

PN-ACS-121  
105500

**ASSESSMENT OF  
JOINT PROGRAMMING POSSIBILITIES**

*BETWEEN THE*

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE'S BUREAU OF OCEANS AND  
INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS (OES)**

*AND*

**USAID'S GLOBAL BUREAU CENTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT  
(G/ENV)**

**IRG**

**International Resources Group**

# Table of Contents

<u>Acronym List</u> .....	ii
<u>Executive Summary</u> .....	1
<u>Introduction</u> .....	1
<u>Major Points</u> .....	1
<u>Findings</u> .....	3
<u>The Challenge</u> .....	4
<u>Assessment</u> .....	6
<u>Introduction</u> .....	6
<u>Background</u> .....	6
<u>Planning Process</u> .....	8
<u>Document Organization</u> .....	11
<u>Programmatic Shared Interests</u> .....	15
<u>Institutional Traits</u> .....	24
<u>Recommendations</u> .....	28
<u>Conclusion</u> .....	31
<u>Annex 1</u> .....	32
<u>OES Goals and Objectives and G/ENV Objectives and Intermediate Results</u> .....	32

## List of Tables

<u>Table 1: Summary of Department of State and USAID Planning Process</u> .....	11
<u>Table 2: Summary Planning and Budgeting Documents</u> .....	14
<u>Table 3: Key Areas of Significant Shared Interest</u> .....	19
<u>Table 4: Areas of Moderately Shared Interest</u> .....	21
<u>Table 5: Areas of Independent Interest</u> .....	23
<u>Table 6: Institutional Traits</u> .....	27

# Acronym List

BBSs	Bureau Budget Submissions
BIOFOR	Biodiversity and Fragile Ecosystem Conservation and Management
BPP	Bureau Performance Plan
CGIAR	International Agricultural Research Centers
CJS	Commerce-Justice-State
CSPs	Country Strategic Plans
DAS	Deputy Assistant Secretary
EPIQ	Environmental Policy and Institutional Strengthening
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FMP	Financial Management Planning
G/ENV	United States Agency for International Development Global Bureau Environment Center
GPRA	Government Results and Performance Act of 1993
GreenCOM	Environmental Education and Communications Activity
IASP	International Affairs Strategic Plan
IBRD	The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
IR	Intermediate Result
IRG	International Resources Group
ITTF	International Institute of Tropical Forestry
MP	Management Planning
NCP	Non-Contracting Party
NIS	Newly Independent States
NRM	Natural Resources Management
OES	Department of States' Oceans, Environment and Science Bureau
PCI	Policy Coordination and Implementation
PP	Performance Plan
PPC	United States Agency for International Development Bureau for Policy, Planning and Coordination
R4s	Results Review and Resource Request
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SO	Strategic Objective
SRPP	Strategic Planning and Policy
SSO	Strategic Support Objective
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

The leadership of the USAID Global Bureau Center for Environment (G/ENV) and the Department of State's Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES) engaged International Resources Group (IRG) to determine ways to enhance overall cooperation between the two organizations. The request grew from the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act, passed by Congress in 1998, and a June 1999 memorandum from Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to then USAID Administrator Brian Atwood, both of which emphasized a closer State Department-USAID relationship. The assignment also resulted from a belief, shared by Assistant Secretary Sandalow and Deputy Assistant Administrator Hales, that a greater degree of coordination could result in synergies beneficial to both OES and G/ENV.

## Major Points

In identifying ways to enhance cooperation between OES and G/ENV, IRG interviewed more than 30 professional staff from both organizations. The information provided by these interviews was complemented by a review of relevant documentation. The following major themes arose from the analysis of this information:

- **A number of significant benefits could result from the two organizations acting in ways that complement each other's strengths.** A closer working relationship could provide OES with influence on additional resources that G/ENV brings to bear. This could, in turn, increase the effectiveness of policy dialogue efforts. Similarly, collaboration with OES could provide G/ENV and USAID Missions with support from OES' broad policy framework—helping G/ENV environmental program interventions reach their full potential. At a minimum, exposure to alternative perspectives and access to broader

information bases would enrich the program content of both OES and G/ENV.

- **Closer cooperation between OES and G/ENV is not about the “imposition of agendas”** (OES dictating how G/ENV should program its resources or G/ENV defining OES’ environmental policy framework). Rather, it takes advantage of an opportunity to combine resources to advance US environmental foreign policy interests. And, to be successful, both OES and G/ENV *must leverage the resources and influence of other parts of their respective organizations.*
- **Addressing a number of institutional issues will enhance the probability of successful interactions between OES and G/ENV.** The State Department and USAID each have unique operating rhythms that derive from separate, but related, mandates. The Department’s primary role is to further US foreign policy through diplomacy and negotiation—a long-term process that places a premium on flexibility and adaptation to changing circumstances. USAID is concerned with sustainable development—a long-term process that requires selection of sequential options that are focused on environmental protection, social development, economic growth, and constancy in implementing the choices made.
- **OES’ and G/ENV’s separate-but-related roles result in different planning processes and time horizons.**
  - *OES’ planning horizons are long-term; for example, some treaties take years to negotiate and decades to implement.* Throughout the process, however, OES also focuses on achieving short-term targets that contribute to the realization of the ultimate objective. In sum, the OES process is marked by the need to shift between tactical and strategic modes in pursuit of a final objective.
  - *G/ENV programs emphasize tangible results and performance-based indicators.* Programs typically have identified starting and end points that are often defined by the length of a strategy cycle (five to seven years) or the period of technical assistance mechanisms (three to 15

years). And there is, in general, an identified progression of activities designed to achieve the desired results.

- **Both OES and G/ENV must contend with significant constraints.**
  - OES is charged with formulating US international oceans, environmental, and scientific policy. Yet, the Bureau sometimes lacks the resources to monitor and promote its implementation, because, within the State Department, the regional bureaus typically control the majority of resources. OES also has responsibility for negotiating international environmental agreements; however, implementation of such agreements is typically handled by US domestic agencies. And, internationally, other countries must develop their own implementation strategies.
  - G/ENV assists with formulation of USAID environmental policy and provision of intellectual and technical leadership for emerging trends and issues. The Center also has a modest level of program resources. However, the Center's role is largely that of programmatic support to regional bureaus and Missions. USAID's decentralized management system assigns primary authority and the bulk of the budget for program development and implementation to the Agency's field missions.

## Findings

Most personnel interviewed believe that closer cooperation can best be achieved if the two organizations enhance and expand current cooperative efforts by providing greater structure and dedicated resources to these activities. Joint undertakings on specific tasks related to areas of mutual interest (e.g., forest protection, transboundary water, coral reef protection, and global climate change) could provide a solid basis for subsequent, broader cooperation.

To achieve effective results from OES-G/ENV cooperation, dialogue and participation must broaden. Within the State

Department, geographic bureaus and embassies must be included in the discussions. Given their position of primacy within the Department and their influence on programs, their support of joint OES-G/ENV initiatives is critical. Similarly, USAID regional bureaus and field missions must be included if the full impact of policy dialogue and multilateral negotiation is to be realized at the country level. Enlisting USAID field missions as active partners could ensure that the environmental agenda is placed in a broader development context (e.g., USAID resources could help move environmental concerns to the forefront of G77 nation development priorities, while simultaneously serving to help solve G77 nation environmental problems). Finally, key planning and budgeting units within State and USAID must form an integral part of joint activities to ensure that adequate resources are available to conduct a collaborative effort.

Since neither the international diplomacy nor the sustainable development arenas are static, a structured approach to discuss emerging issues and priorities should be a part of a closer OES-G/ENV relationship. A systematic process to discuss such matters (e.g., Persistent Organic Pollutants and the urban environment) and consider them for inclusion in a joint undertaking would serve to keep programs current with, and responsive to, critical environmental priorities.

## The Challenge

G/ENV and OES are in a position to combine forces and achieve significant program synergies through closer cooperation.

- Congress has mandated that the State Department and USAID cooperate more closely.
- The Secretary of State and the previous USAID Administrator have provided a vision on how such cooperation should take place.
- Increased interdependence of environmental problems and solutions (e.g., cross-border impacts, policy change and governance, technology, trade, treaties, etc.) requires implementation of integrated approaches.

Circumstances are conducive for OES and G/ENV to seize the initiative—by defining the terms for closer cooperation at political and program levels—to create an integrated, effective approach for advancing the US foreign environmental policy agenda.

# Assessment

## Introduction

Under the Environmental Policy and Institutional Strengthening (EPIQ) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC), the USAID Global Bureau Environment Center (G/ENV) issued a work order to International Resources Group (IRG) to assess ways that the Department of State's Oceans, Environment and Science Bureau (OES) and G/ENV could collaborate more closely in planning and implementing environmental programs of common interest. Specifically, the assignment required EPIQ to:

- Describe the planning/programming processes of both USAID/G/ENV and State/OES;
- Identify areas of program overlap;
- Identify areas with no mutual interest; and
- Provide recommendations on next steps for establishing a closer working relationship.

## Background

This assignment grew from two initial documents. The first, a June 4, 1999, memorandum from Secretary of State Albright to then-USAID Administrator Atwood, was entitled, *The State-USAID Relationship*. The second document, *Enhancing State-USAID Cooperation*, was a November 19, 1999, memorandum issued by OES Assistant Secretary David B. Sandalow and USAID/G/ENV Deputy Assistant Administrator David Hales.

Secretary Albright's memorandum noted that the basis for the new relationship between the Department and the Agency was the *Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act* of 1998 and its associated Executive Order. The memorandum provided detail regarding agreement on goals, programming planning authorities, and responsibilities. The agreement on goals:

- Affirmed that sustainable development and humanitarian assistance are major components of U.S. foreign policy;
- Delegated authority to USAID for managing development and other economic assistance programs; and
- Affirmed maximum coordination with other U.S. Government agencies, bilateral donors, and multilateral institutions.

Regarding the establishment of program planning authorities and responsibilities, the Secretary noted the following:

- The Secretary of State has overall responsibility for U.S. foreign policy;
- The Secretary of State delegates to the USAID Administrator the authority to carry out the agency's mission (e.g., creation of development policies and implementation of development programs);
- USAID participates in developing the international affairs strategic plan (IASP);
- USAID consults with the Department of State in preparing its annual performance plan report; and
- The Department of State participates in the annual USAID country strategic plans (CSPs), Results Review and Resource Request (R4s), and bureau budget submissions (BBSs).

The Sandalow-Hales memorandum builds upon Secretary Albright's directive, clearly stating that OES and G/ENV will seek closer coordination among the two programs, beginning with the FY 2001-2002 program planning cycle. Specifically, Sandalow and Hales instructed their staffs to identify areas of shared environmental program priority, describe each organization's respective roles and responsibilities concerning action on shared priorities, and prepare resource requests based on shared goals and objectives.

## Planning Process

### USAID/G/ENV

The key planning and programming document for all USAID operating units, including G/ENV, is the R4. The document serves to measure program progress against established targets and to provide justification for future funding.

Formally established in FY 1996 as a product of the Agency's mid-1990s comprehensive re-engineering exercise, the R4's roots lie in a long-standing USAID Action Plan annual program review process. Thus, the R4 has a life cycle of five years but is updated annually. It is derived from a seven-year USAID/G Bureau Strategic Plan, and is an integral part of a series of documents (e.g., annual budget submission, congressional presentation, mission R4s) that make up USAID's yearly budget request evaluation process.

R4 preparation follows standard USAID procedures. General guidance, on both content and format, is issued by the Agency's Bureau for Policy, Planning and Coordination (PPC). This guidance is complemented by G/ENV-specific direction prepared and issued, along with a document preparation schedule, by the Center's program office. The draft text and tabular data are prepared by the Center's technical offices. In keeping with the Global Bureau's principal mission of technical support to field operations, technical officers interact closely with USAID mission and geographic bureau personnel to measure the contribution of Center efforts toward USAID bilateral and regional investments in the environment.

Draft material is submitted to the Center's program office, which prepares the complete draft R4. The G/ENV Deputy Assistant Administrator presents the draft to the USAID Assistant Administrator for Global Programs for review and approval. The presentation is conducted formally through a scheduled meeting with outside participation (i.e., representatives from the Agency's geographic and central Office of Policy and Program Coordination and management bureaus). The review critically judges program progress assessments and the soundness of arguments for future funding. Upon approval by the Assistant Administrator, the

G/ENV R4 becomes part of the USAID submission to the Secretary of State, with eventual inclusion in the President's budget presentation to Congress.

### State/OES

OES's program planning process shares many similarities with that of USAID/G/ENV. The key document for OES is the Bureau Performance Plan (BPP). The BPP serves as a blueprint for the OES program on global and regional environmental policy and diplomacy issues. It also provides the rationale for funding and personnel to implement the program. While a succession of documents have required strategic planning by all Department of State units, the BPP grew from the *Government Results and Performance Act (GPRA)* of 1993. It represents the first concerted effort to link the allocation of financial resources to Department (and OES Bureau) priorities.

The BPP has a three-year horizon with annual updates. It is anchored in State's International Affairs Strategic Plan (IASP), currently under revision, which establishes the key foreign policy goals for all activity sectors, including the environment. As with the USAID R4, the OES BPP is linked to a series of documents [e.g., the performance plan (PP), the Commerce-Justice-State (CJS) Plan, the annual budget submission) that make up the annual planning-budget cycle.

The OES BPP, prepared from February to June, follows a process that is currently under review—aiming to reduce work through streamlining documents and eliminating duplication. General BPP guidance is issued, in separate sets, by each of the Department's central planning units: strategic planning and policy (SRPP); management planning (MP); and financial management planning (FMP).

- SRPP focuses on big-picture, technical aspects of strategic planning (e.g., goals, objectives, indicators, and the relationships among them);
- MP is concerned with support-services aspects of program planning, (i.e., physical infrastructure, personnel and commodities); and

- FMP concentrates on financial management matters.

This general guidance is consolidated and rationalized by the OES Office of Policy Coordination and Implementation (PCI).

The basic BPP material (i.e., indicators, text and budget projections) is drafted by the cognizant technical offices, in consultation with the designated deputy assistant secretary (DAS) within OES. It is then forwarded to PCI, which prepares the complete BPP draft. Informal reviews of the draft among PCI and the OES front office refine document contents in preparation for review and approval by the Assistant Secretary of State for OES.

The same informal DAS-level, front-office review is used to negotiate and resolve any content and budget differences between PCI and the technical offices. In principle, the review by the Assistant Secretary is a formal presentation with inter-office and inter-agency participation. While some outside participation occurs (e.g., SRPP, FMP, MP, and, most recently, USAID/G/ENV), in practice, OES BPP reviews are mainly in-house procedures—although the Secretary of State occasionally reviews a BPP of a functional bureau like OES. Upon approval, the BPP becomes part of the Executive Branch’s budget submission to Congress.

Table 1 demonstrates the essential elements of the planning processes of both USAID/G/ENV and State/OES.

**Table 1: Summary of Department of State and USAID Planning Process**

	State/OES BPP	USAID/G/ENV - R4
Planning Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPP: Bureau Performance Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R4: Results Review and Resources Request</li> </ul>
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning and funding (essentially operating funds, with ESF—Environmental Diplomacy Funds)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress Measurement and Funding Request (Program and Operating Funds)</li> </ul>
Origins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiated in 1993 in the context of the Government Results and Performance Act (GPRA) requirements to better link Department resources to priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instituted in 1997 as part of USAID Re-engineering. Grew out of long-standing USAID Annual Action Plan Process</li> </ul>
Primary Strategy/ Programming Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Department of State International Affairs Strategic Plan (IASP)—provides framework for foreign policy goals; currently in revision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>G/ENV Strategic Plan—5-year horizon</li> </ul>
Life Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 years with yearly updates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 years with yearly updates</li> </ul>
Links to Other Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IASP, CJS, Annual Budget Submission, and Geographic Bureau BPPs, Post MPPs, Congressional Presentation Document (CPD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Center Strategic Plan, Congressional Presentations, Annual Budget Submission, Regional Bureau, and Mission R4s</li> </ul>

## Document Organization

### USAID/G/ENV—R4

The USAID R4 is organized around a cascading set of planning and measurement tools.

The highest level of planning/measurement, the Strategic Support Objective (SSO), is a long-range target, the achievement of which results in meaningful improvement in the environment and natural resource base of USAID's partner countries. G/ENV objectives include SSOs for sustainable natural resource use, urban environmental management, sustainable energy production and use, and response to climate change. The support aspect of the SSO designates and recognizes the USAID Global Bureau's principal role as one of support to the efforts of the Agency's prime operating units, the overseas field missions.

The Intermediate Result (IR) is the level of planning/measurement directly below the SSO. IRs are specifically designed activity packages that lead to achievement of particular SSO objectives. IRs are also developed in linked sets to produce synergies and the efficient use of financial resources. For example, IRs for the natural resources management strategic objective include initiatives to effect bio-diversity conservation, improve management of natural forests and tree systems, enhance environmental education and communication, and increase conservation and the sustainable use of coastal and freshwater resources. All of these IRs are parts designed to achieve the larger whole.

Indicators are the narrowest level of planning/measurement. They track IR activities' progress and measure it in quantifiable terms. For example, indicators for the natural forest management IR include the number of hectares under effective management and number of hectares under improved management. In addition, a policy success indicator is determined by proxy measures, such as forest protection laws passed and rational forest use implementing regulations developed and adopted.

The Global Bureau uses one more measurement set—the value-added indicator. This tool, derives from the Global Bureau's field mission support role, gauges complementary assistance to field programs. Value-added impact is measured in terms of person days of Global Bureau temporary duty visit support to overseas missions and the dollar value of G/ENV core funding provided to field activities. In addition, G/ENV applies the value-added indicator to estimate its contribution (calculated in staff time and program dollar value) to global or multi-national activities, such as regional conferences on environmental issues and the implementation of transboundary environmental programs.

The G/ENV planning and reporting process of establishing objectives, developing activities, and measuring progress clearly emphasizes quantification, results achievement, accountability, and the linkage of progress to budget allocation.

## State/OES—BPP

The BPP is also structured around a cascading series of planning tools. The OES Bureau-level goals are the broadest level of planning. These goals include promotion of the following:

- Resource conservation;
- Sustainable management;
- Management of terrestrial, marine, and atmospheric resources;
- Reduction of health and environmental risks from toxic chemicals, hazardous wastes and the spread of infectious disease; and
- Promotion of open areas to oceans and space.

They derive from the Department of State's International Affairs Strategic Goals and represent priority U.S. interests in international oceans, environment, and science.

Strategic Objectives (SOs), the next planning level, contribute to achieving the Bureau's goals and, accordingly, are developed and grouped in clusters. BPP objectives approximate USAID R4 IRs. Examples of objectives (under the terrestrial, marine, and atmospheric resources goal) include promotion of sustainable fisheries management, international agreement on elements of the Kyoto Protocol, and development of global and regional institutions for managing freshwater resources. Hazardous waste reduction objectives include upgrading the procedures for international shipment and disposal of toxic waste and strengthening worldwide political commitment to enhanced preparedness against infectious diseases (e.g., HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria).

Indicators, the BPP's final unit of planning, are defined activities that support particular objectives. They generally compare to the USAID R4 indicators, but have a broader scope and mark events and processes that contribute to the achievement of or sustain SOs and Bureau-level goals. For example, the OES resource conservation and sustainable management objective is supported by indicators to 1) protect sea turtles through an annual shrimp

export certification process; 2) implement the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) plans on shark management; and 3) reduce or eliminate non-contracting party (NCP) fishing activities in regional fisheries organizations. As can be seen, each of these indicators represents an ongoing process, for which measurement in quantifiable terms may not always be applicable. The same objective may also have a measurable and narrow-in-scope indicator (e.g., realization of two workshops, one in Africa and one in Asia on sustainable fishing, conservation, and management practices).

Table 2 provides a summary of the USAID/G/ENV R4 and State/OES BPP. Amore detailed presentation of OES goals and objectives and G/ENV objectives and intermediate results is contained in Annex I.

**Table 2: Summary Planning and Budgeting Documents**

USAID G/ENV - R4	STATE OES BPP
<p><b><u>Strategic Support Objectives (SSOs)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadest level of planning</li> <li>• Long-range targets leading to meaningful improvement in the environment and natural resource base in partner countries</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>OES Bureau Goals</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadest level of planning</li> <li>• Goals derived from State Department's International Affairs Strategic Goals</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Intermediate Results (IRs)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific activity packages designed to lead to the achivement of SSOs</li> <li>• Developed in linked sets to produce synergies and efficient use of finacial reources</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Strategic Objectives (SOs)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities designed to contribute to achieving Bureau goals</li> <li>• Developed and grouped in clusters</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicators</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrowest level of planning/ measurement</li> <li>• Used to track IR activities' progress and measure it in quantifiable terms</li> <li>• "Value-added" indicators</li> <li>• gauge G/ENV's complementary assistance to field programs</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Indicators</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrowest level of planning</li> <li>• Activities that support particular activities defined in the SOs</li> <li>• Can represent ongoing processes for which quantifiable measurement is not always applicable</li> <li>• Can also be specific, narrow measures of progress or achievement</li> </ul>

## **Programmatic Shared Interests**

As noted above, USAID/G/ENV SSOs include objectives to protect and sustain natural resources, principally forests, freshwater and coastal ecosystems, and agricultural lands, and to improve the response to climate-change challenges. These objectives match up well with the OES strategic goal on conservation and sustainable management of terrestrial, marine, and atmospheric resources. Considerable common ground also exists between the G/ENV SSO on natural resources and the OES strategic objective concerning reduction of health and environmental risks from disposal of toxic chemicals and hazardous wastes.

Engagement with international partners (e.g., the World Bank, regional development banks, United Nations Development Program, the European Union, the Mekong Delta Commission, the Southern Africa Development Commission) is another area of joint interest and priority. OES has developed a discrete strategic objective—to strengthen relationships with bilateral, regional, and multilateral institutions engaged in the environmental arena—for this purpose. While USAID does not have the same explicit target for interaction with international partners, the Agency has a long history of involvement with the same organizations on a wide range of topics, including the environment.

### **Areas of Significant Shared Interest**

The OES–G/ENV overlap in strategic planning is reflected in shared priorities at the program level. Both organizations are actively engaged in four areas across a broad front: global climate change, natural resource management, forestry, and energy.

#### ***Global Climate Change***

OES places high priority on advancing the U.S. global climate change agenda on a range of issues related to the Kyoto and Montreal Protocols. Specifically its multilateral negotiations aim to develop and gain international acceptance of guidelines for

rational land and forestry use, the application of CDM mechanisms, and agreement on measures to reduce ozone depletion. OES also places high priority on formulating and successfully negotiating an international protocol/convention to control invasive species and reduce persistent organic pollution levels. Believing that G77 countries (largely third-world states) are key actors on both questions, OES views G77 support as vital to successful dealing with the threat these issues pose to the global environment.

G/ENV likewise actively participates in the global climate change arena. For example, the Center supports a number of bilateral field-mission programs in developing policy frameworks for land use. With a specific relationship to the Kyoto Protocol, G/ENV has financed drafting of position papers related to the Argentina Round and has also backed research initiatives on climate change by the International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR). Through its worldwide GreenCOM (Environmental Education and Communication Activity), the G/ENV Center promotes public awareness and action campaigns on climate change.

#### *Natural Resources Management (NRM)*

OES's broad NRM agenda includes plans to intensify interaction with the international donor community, while simultaneously engaging new partners (e.g., Colombia, Egypt, SAARC, and the Central American and Caribbean states) on the same wide range of issues. To this end, OES is planning a series of bio-diversity workshops in East Asia and Latin America. While developing position papers for negotiations on an international convention to protect coral reefs, OES also has proposed a special joint State/OES/USAID task force to address coral reef issues. OES also gives precedence to revitalizing the Middle East working group on the environment, and the Bureau is pursuing agreements for transboundary environmental assessments in several world regions (e.g., Central Asia, the Nile Basin, and Southern Africa). In addition, OES aims to conduct a series of workshops in the Near East and Latin America on the importance of bio-diversity and to launch a counter-desertification-reseeding program in West Africa.

G/ENV's NRM involvement is equally broad. Through its IQC mechanisms, the Center contributes directly to bilateral NRM initiatives in more than 30 countries. This portfolio includes development of comprehensive policy frameworks as well as specifically targeted program interventions to enhance the sustainable use of natural resources. G/ENV places a high priority on supporting transboundary environmental sector assessments and has helped to frame an agenda to address desertification in Africa. USAID's long and rich history of interaction with the international donor community covers the full gamut of development issues, and G/ENV has provided Agency leadership in dialogue with the World Bank (IBRD), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and other international organizations on a broad-based environmental agenda. In particular, the Center has pioneered the idea of environmental audits, has promoted assigning economic value to natural resources and incorporating this concept into host-country economic development plans, and has identified the need for sustainable finance strategies to ensure the availability of environmental and natural resource management services.

### *Forestry*

OES' forestry sector involvement includes completing negotiations for an agreement to conduct transboundary environmental assessments—including taking stock of forest resources to determine the rate and primary causes of forest-cover reduction. Many potential signatories to the agreement are G-77 nations with significant natural forests (e.g., Brazil, Chile, several African countries, Indonesia, and India). OES is helping negotiate a G-8-sponsored global forest action plan and will hold regional workshops to demonstrate how remote sensing can be used in such plans.

G/ENV is actively engaged in the forestry sector. Center personnel participated in the 1998 International Institute of Tropical Forestry (ITTF) Caribbean Foresters meeting that considered deforestation impact in that region, and G/ENV is involved in policy-level discussions for developing a G-8 worldwide forest action plan. Through its ongoing projects (e.g., EPIQ and BIOFOR), G/ENV supports bilateral USAID Mission NRM, including sustainable forest management and policy initiatives in more than

30 countries. Policy agendas include essential issues, such as logging concessions, stumpage fees, and timber taxes. The Center also assists program-level forestry management initiatives in over 20 countries. Many of these investments emphasize village-level forestry management, agroforestry practices, and carbon sequestration.

### *Energy*

In addition to global climate change, OES places high priority on policy initiatives regarding non-renewable energy exploration, generation, and consumption in the Caspian Sea region. It is also attempting to secure Newly Independent States (NIS) participation in the UN Transboundary Air Pollution Convention. Finally, OES actively seeks business opportunities for private U.S. companies in the international energy market.

The centerpiece of G/ENV's energy sector involvement is policy, and Center initiatives have helped formulate policy agendas on sustainable energy use; exploration, revenue generation, and resource management; promotion of renewable energy sources; and energy planning. In addition, G/ENV has provided training opportunities for scores of host-country counterparts on a range of energy sector matters and has assisted in the adoption of clean air technologies by more than 140 host-country enterprises.

Table 3 details both OES' and G/ENV's involvement in areas of significant mutual interest.

**Table 3: Key Areas of Significant Shared Interest**

AREA	State/OES		USAID/G/ENV	
	Policy	Program	Policy	Program
<b>GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE: Kyoto &amp; Montreal Protocols</b>				
Land & forestry use guidelines	●		●	
CDM Mechanisms	●	●		●
Ozone depletion reduction	●	●		●
Kyoto related CGAR			●	
Kyoto Argentina Papers			●	
Energy, BIOFOR, EPIQ IQC's				●
GEF Projects, Montreal Protocol Fund		●		
Invasive Species				
Protocol	●			
Public Awareness Campaign				●
Workshops		●		
Southeast Asia Environmental Initiative	●	●	●	●
<b>FORESTRY</b>				
EPIQ, BIOFOR IQC's - 30+ countries			●	●
Indicators for CIFOR + IQC's in bilateral programs (Cameron, Cote d'Ivoire, Brazil)			●	●
Significant Participation IITF Caribbean Foresters meeting (6/98)			●	
Negotiable G-8 Forest Action Plan	●		●	
Workshops, remote sensing G-8 Forest Action Plan		●		
Carbon Sequestration	●	●		●
Forestry Management IQC's 20+ countries (e.g. Mexico, Indonesia, Tanzania, Senegal, Honduras)	●			●
<b>NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</b>				
Dialogue with donors (IRRD, ADB, IADB, EU) on broad range of ENV and NRM issues	●		●	
Dialogue with "new" partners (Egypt, Colombia, SAARC, and Central America) on ENV and NRM issues.	●		●	
Caspian Sea OSCE Env: Security Conference	●			
ECO-system Policy – UNEP, IBRD, ICUN, WCMC	●			
Transboundary Env. Impact Assessments (Secure signatures)	●		●	●
Eco-system Management Programs (Latin America & Asia)		●		
Bilateral NRM Programs via IQC's (30+ countries)			●	●
Jordan Ag. Extension Service		●		
Jordan Regional Env Center		●		
Revitalize Mid-East Interagency working Group on Env	●			
Regional workshops (near East, Asia, & Latin America) flock & fauna		●		

AREA	State/OES		USAID/G/ENV	
	Policy	Program	Policy	Program
Conduct eco-system management programs		●		
Counter desertification reseeding program – West Africa		●		●
<b>ENERGY</b>				
Caspian Basin, Reinforce initiatives – OES	●			
Convention UN Transboundary Air Pollution (secure Eastern European – NIS participation)	●			
Formulated policy agendas (e.g. efficiency, renewable energy, energy planning) 12 countries via IQC's			●	●
Technical advice USJI – energy pilot projects				●
Opportunities for US private sector international energy market.	●			●
Clean air technologies 140 companies				●
<b>COASTAL MARINE RESOURCES</b>				
Coral Reefs				
Joint State/USAID Task Force on policy and program	●	●	●	●
Coral Bleaching, convention and position papers	●		●	●
Guidelines on community-based				●
Bilateral (e.g. Indonesia, Marine Park, Tanzania, Marine Institute, Philippines, Russia, Honduras)				●

### **Areas of Moderately Shared Interest**

OES and G/ENV share a moderate degree of overlap in two areas: freshwater resources and environmental education.

#### ***Freshwater Resources***

While transboundary water has only recently been added to the OES agenda, the potential destabilization threat posed by transboundary disputes in a number of geographic regions has made it a priority. OES actively engaged in discussions with neighboring states in Central Asia to bring about a peaceful, equitable solution to disagreements over use of scarce freshwater resources. To help avert similar disputes in other regions, OES' strategic plan includes a series of conventions and workshops on regional water issues regarding the Nile Basin, the Mekong River, and South African (SAARC).

G/ENV was a leading force in developing a policy agenda for transboundary water use among the Central Asian Republics.

That agenda currently serves as the basis for dialogue among the principles concerning equitable sharing of fresh water. The Center is also helping develop the technical working papers for addressing transboundary questions in Southern Africa, the Nile Basin, and among SAARC countries. In addition, G/ENV supports ongoing water policy and water management activities in Egypt, Jordan, and other countries.

### ***Environmental Education***

With the recent move of the U.S. Information Service (USIS) into the Department of State, public diplomacy has gained importance in OES programs. The Bureau now seeks opportunities to apply this resource in support of major diplomatic initiatives. G/ENV is also actively engaged in environmental awareness in many of its programs. For example, G/ENV's GreenCom initiative is raising public awareness on a range of environmental issues in a number of G-77 countries (e.g., El Salvador, Panama, and Tanzania). The Center also supports a special water use awareness campaign in several Middle Eastern countries.

Table 4 illustrates the areas of moderately shared interest.

**Table 4: Areas of Moderately Shared Interest**

AREA	STATE/OES		USAID/G/ENV	
	Policy	Program	Policy	Program
<b>FRESH WATER</b>				
Workshops, conferences regional water resources (e.g. Nile, Basin, SAARC, Mekong River commission initiatives.		●		●
Transboundary Water limitations (Nile, Basin, CAR, Southern Africa)			●	●
Public Awareness Campaign water countries (MEP)				●
Bilateral				
Via IQC's policy and water mgt. (Egypt, Jordan)			●	●
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION</b>				
Local capacity building and public awareness via IQC in 10 bi-lateral counties				●
Public diplomacy		●		

## **Areas of Independent Interest**

The four technical areas in which the OES and G/ENV plans and programs share little or no common interest are oceans, urban environment, space, and infectious diseases.

### ***Oceans***

Oceans, or "blue" environmental issues are of considerable concern to OES. The Bureau has given high priority to the Law of the Sea Convention with particular emphasis on such questions as securing U.S. Senate advise-and-consent on key international agreements (e.g., UN Convention on Law of the Sea and 1994 Seabed Mining Agreement), a research treaty with Mexico on the Gulf of Mexico Western Gap fishing grounds, sea turtle conventions in the Indian Ocean and in the Caribbean, and migratory fish protection regimes for the western and central Pacific.

USAID, has no history of involvement in ocean issues. Rather, the Agency focuses on natural resources traditionally considered to be within the sovereign areas of host countries. The coastal environment is where OES and G/ENV interests intersect on marine questions.

### ***Urban Environment***

With regard to the urban environment sector, USAID clearly leads in interest and activity, with G/ENV establishing ongoing bilateral and regional policy initiatives on such topics as sustainable finance for urban infrastructure and pollution control. These policy efforts are complemented by programmatic interventions, decentralized municipal planning, rational municipal use of energy, and provision of social infrastructure (shelter, schools, and health facilities). In addition, the Center's Urban Environment Office supports an ongoing research initiative concerning the nexus of population growth, environmental scarcity, urbanization, and international security.

### ***Health and Infectious Diseases***

OES' interest in health and infectious diseases focuses on establishing mechanisms to upgrade surveillance of high-profile

infectious diseases, such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, especially in developing countries. USAID's long-standing programs to address these serious international health problems comprise the Agency's second-largest portfolio next to G/ENV, but the health sector does not fall within the Environment Center. Therefore, while there is some overlap between OES and Global Bureau priorities in health, no overlap exists with G/ENV programs.

### Space

Space is a portfolio area in which there is absolutely no overlap between the two organizations. While questions such as peaceful use of outer space and space station codes of conduct are part of the OES agenda, space is simply not part of the USAID mandate.

Table 5 illustrates each agency's areas of independent interest.

**Table 5: Areas of Independent Interest**

AREA	OES		G/ENV	
	Policy	Program	Policy	Program
<b>OCEANS</b>				
Research Treaty with Mexico on Gulf of Mexico "Western Gap:	●			
Secure US Senate Advise and Consent on key agreements (e.g. UN Convention on Law of Sea, 1994 Seabed Mining Agreement)	●			
Migratory Fish regimes Western & Central Pacific Multi-lateral High Level Conference	●			
Turtle Protection Conclusion of Indian Ocean Sea Turtle Convention; Inter-American Convention.	●			
<b>URBAN ENVIRONMENT</b>				
Policy			●	
Sustainable Financing for municipal infrastructure			●	
Research on nexus of population growth, environmental scarcity, urbanization international security nexus.				●
Urban Management & Infrastructure				
Pollution Control	●		●	●
Decentralization Planning (Resource Cities)				●
Infrastructure Power				●
<b>HEALTH-INFECTIOUS DISEASE</b>				
Air Quality Agreement Technical work on ozone depletion	●			
Infectious Disease surveillance	●			

AREA	OES		G/ENV	
	Policy	Program	Policy	Program
Secure US ratification of Basil Convention	●			
Conclude Negotiation with OECD on hazardous waste recycling	●			
<b>SPACE</b>				
Private Sector participation in UN Committee, peaceful use of outer space.	●			
Agreement, space codes of conduct	●			

## Institutional Traits

A congressional mandate and high-level policy directives have strongly encouraged closer cooperation between the Department of State and USAID. Since State/OES and USAID/G/ENV have common ground and shared interests regarding strategic planning processes and program priorities, the two entities have a strong basis upon which to build a more synergistic working relationship.

The institutional traits and organizational culture of State/OES and USAID/G/ENV must be carefully considered when working toward establishing closer ties. Each has developed distinctive mechanisms regarding planning and priority-setting, spanning a broad range of effort and experience. Further, to come to agreement on process, both practice and perception must be addressed. For example, issues will include the planning horizon and attitudes toward the relative value of planning, the choice of issues to address and the reasoning behind the choice, and the desired method for addressing each matter.

## Operating Principle

OES' basic operating principle is to respond to diplomatic issues in a way that will help advance U.S. interests in the international arena. Related to this principle is a deep-seated belief by OES professionals in the art of diplomacy; a conviction that the world is dynamic—situations change, sometimes in a precipitous way. Hence, a premium is placed on flexibility and rapid adaptation to new circumstances.

For USAID, the basic operating principle is to affect economic development in Third World countries. Development, by definition and based on decades of experience, is a long-term process. Hence, the USAID approach places a premium on constancy. Precedence is given to carefully defining objectives, designing programs to achieve the objectives, and staying the course until success is realized. Recent re-engineering changes have sought to enhance flexibility and adaptation, at least at the tactical level.

### **Policy/Program Priority Selection Criteria**

Both OES and G/ENV use a variety of criteria to fashion their respective programs. For OES, a critical factor is the immediacy or importance of an issue judged against U.S. big-picture strategic international interests. For example, equitable access to and use of international fishing grounds is important to the U.S. commercial interests and, by extension, to the country's economic soundness. Accordingly, successful negotiation of Law of the Sea Conventions that either promote or protect U.S. commercial interests are assigned priority status. The priority ranking given by the importance of the issue is often cross-cut by the size or influence in the international arena of the countries involved. Greater precedence is given to matters involving global economic or military powers—first-tier countries, such as Russia, Japan, China, and the European Union. Similar issues and involvement exist with second-tier states (e.g., Nigeria, South Africa, Egypt). The ranking assigned to issues involving third-tier states (i.e., most small developing countries) is determined by the importance of the issue. OES priorities are also determined by external influences (i.e., U.S. advocacy group or negotiating partner pressure), leadership directives, and the status of ongoing activities.

For G/ENV, the prime determinant of program priority is potential developmental impact—to what extent will a given initiative contribute to the attainment of an established strategic objective? Ancillary, yet important factors, such as USAID directives, congressional earmarks/recommendations, and the status of ongoing activities also affect the shape and direction of the G/ENV program.

## Perception of Planning (Value-Added)

Only a small percentage of OES staff historically have recognized strategic planning as adding value to their work program; many consider it merely a bureaucratic requirement. In part, this view derives from the art-of-diplomacy characteristic mentioned earlier—a commonly held opinion captured by the following quotation of an OES officer,

*The unpredictable nature of our work and our need to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances minimizes the utility of planning. You cannot plan for what we are required to do. Nor does what we do lend itself readily to quantification.*

This view is reinforced by a second commonly held perception—a long-standing sense of disconnection between program performance and resource allocation. Based on experience, OES personnel perceive that performance carries little or no influence on budgets assigned to them by the Department's central planning units. Rather, they believe that traditional standing in budget allocation lists and priorities based on changing political leadership usually determine resource levels.

G/ENV has a more positive appreciation of planning. Long-term strategic planning, a consequence of the Agency's long-term economic development mandate, has been a traditional part of USAID procedure. Moreover, the Agency has a recognized, established relationship between program results and budget allocation.

## Planning Horizon

In principle, OES planning cycles operate on a medium-term, three-year time horizon. However, in practice, priorities, work assignments, and energy are governed by much shorter cycles, frequently three months or less. Thus, OES frequently reacts to changing situations rather than proactively planning for specific outcomes. Unlike its planning cycles, however, OES has an exceedingly long-term vision, which is not bound by a specific time frame.

In contrast, G/ENV plans for the long term and operates with a different rhythm. The R4 is crafted for a five-year period with yearly updates. IR activities also have multi-year time spans. In short, the USAID approach emphasizes setting a program in place, staying with it for the long haul, and regularly taking exact measurements of its progress.

### Planning Design Cycle

The OES BPP design cycle is carried out over a five-month period—February to June. USAID’s R4 updates typically require more time (six to eight months) to prepare. The additional time needed by G/ENV results from the demand for quantifiable, specific progress indicators and the related requirement to interact with field missions to generate the needed data.

### Program Implementation Methodology

OES’ approach to its program implementation is dominated by a reliance on direct-hire personnel and the use of operating funds. In contrast, G/ENV, takes a wholesale approach, using much of its program budget to hire contractors to carry out technical tasks. Consequently, the Center has developed a variety of technical service provision contract tools. While it takes up to 18 months to establish these mechanisms, once on line, they offer rapid, facile means for acquiring program implementation support.

Table 6 below highlights the particular institutional traits of each organization that must be considered when seeking to bring them into a closer relationship.

**Table 6: Institutional Traits**

Trait	OES	G/ENV
• Planning Horizon	• Medium-Term – 3 years with 1-year updates	• Long-Term – 5 years with 1-year updates
• Design Cycle	• Up to 5 months	• 6-12 months
• Operating Principle	• Response to diplomatic issues	• Address development issues
• Policy/Program Priority Selection Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Immediacy/importance of diplomatic issues</li> <li>◦ Directives (leadership changes)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congressional earmarks</li> <li>• USAID directives</li> <li>• Development impact</li> </ul>

Trait	OES	G/ENV
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Status of on-going activities</li> <li>◦ External influences</li> <li>• - Established activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established activities</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation Approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliance on direct hire personnel</li> <li>• Reliance on operating funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliance on contracted personnel</li> <li>• Reliance on program funds</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value Added of Planning Perception</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear relationship to resource allocation</li> <li>• Unclear relationship to Bureau priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear relationship to resource allocation</li> </ul>

## Recommendations

In addition to the congressional mandate and senior management directives, a programmatic basis exists for building a closer working relationship between OES and G/ENV. However, the differences in institutional traits and planning requirements suggest deliberate thoughtfulness in the movement toward joint programming. Accordingly, a measured, two-track approach is recommended. Track I would consist of a set of short-term pilot implementation activities to be launched immediately. While Track II also would begin immediately, it would address the broader issues of program coordination and would require more time to establish.

### Track I: Short-Term Pilot Activities

The pilot efforts would involve immediate planning and implementation of discrete activities that would mutually benefit both organizations, for example, to further an OES diplomatic initiative while simultaneously contributing to the achievement of an established G/ENV SSO. The pilot activities would operate in the following manner:

- Creation of two to three joint OES-ENV working groups on areas of mutual overlap, priority, and interest (e.g., coastal zone natural resources management/coral reefs, transboundary water, and forestry).

- Both OES and G/ENV leadership would endorse creation of the working groups, thus validating their importance and the commitment of senior management to increased OES-G/ENV cooperation.
- Working groups would develop and carry out work plans on a few activities in support of a mutually shared program priority. The activities would be basic (e.g. drafting of a position paper, realization of a training course for counterparts, organization of a conference) and easily implemented. Work plans would have timelines and assignment of discrete tasks. All activities would be reported on in a timely manner and in a fashion (e.g. adequate quantification) suitable for the planning/reporting requirement of both organizations.
- Funding for the activities would be shared. If it is not possible to secure OES funding at this point in the budget cycle, consideration could be given to using USAID resources against the firm commitment of OES repayment in the following fiscal year.
- Existing USAID/G/ENV contracting mechanisms could be used to procure services required by work-plan activities.

For example, one working group could be fashioned around the coastal environment-coral reef protection issue in the Caribbean—a key component of the NRM agendas of both the Department of State and USAID. State/OES is engaged in the negotiation process of the Cartagena Convention, a multi-faceted agreement that would further U.S. interests to safeguard bio-diversity and simultaneously protect U.S. commercial fishing interests in the Caribbean. USAID's interest centers on promotion of bio-diversity and sustainable economic growth through protection and rational use of coastal zone resources. To this end, the USAID programs in Jamaica, through its Ridge to Reef initiative, and in the Dominican Republic, through a comprehensive environmental assessment that includes coastal resources, are being put in place. Similarly, in the aftermath of Hurricane Mitch, USAID/Honduras is assigning resources to assess the damage to the country's north coast coral reefs and to rehabilitate the south coast mangrove swamps, which are critical to the shrimp industry.

A comprehensive convention that affirmed multinational commitment to rational use of coastal resources could provide a comprehensive region-wide policy context that would facilitate implementation of USAID's bilateral efforts. Successful implementation of USAID programs would, in turn, promote the perceived value of the OES big-picture diplomatic initiative.

An essential aspect of OES success is convincing countries to side with the U.S. position on various issues. Certain activities, carried out by G/ENV, could serve as important keys to garnering needed support for the U.S. international position. For example, technical papers could offer environmental and economic rationale for the U.S. stance, while training courses for potential partner-country personnel could help ensure adequate technical capacity for the country to comply with agreement commitments.

### **Track II: Medium-Term Program Coordination**

Track II would involve an 18-month effort to analyze the organizations' planning processes and procedures with an eye cast toward a unified planning exercise. It would incorporate the lessons learned through Track I pilot activities. Discrete parts of Track II would include:

- Establish a working group to determine if the BPP and the R4 can be harmonized. This exercise would give particular attention to rationalizing units of measurement (objectives, goals, indicators, etc.) in ways that would
  - satisfy both organizations,
  - find more common ground on planning/action horizons,
  - accommodate other documents that each organization must prepare in the yearly planning/budget cycle, and
  - reduce work load.
- Mutually share information on the respective programs through an initial staff-wide participatory meeting and periodic brown-bag lunches to address specific topics. Participation would focus on cognizant representatives from each organization. As OES and G/ENV senior management explain

and endorse the concept and practice of collaboration and cooperation, they would also serve to validate it to their respective staffs.

- Formalize mutual participation in the review and concurrence of BPP and R4 and other key strategy or planning documents. This participation should be at ranking, decision-making levels of both entities (PDAS for OES and Deputy Director for G/ENV).
- Expand the number of technical working groups to plan and execute closely defined, mutually beneficial activities.
- Establish a rapid response facility (R2F) to procure the assistance required to carryout technical support work. The R2F could be structured on the G/ENV IQC model.
- Formalize the mutual participation in the review and concurrence of BPP and R4 and other key strategy or planning documents. This participation should be at ranking, decision-making levels of both entities.

## Conclusion

G/ENV and OES are in a position to combine forces and achieve significant program synergies through closer cooperation.

- Congress has mandated that the State Department and USAID cooperate more closely.
- The Secretary of State and the previous USAID Administrator have provided a vision on how such cooperation should take place.
- Increased interdependence of environmental problems and solutions (e.g., cross-border impacts, policy change and governance, technology, trade, treaties, etc.) requires implementation of integrated approaches.

Circumstances are conducive for OES and G/ENV to seize the initiative—by defining the terms for closer cooperation at political and program levels—to create an integrated, effective approach for advancing the U.S. foreign environmental policy agenda.

# Annex 1

## OES Goals and Major Objectives

### **Conserve/Sustainably Manage Terrestrial, Marine and Atmospheric Resources, including the Earth's Climate**

- Promote sustainable multilateral and bilateral fisheries management, protect endangered marine species.
- Achieve international agreement on components of Kyoto protocol, continue implementation of the Montreal protocol.
- Promote mechanisms for sustainable management marine and terrestrial eco-systems.
- Promote development of global and regional institutions for managing fresh water resources (via, inter alia SAARC, SADC and Mekong River Commissions).

### **Reduce Health and Environmental Risks from Toxic Chemicals, Hazardous Wastes and Spread of Infectious Disease**

- Reduce/manage risk to human health and environment international shipment and disposal of hazardous waste.
- Strengthen political commitment for enhanced preparedness against infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS, TB, Malaria – SADC, South Asia, East Asia Pacific).

### **Promote Open Areas to Oceans and Space**

- Maintain and promote fishing opportunities for U.S. fisheries (East Pacific, West Pacific, Atlantic—Russia, Baltic States).
- Supplement international law concerning ocean justification (Law of Sea Convention).
- Promote mechanisms for sustainable management marine and terrestrial eco-systems.

## **Strengthen Bilateral and Regional Relationships and Multilateral Institutions**

- Dialogue with key countries, regions and intergovernmental organizations to advance USG OES interests (e.g., Environmental Policy Dialogue under U.S. – Japan Common Agenda, NRM with Egypt, India, Colombia, SAARC, SADC).
- Enhance regional engagements via hubs (e.g., Sustainable development of Mekong River Basin, NRM in West Africa, Agricultural Extension Service in Jordan, Sustainable Management of Nile Resources).

## **Ensure Science Integrated into Conduct of U.S. Foreign Policy**

- Improve integration of science of climate change into U.S. Foreign Policy (e.g., NFCs, PFCs, and lumber fuel emission).
- Expand bilateral cooperation to build support for USG positions on environmental etc. (e.g., Japan, China, Brazil, Korea, Russia).
- Improve flora and fauna information systems in support of policy formulation (Near East, Latin America—IBRD, ICUN, UNEP).

## **Increase Public Diplomacy and Outreach**

- Provide on-site media relations support to U.S. delegations during major environmental conferences and negotiations.

## **G/ENV's Strategic Support Objectives (SSOs) and Key Corresponding Intermediate Results (IRs)**

### **Increased and Improved Protection and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources Principally Forests, Biodiversity, Freshwater and Coastal Ecosystems, and Agricultural Lands**

- Effective biodiversity conservation management.
- Improved management of natural forests and tree systems.
- Environmental education and communication.

- Increased conservation and sustainable use of coastal and freshwater resources.

#### **Improved Management of Urbanization in Targeted Areas**

- Expanded and equitable delivery of urban environmental services and shelter.
- More effective local governments
- Reduced urban pollution.

#### **Increased, Environmentally Sustainable Energy Production Use**

- Increased energy efficiency.
- Increased use of renewable energy resources.
- Increased production and use of clean energy.

#### **Improved Response to Climate Change**

- Develop and lead \$1 billion Climate Change Initiative.
- Develop indicators to measure climate – related result of USAID activities in agriculture, biodiversity, energy, forestry and urban sectors.
- Provide Agency leadership in international negotiations on climate change.