially conscious as USAID's own credibility may be undermined through partnerships with environmentally unsound private-sector entities; and there should be an SO IEE (otherwise amend) to cover activities under the Alliance. Does the private sector partner have their own environmental guidelines/policy that would suffice?
- N. Mozambique has private/public/community partnerships. Pemba Bay – great diving, beautiful coral, but there are no fish because the area is over-fished by communities. Efforts are now underway to work with communities to bring back fish by using no-fishing zones and breeding zones.

Proposed Solutions in Reg. 216 Application and "Beyond Compliance" (Module 12B)

Environmental Policy Dialogue: Which Missions are tracking environmental policy issues?

- Senegal— certification in private sector arena for European standard; USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS); lots of discussion; Are US APHIS advisors aware of the European standards? Not capitalizing on existing certification systems.

- Zimbabwe—land reform; wildlife; Zimbabwe Environmental Lawyers Association – advocacy from WRI; Lessons learned from land reform; Natural resources forum started and on-going.
- Kenya—streamlining environmental practices; environmental guidelines for districts.
- Madagascar monitoring environment; titanium exploration, should have done EAs; 0.4 percent profit back to environment.
- Regional—trade, transportation corridors, etc.

<u>What we can do as a community at the regional, agency and bilateral level?</u>
Action Items:

a. Mission Orders: find out status and/or create/update: Uganda, Sudan, RSA, Kenya, DRC.
   - Interesting aside: RCSA used a Mission Notice to promote water conservation; with dramatic cost savings.

b. Practice what we preach.
c. Create one-slide, one-hour, and one-day presentations: unanimous vote that this is needed. If supplied with good presentation almost all MEOs agree to do presentation at their Missions.
   - There is a significant demand for this.
   - Team could send in suggestions by email.
   - All empowered to use the Africa Regional MEO listserv; reaches 50-60 people.

d. RFPs, RFAs, contracts, scopes of work : ensure environmental considerations are incorporated in each!
e. Sensitize the Front Office, Program Office, Contracts Office. <u>Need tools to do this</u>!
f. Turn over responsibility for IEEs to partners. (Move this function from MEOs/SO Teams).
   - How do we to address lack of follow-up? What happens with follow-up and mitigation?
   - Partners would do a better job if they had ownership of the process.
   - MEOs and SO Teams would just spot-check based on reports from the partners.
   - If there is a discrepancy between the governing IEE and activities, it's often because the IEE was written far away by people who don't know the on the ground situation.
   - Include quarterly environmental reports from partners (as Sudan has done for rural electrification)
   - Environmental indicators – need to be included.
   - Each activity manager would do spot-checks in field (Senegal) rather than just an M&E person.

g. Host country capacity? How to link to host country systems? Structured investment? IMPORTANT TO BUILD LOCAL CAPACITY FOR SUSTAINABILITY!
h. Is an MEO guidebook needed?
i. Best MEO practices should be documented with more "sharing" opportunities/presentations.

<u>Workshop Closing (Module 13 – Wrap up)</u>

The workshop concluded with a participant post-test, submission of Mission self-assessment questionnaires, and completion of course evaluation forms. These are summarized in the final Workshop report.

ANNEXES

Illustrative Mission Environmental Officer (MEO) Work Objectives & Elements

Revised & Updated October 2004

[Nov. 1, 2004 Draft by Knausenberger & Hester]

Assumption: The MEO may be a part-time or full-time position (typically, MEO duties are only part of the assignment for a full-time position) depending on the size, complexity and nature of a Mission's portfolio and the degree of impact assessment training of the incumbent. The duty can range from 10 percent to 100 percent of a trained person's time.

While the person can be administratively based on one team, to be effective the MEO must have easy access to all Team Leaders and the Mission Director. Experience has shown that MEOs can be optimally effective when based in the Mission's Program office. Experienced, trained FSNs can be designated as MEO. It is recommended that a backstop MEO also be designated. [*see below DoA from ADS 101.3.1.1*]

MEO serves as both as the environmental compliance officer, and the "environmental conscience" of the Mission, to help "mainstream" environmental awareness in decision making, promoting integration of environmental values, enhance program design, impact and sustainability, helping to ensure that unintended consequences are avoided, and positive outcomes enhanced.

Core Duties:

1. **Lead the application of 22 CFR 216 & ADS Chapter 204 Environmental Procedures** across all Mission programs. Serve as a member (regular or virtual) on every Mission SO Team providing expertise on environmental compliance, mitigation measures and how to incorporate them into activity design, how to prepare and process appropriate documentation. Train Mission staff in basic 22 CFR 216 requirements and methods.

2. **Monitor and periodically audit** SO Teams' portfolios of activities to ensure:
   a. every Mission activity has an approved and operational 22 CFR 216 document in place;
   b. monitoring and mitigation actions specified are being addressed effectively (includes making field trips to SO programs' implementation partners' sites with SOT, etc.);
   c. amendments, if necessary, to 22 CFR 216 documents are undertaken as required and their mitigation measures are effectively incorporated into revised activity and SO designs; and
   d. Annual Reports by SO teams incorporate the degree of 22 CFR 216 decision compliance each year when reporting on results [do analysis for and prepare the required "Environmental Compliance" section of the AR].

3. **Pre-obligation Environmental Review** (ADS **201.3.12.2** section b): Assists SOTs in, and/or manages, the preparation of, and clears on, all Mission Initial Environmental Examinations, Requests for Categorical Exclusions, Scopings, Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Statements, Pesticide Evaluation Reports & Safe Use Action Plans, and any amendments to these.

4. **Mission Order**. Prepare, keep up to date, and promote application of, a Mission Order on environmental procedures to ensure integration of environmental values into standard Mission operating protocols and decision making.

5. **Strategic Planning Support.** Supports SOTs and Mission management in development of the environmental analysis during strategic planning (ADS 201.3.8.2). This responds to the Tropical Forestry & Biodiversity provisions of the FAA 118/119 as applicable to the preparation of Country (and Integrated) Strategic Plans. In Africa Bureau, these have been termed Environmental Threats and Opportunities Analyses (ETOA).

6. **Other ADS Policies & Procedures**. Help ensure environmental analysis and compliance of Mission programs is consistent with appropriate Achieving (ADS 202) and Assessing and Learning (ADS 203) and other relevant ADS Policies and Procedures, such as during Portfolio Reviews (ADS 203.3.7.2).

7. **Environmental Analysis.** Drawing upon the previous environmental analysis during strategic planning (201.3.8.2) and the information from the pre-obligation requirement for environmental impact (201.3.12.2 section b), help Operating Units incorporate the environmental recommendations into activity planning. Often additional environmental analyses may be useful to activity design and should be undertaken at this time.

8. **Biosafety Procedures.** Support the compliance by SO Teams with related Agency procedures, e.g., USAID's "Biosafety Procedures" covering Biosafety, Genetically Engineered and Transgenic Organisms guidance (ADS 211 draft).

9. **Capacity Building**.. Provide for environmental impact assessment capacity building among partners to streamline cooperation and promote integration of environmental management practices into programming.

10. **Title II Environmental Compliance**. In Missions with PL-480 Title II programs, act as coach to the Food for Peace and agriculture officers managing Title II Cooperating Sponsors and the Development Activity Program (DAP), Emergency Programs (EP) and Developmental Relief Programs (DRP) IEEs and CSR4 (Annual Report) Environmental Status Report submissions. The MEO clears on all.

11. **Recordkeeping**. Maintains Official 22 CFR 216 Files in hard and electronic copy.(22 CFR 216.10, ADS 202.3.4.6)

Additional Representative Roles:

12. Mainstream state-of-the-art development in the Mission by ensuring environmental awareness in decision making, promoting integration of environmental values, enhancing program design, impact and sustainability, ensuring unintended consequences are avoided, while enhancing positive outcomes and maximizing results. For example:
    a. Interact with Regional Legal Advisors, Contracting Officers to reinforce the application of the environmental procedures (verified in statutory checklists, assistance checklists, etc.).
    b. Promote incorporation of environmental provisions from 22 CFR 216 documentation into procurement instruments as appropriate..
    c. Promote mainstreaming of environmental management by participating in core planning and achieving steps with SOTs, e.g., in post-award briefings with contractors, grantees; SOT & partner work planning sessions, activity implementation reviews and results reporting.

13. **GCC. C**ontribute to Global Climate Change (if appropriate to the Mission) and other earmark reporting requirements.

14. **MDB project assessment.** In cooperation with EGAT, analyze Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) project environmental impact assessments, as needed. Mission feedback on environmental impact issues of selected MDB projects up for review is used by EGAT to inform the U.S. vote on these projects.

15. **Host country Environmental Procedures**. In a fashion consistent with 22 CFR 216, promote application, as appropriate, of host country environmental procedures to USAID investments.

16. Help assure consistency of Mission programming with appropriate international conventions.

17. Special assignments. Could include donor coordination in the E/NRM sector, design and evaluation, special requests, TDYs, environmental meetings, etc.

18. Help respond to requests for opinions, information and feedback on environmental issues, such as those requested by senior management, Presidential Initiatives, Global Bureaus (EGAT, Global Health), embassy, Congress, etc.

19. Help ensure that DCA, GDA, and MCA activities are incorporated as appropriate under Mission environmental compliance instruments and that due diligence is appropriately applied.

Matters Arising for Discussion & Consideration with Respect to Enhancing MEO role:

1. To what extent do Reg. 216 functions and responsibilities get captured in the work objectives and Annual Performance Evaluations of the MEO, relative to other assignments in a technical or program office?

2. Integrate MEO assignment with those of the backstop 10, 30, or 40 work objectives as

the case may be.

3. A common situation is that the MEO is regarded as an “environmental policer,” exercising authority for its own sake, effectively becoming a nuisance, frustrating the process of development. MEO needs to view her/his role as a creative one, not a compliance one. Stress the development results benefits to the mission staff and partners, and keep the legal hammer in the background;

4. Concerted effort is needed to raise the profile and “standing” of MEOs in the eyes of Mission management. MEO must have technical qualifications and skills to offer to the mix! And strong motivation, aided by a culture of support and encouragement.

5. Recognize and empower FSNs to serve as (co-, backstop) MEOs, but need strong technical support and orientation from REO and BEO, training, etc.

6. What relevance does being a FSN, PSC, RSSA, etc. (i.e., non-USDH) have for the MEO role?

   Authority: ADS 103 .3.1 .1 sets forth that "non-US citizen employees (host country and third country Personal Services Contractors (PSCs) and direct-hire employees) may be delegated or assigned any authority, duty or responsibility, delegable to US citizen direct hire employees" with certain limited exceptions, which exceptions do not include the designation as the MEO.

7. Technical capacity, training and “empowerment” of the MEO have a major bearing on whether a MEO is motivated and effective.

8. Support professional development planning, membership in professional associations, e.g., IAIA.

9. Providing a MEO Designation Letter may be a good idea to give the MEO “standing” in the Mission, esp. a FSN.

10. MEOs should take a role in follow-up on IEEs’ conditonalities, ensuring the accountability for implementation of IEE provisions is happening, or if not, why not, and promote appropriate adjustments.

11. Turn-over in staff, institutional memory, are a constant problem to deal with in Missions’ MEOs, partners’ trained staff, etc. So, AEC, BEO, REOs should make a concerted effort to maintain a regular program of training and capacity building.

12. Consider the MEO role & responsibilities broadly in context of planning, achieving, evaluating (ADS 201, 202, 203).

13. Include MEOs in BEO and REO communications, collaborative workspace, tool sharing platforms, Web sites, etc.

WORKSHOP AGENDA

Start	End	Module No. & Facilitator		Session Title	Details/Components
Monday May 16, 2005				**Arrival and Registration**	
15:00				**Optional Game Drive or Boat Excursion**	
18:30	19:30	-		**Registration & Pre-test**	
19:00				**Dinner**	
20:00	21:00			**Facilitators' Meeting – Bateleur I**	
Day 1: Tuesday May 17, 2005				**Theme: Why Does USAID Have Environmental Procedures and How Do I Respond?**	
A.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Wes Fisher Note taker / Recorder: Ian Kline					
8:00	8:20		CS MD		• Welcome by Camilien Jean W. Saint-Cyr, Regional Environmental Advisor, RCSA • Dawn Thomas, Acting Mission Director, USAID, Regional Center for Southern Africa (RCSA)
8:20	9:30	1	CS WK WF	**Opening, Introductions, Expectations**	• Facilitator / Participant Introductions • Review Objectives and Agenda • Venue/Facilities/Logistics Info – Alison Notley • Facilitator & Participant Expectations
9:30	10:30	2	WK CS	**Motivation & Rationale for Environmentally Sound Design (ESD)**	• Why Assess? Motivation for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Reg. 216 • Principles of Environmentally Sound Design
10:30	10:45			***Break***	
10:30	11:15	3	WF EW	**Key Concepts for EIA**	• EIA Overview • Information Requirements and Tools, Checklists • Mitigation and Monitoring
11:15	12:15	4A	WK	**Basic USAID Environmental Procedures**	• Reg. 216 Environmental Procedures Overview (Chap. 2, EPTM) • Introduction to EPTM as environmental documentation support tool
12:15	13:15			***Lunch***	Presentation by Mr. A. Lebonetse, District Wildlife Coordinator, Chobe National Park, *The Management Plan for Chobe National Park* (Draft 2001) with special reference to the *Chobe Riverfront Management Plan*
P.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Jody Stallings Note taker / Recorder: Ginger Waddell					
13:15	14:15	4B	WF	**USAID Procedures (cont'd)**	Screening/Categorization: Group exercises
14:15	14:30			***Break***	
14:30	15:10	4B	EW		Screening/Categorization: Report out
15:10	17:00	5	WF EW EC	**USAID Environmental Documentation**	Required Environmental Documentation: EPTM Chapter 3 • Umbrella IEE Procedures • Environmental Review Form: Screening and Reporting • Title II SYAP/MYAP Guidance • Environmental Status Reports (Title II)
19:30	20:30	6	WK WF	***Dinner & Discussion***	• Assigning Site Visit Teams: Kasane Dumpsite, Sewage Ponds, Chobe Farms and Env. Health Vector Control storage facility
20:30	21:00			Facilitators' Meeting –	**Bateleur I**

Day 2: Wednesday May 18				**Theme: Environmental Procedures as Strategic Support**	
A.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Cam St-Cyr Note taker / Recorder: Nico Tchamu					
Start	**End**	**Module No. & Facilitator**		**Session Title**	**Details/Components**
8:00	8:30		CS AN	**Tech review** **Logistics**	Review and address questions from Day 1 Announcements and logistics updates
8:30	9:45	7	WF WK EW	**Working Groups: Basic Concepts and Reg. 216**	Recap of material so far: • Brief Walkthrough of 22 CFR 216 • EIA Concepts • Mitigation and Monitoring
9:45	10:45	8A	WF WK	**Writing the IEE**	• Tools: EPTM Ch. 4, AFR *Guidelines* for ESD • Format and Structure of IEEs, • What If I Have to Go Beyond An IEE? (EA/PEA/SEA) • Environmental Documentation Samples, IEE Examples (EPTM Annex D)
10:45	1100			***Break***	
11:00	12:30	8A	WK WF	**Sample Environmental Documentation**	• Style Tips, Recommended Acceptable Language & Formats (RALF) for preparing Requests for Categorical Exclusions and IEEs • Tricky & interesting cases (participant reaction) • Participant experiences and questions
12:30	13:30			***Lunch***	Presentation by Mowana Hotel General Manager John Gray on cumulative effects of Chobe Riverfront development concerns
P.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Erika Clesceri Note taker / Recorder: David Mutazindwa					
13:30	14:45	8C	WF HA	**Local Environmental Management example**	• Review of excerpts from Chobe Riverfront Management Plan • Transect Walk: Mowana's Environmental Management: Water, Sewage, Solid Waste, Lodge conservation efforts
14:45	15:30	9A	WF WK EW	**Special Topics (1):** USAID Preoccupations **Includes 15 min. *Break***	• Africa Bureau *Env. Guidelines for Small-scale Activities in Africa* (EGSSAA) [15 min.] • IPM/Pesticides & PERSUAPs (WK) [15 min.] • Fertilizers & Reg 216 [5 min.] • Biosafety & biotechnology, ADS 211 [5 min.] • Water quality testing [5 min.]
15:30	18:00	10A	WF	**Case Site Visits: EIA Team Exercise**	• Case Site Team visits to Kasane Dumpsite, Sewage Ponds, Chobe Farms and Env. Health Vector Control storage facility
19:30		9B	KK	***Working Dinner -- Special Topics(2)***	• Transboundary Natural Resources Management Issues (Keith Kline and Michael Chase)
21:00	21:30			***Facilitators' Mtg.***	

Day 3: Thursday May 19, 2005				Theme: Challenging ESD Issues and How to Deal with Them as an MEO or SOT Member -- Focusing on the *Spirit* of Reg. 216	
Start	**End**	**Module No. & Facilitator**		**Session Title**	**Details/Components**
A.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Jim Walsh Note taker / Recorder: Keith Kline					
8:00	10:30	10B	WF HA	**Case Site Team EIA Exercises** Includes *Break*	EIA exercise group work: impact & mitigation categorization
10:30	11:30	10C	WF WK	**EIA Team report outs**	Plenary: Report Out and Comments
11:30	12:30	9C	EC	**Special Topics (3):** Environment and Emergencies	• Rapid Environmental Assessment in Emergencies • SPHERE Standards for Humanitarian Assistance • HIV/AIDS & Environment
12:30	13:30			***Lunch***	Selected Mission highlights: information sharing
P.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Ephantus Wahome Note taker / Recorder: Josefa Gomes					
13:30	14:30	8C		**Work Group Exercises**	Practice in application of Environmental Procedures
14:30	15:30	9D	WK JS GW	**Special Topics (4)** "Market-led environmental performance"	• Corporate environmental and social responsibility as a competitiveness strategy • Trade & Environment, WTO • Public/private alliances: GDA, DCA, SME, etc.: due diligence and compliance challenges • Private Environmental and Social Management Standards, ISO 14001, EUREPGAP, ISEAL, etc. • MSM Enterprise & Environment • Financial Intermediation & Environment • USAID Role in Impact Assessment at the Multilateral Development Banks
15:30	16:00			***Break***	
16:00	17:30	11A	WK, KR EW	**Program/Activity Cycle Integration and Environmental Mainstreaming (1)**	• Environmental Mainstreaming in USAID Programs • Strategic Planning and Analyses & Development Planning • ADS 201 Planning & ADS 202 Achieving • FAA 117, 118, and 119: Tropical Forestry and Biodiversity & Environmental Threats and Opportunities (ETOA) • ADS 204 Environmental Procedures: BEO, REA, MEO & SOT responsibilities • *Regional Environmental Quality Management Support*: Training, Capacity Building and Analysis • Regional Support Services (RCSA, REDSO, WARP)
18:30	---		WK WF	**Dinner & Discussion**	Developing a Community of Practice for USAID Environmental Compliance Practitioners

Day 4: **Friday May 20**				**Theme: Addressing Challenging ESD Issues as an MEO or SOT Member: Focusing on the *Spirit* of Reg. 216 (Continued)**	
Start	**End**	**Module No. & Facilitator**		**Session Title**	**Details/Components**
A.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Bob Buzzard Note taker / Recorder: Sheila Roquitte					
8:00	8:15		CS AN	**Tech review Logistics**	• Review issues from Days 2-3 • Announcements, logistics
8:15	9:30	11B	CS WK KR	**Program/Activity Cycle Integration and Mainstreaming (2)**	• MEO terms of reference • Value of Mission Orders • Better follow-up to Conditions, Deferrals • Activity modifications, additions and IEE amendments • Environmental Status Report (recap): is the rest of the Agency ready for this? • Legal & Policy Considerations for Environmental Review: GC, RLA roles (KR) • RCO roles: Acquisition & Assistance • MEO/SOT & environmental considerations • Green Procurement
9:30	10:30	12A	WK WF	**Strengthening Environmentally-sound Design**	• Using Regulation 216 Strategically • Is Reg. 216 Ripe for Revision? • Mission capacity in ESD and management for sustainability – Survey questionnaire / self-assessment
10:30	11:00			***Break***	
11:00	12:00	9F	GW WK KK	**Special Topics (6) & Discussion**	• State-USAID Joint Strategic Planning: Implications • Policy Reform, Sectoral Assistance, Millennium Challenge Corporation • Environmental Justice & Advocacy • Presidential Initiatives
12:00	14:00			***Lunch***	
P.M. Moderator/Facilitator: Keith Kline Note taker / Recorder: Candace Buzzard					
14:00	16:00	12B	WK WF EC	**Key Problems and Proposed Solutions in Reg. 216 Application and "Beyond Compliance"**	• Analyze how to work together in region • Future capacity building needs • Develop regional action plan and recommendations on how to better mainstream environmental considerations in development programs
16:00	17:00	13	CS WK WF	**Wrap up**	• Complete, submit evaluation form, Mission self-assessments • Certificates of Completion • Close out remarks by Mission Director
19:00	20:00			**Facilitators' Debriefing**	

AN : Alison Notley
CS: J. Camilien W. Saint-Cyr
KK: Keith Kline
EC: Erika Clesceri
EW: Ephantus K. Wahome
GW: Ginger Waddell
HA: Hayley Adamski, AWF
IK: Ian Kline, Vice President, Cadmus Group
KK: Keith Kline
KR: Kim Robinson, RLA, USAID/RCSA
MD: Mission Director (Acting, Dawn Thomas)
WF: Weston A. Fisher
WK: Walter Knausenberger

Participants

USAID / Africa Bureau Mission Environmental Officers' (MEO) Training Workshop
Kasane, Botswana
17–20 May 2005

LAST NAME	GIVEN NAMES	TITLE	MISSION & ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	EMAIL
Badiane	Aminata Nuane	AG/NRM Specialist	USAID/Senegal, Dakar	(221) 869 6100	(221) 869 6101	badiane@usaid.gov
Buzzard	Robert F.	General Development Officer	USAID/Kenya, Nairobi	(254) 20 862 400	(254) 20 860 949	robuzzard@usaid.gov
Buzzard	Candace	GDO/Environment Officer	USAID/Zimbabwe, Harare	(263) 42 509 92	(263) 42 524 78	cbuzzard@usaid.gov
Chaunga	Florence	Logistics Coordination	RAPID/Chemonics			
Clesceri*	Erika	Environmental Specialist	USAID/DCHA/FFP, Washington, DC	(202) 712 0453		eclesceri@washington.usaid.gov
Fisher*	Weston	Principal, Capacity for Impact Assessment and Management	Cadmus Group, Boston, USA	(978) 239 1063	(617) 673 7001	wfisher@cadmusgroup.com
Gomes Mateus	Josefa	Administrative Assistant, MEO Designee	USAID/Angola, Luanda	(244) 23 99 518	(244) 23 99 521	jgomes@usaid.gov
Kline	Ian	Vice President	Cadmus Group, Boston, USA	(617) 673 7174		ikline@cadmusgroup.com
Kline	Keith	Regional NRM Advisor	USAID/RCSA, Gaborone, Botswana	(267) 392 4449	(267) 316 4286	kkline@usaid.gov
Knausenberger*	Walter I.	Senior Regional Environmental Officer	USAID/REDSO/ESA Nairobi, Kenya	(254) 20 862 400 ext 2267; Cell: (+254)(0)733 896 956	(+254) 20 860 949	waknausenberger@usaid.gov
Martins	Jose Agosto	Project Manager, Tourism	USAID/Mozambique Maputo			

LAST NAME	GIVEN NAMES	TITLE	MISSION & ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	EMAIL
Mooketsi	Dorcus Masego	RPIO Administrative Assistant	USAID/RCSA, Gaborone, Botswana	(267) 363 1351	(267) 316 4286	dmooketsi@usaid.gov
Mutazindwa	David	Project Management Specialist	USAID/Uganda, Kampala	(256) 31 387 387	(256) 31 387 292	dmutazindwa@usaid.gov
Nantamu	Nightingale	Program Management Specialist	USAID/Uganda, Kampala	(256) 31 387 387	(256) 31 387 377	nnantamu@usaid.gov
Nicodéme	Tchamou	Program Development Specialist	USAID/Kinshasa, CARPE	(243) 81 700 7195	(243) 880 3274	ntchamou@usaid.gov
Notley	Allison	Logistics Coordination	RAPID/Chemonics			
Ramanase	Zoelimalala	Land Resources Management Specialist, CTO	USAID/Madagascar, Antananarivo	(261) 20 225 3920		zramanase@usaid.gov
Robinson	Kim	Regional Legal Advisor	USAID/RCSA, Gaborone, Botswana	(267) 363 1244	(267) 316 4263	krobinson@usaid.gov
Roquitte	Sheila	Program Officer	USAID/South Africa, Pretoria	(27) 12 452 2266	(27) 12 452 2399	sroquitte@usaid.gov
Saint-Cyr*	Camilien J.W.	Regional Environmental Advisor	USAID/RCSA, Gaborone, Botswana	(267) 392 4449	(267) 316 4286	csaint-cyr@usaid.gov
Stallings	Jody	Nat. Res. Mgmnt Advisor & MEO	USAID/Uganda, Kampala	(256) 31387 387	(256) 31 387 292	jstallings@usaid.gov

LAST NAME	GIVEN NAMES	TITLE	MISSION & ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	FAX	EMAIL
Thomas	Dawn	Deputy Regional Director	USAID/RCSA, Gaborone, Botswana	(267) 363 1242	(267) 316 4263	dthomas@usaid.gov
Waddell	Ginger	Project Development Officer	USAID/RCSA, Gaborone, Botswana	(267) 363 1318	(267) 316 4286	gwaddell@usaid.gov
Wahome*	Ephantus K.	Assistant Regional Environmental Advisor	USAID/REDSO/ES Nairobi, Kenya	(254) 20 862 400 ext 2714 Cell: (+254)(0)722 822 306	(+254) 20 860 949	ewahome@usaid.gov
Walsh	James	Sudan Dev. Program Manager	USAID/Sudan Field office, Nairobi, Kenya	(254) 20 862 400	(254) 20 860 341	jwalsh@usaid.gov
* Facilitator						