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What does the Approach require? (the big picture)

1. The approach specifies an Environmental Impact Assessment and Climate Risk Management process that must be applied to all activities before implementation.

2. This process frequently results in environmental management conditions (mitigation & monitoring measures).

3. These measures must be implemented and monitored over the life of the activity/project (LOP).

Objective: Assure Environmentally Sound Design and Management of USAID-funded/USAID-managed activities.
What does the approach require? (a little more detail)

1. Environmental considerations must be taken into account in activity planning.
2. No activities implemented without approved Reg. 216 environmental documentation.
3. Any resulting environmental mitigation and monitoring conditions are:
   1. Written into award instruments.
   2. Carried out by the implementing partner, and this implementation is monitored.

   The output of the EIA process specified by 22 CFR 216*

   USAID monitors via field inspections and review of routine project reports submitted by IPs. To make this possible, project reporting by IPs must provide an auditable record of environmental compliance.
4. Environmental compliance is assessed annually as part of formal Mission (operating unit) reporting.

5. Environmental compliance documentation is maintained by the Mission & each sector team.
Compliance requires that

1. Contracts and awards require compliance with EIA conditions
2. Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) exists
3. Environmental considerations are integrated in workplans & budgets
4. Environmental compliance as a normal part of project performance reporting
5. Environmental compliance is evaluated in USAID field visits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID</th>
<th>Implementing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assures Environmental assessment documentation in place.</td>
<td>Implement environmental management conditions established in EIA documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes/approves environmental mitigation &amp; monitoring conditions.</td>
<td>Report on implementation to USAID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversees compliance with these conditions, a core part of project management responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEARNING APPROACHES – A focus on practical application

- Classroom instruction
- Small-Group Presentations
- Integration of “Special Topics” sessions
- Outside of classroom exercises
- Field visits
- Transect walk
- Google site
Training Approach

Participants involved in small group discussions

Participants on outside classroom site visits
EVALUATION APPROACHES

• Individual Daily evaluation
• Individual Final evaluation
• Small-Group EIA Presentations
## WORKSHOP RESULTS

### Individual daily evaluation (Jan 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION ELEMENT</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAY 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the methodology used during the day</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General usefulness of this day's theme for your organization</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the information presented today</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the hotel, room and food</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the workshop organization</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating based on the following scale: 5 = very good, 4 = good, 3 = average, 2 = inadequate, 1 = bad
### LEARNING APPROACH (January 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION ELEMENT</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORE (5=very good, 1=bad)</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Balance in time allocation (presentation, group exercises, field visits, discussions and dynamics) | 4.63 | • Time allotment sufficient  
• Field trips were great  
• Good balance - Enough time for discussion |
| Technical quality of the materials | 4.53 | • Provides a lot of information  
• Materials were well designed to assist us with the exercises and our own work |
| Level of satisfaction with group exercises | 4.58 | • On days 1 & 2 recommend moving around a bit more & doing more than just "discuss in groups" Give us problems to solve.  
• The group exercises encouraged team work, reflecting real field situations |
## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS (A Series of 3 Workshops)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION ELEMENT</th>
<th>AKOSOMBO, GHANA (JANUARY 2017)</th>
<th>SALY, SENEGAL (OCTOBER 2016)</th>
<th>AKOSOMBO, GHANA (OCTOBER 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Quality</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Visits</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating based on the following scale: 5 = very good, 4 = good, 3 = average, 2 = inadequate, 1 = bad
WORKSHOP RESULTS
INITIAL VRS POSTWORKSHOP KNOWLEDGE
(October 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION ELEMENT</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORE (5=very good, 1=bad)</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial knowledge</strong>: Thinking back to before you received an invitation to this workshop, how would you have rated your understanding of USAID environmental regulation and ESDM? ( 1= No Knowledge, 5=very advanced)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>While the majority of the USAID Mission and Project Management staff in attendance reported a high degree of prior knowledge of environmental compliance with Reg 216 and ESDM (4-5) a majority of the participants were from IP organizations and reported a lower degree of initial knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Workshop Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>After the workshop average knowledge of USAID environmental compliance requirements increased from 2.90 to 4. This is a positive increase that reflects the beneficial impact of the workshop on knowledge of environmental compliance and ESDM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSONS LEARNED

• A mix of participants with different levels of knowledge engenders peer to peer learning which seems to be very effective adult learning approach

• Field based Environmental assessment training best produces increased knowledge

• No two workshops are the same: Adapt and custom-make each adult training session to suit the audience/participants needs.
Conclusion

- Adult learning techniques and a focus on practical application.

- At least 50% of the total workshop - Group exercises/field visits

Helps achieve LOP Environmental Compliance in Project management

- Small group discussions, classroom exercises, quiz games and a field visit component.
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