

**Pollution Control and other Measures to Protect Biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika
(RAF/92/G32)**

MINUTES OF THE SECOND PROJECT TRIPARTITE REVIEW MEETING

Nairobi 25-26 MAY 1999

Summary of the main Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The project should continue to aim at the joint management of a shared water resource. All the activities and results of the project should strive for this objective. (point 4.7 para 72)
2. The project should continue to ensure the consistency of the project with the principles for integrated management of water resources and with the pertinent conventions in this field, at a world wide and regional level. (point 4.7 para 81)
3. For the remainder of the project, UNOPS should reinforce its role of technical control according to the decisions taken at the next Regional Steering Committee meeting. (point 4.7 para 118)
4. UNOPS should present a summary table at the next Steering Committee meeting, indicating the current budget situation. (point 4.7 para 123)
5. The project should identify which institutions are (or will be) mandated to fulfil each of the follow-up/evaluation functions that are planned for the future. (point 4.7 para 133)
6. The project should involve nationals further in the definition of work programmes; (point 4.7 para 134)
7. The project should make the best-qualified national experts on the regional level, work closely with the recently recruited facilitators. (point 4.7 para 136)
8. Expenses (for expatriate or national experts) for project meetings should be limited to the minimum compatible with the achievement of expected outputs; (point 4.7 para 139)

9. Any charging of time to expatriate experts on the project budget should be limited to tasks carried out in the region, tolerating, however, provisions in the contract made between UNOPS and the NRI Consortium and time spent on preparing and writing reports, if necessary; (point 4.7 para 141)
10. The project should complete the databases regrouping the existing data and install them in the appropriate institutions. (point 4.7 para 149a)
11. The project should make a synthesis of all the pertinent scientific knowledge acquired to date, which is necessary for the definition of the special studies and for the elaboration of management tools for the Lake. (point 4.7 para 149b)
12. The project should treat as a major problem the question of verifying (or invalidating) the basic hypothesis concerning the environmental impacts that are threatening the Lake. (point 4.7 para 155)
13. Maximum effort should be laid by the project in a timely implementation of all the special studies and the overall planning of activities should assure that they can provide the necessary background for the Strategic Action Plan. (point 4.7 para 156)
14. The project should prepare a document (as a supplement to the present 'standing instructions' concerning the sampling and laboratory work) on the overall technical approach and on the way collected data may contribute to a better knowledge of the problems and to the development of the future management tools. (point 4.7 para 157)
15. The project should prepare and implement before the end of the project sustainable mechanisms/procedures for professional exchanges between the national experts in order to meet the future needs for exchange of information, of experiences and continuous harmonisation. (point 4.7 para 158)
16. Recommendations concerning specific technical aspects of the special studies (paras 159-214 of MTE report) should be evaluated by special study teams and incorporated into their work plans as appropriate.
17. The project should target training towards the identified needs for the post-project phase; (point 4.7 para 216)
18. The project should target equipment of the national structures towards the needs of monitoring post-project as well as against the intercalibration and the exchange of data. (point 4.7 para 221)

MINUTES OF THE 2ND TRIPARTITE REVIEW

Introduction

The following minutes are a summary of the issues that were debated and decisions taken and not a verbatim record of the meeting. All comments on a particular agenda item are therefore grouped together regardless of when the comments were made during the course of the meeting.

Participation

Thirty-one participants took part in the meeting: 4 from Burundi, 4 from DRC, and 4 from the United Republic of Tanzania, 4 from the Republic of Zambia, 3 from UNDP, 1 from GEF, 2 from UNOPS, 3 from NRI, and 5 from PCU. A Logical Framework facilitator was also present. Mr Jean Berchmans Manirakiza, Director General for INECN Burundi had been previously designated to chair the meeting. A list of participants is given in Annexe 1.

Proceedings

Item 1. Welcome by Chairman

The elected chairman, Mr Jean Berchmans Manirakiza from Burundi, welcomed participants. He informed the meeting that the three members of the DR Congo delegation due to arrive from Kinshasa had been delayed and would not arrive until the following day. Nevertheless, as one delegate from DR Congo was present it was agreed that the meeting should proceed but that country presentations would await the arrival of the remainder of the Congolese delegation.

Item 2. Approval of the agenda

In considering the provisional agenda, circulated prior to the meeting, (Annexe 2) much discussion centred on the appropriateness and desirability of carrying out the proposed logframe review and update. Eventually, it was decided to postpone the review, because it was considered that the logical framework should not be considered at a Tripartite Review Meeting and that the project personnel required for such a task were not at the meeting.

The logframe review was later abandoned entirely. The agenda was thus modified and approved as follows.

- | Item | |
|------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Welcome by chairman |
| 2 | Approval of agenda |
| 3 | Project progress |
| 4 | Country presentations |
| 5 | General discussion |
| 6 | GEF comments |

- 7 Review of MTE report
- 8 Closure

Item 3. Project progress

Two presentations were made under this item, the first by Dr Kelly West, Scientific Liaison Officer aimed at reminding delegates of the unique nature of lake Tanganyika and the prime purpose of the Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity project. The second by Dr A. Menz, Project Co-ordinator on project progress for the period since the last Tripartite Review held in Lusaka in January 1998.

In the first presentation entitled ‘Why are we here?’ Dr Kelly West explained the origins of Lake Tanganyika, the value of its fauna, and the value of the lake for the riparian populations. She drew attention to the fact that despite the undoubted value of the Lake, it is facing environmental threats, mainly from sedimentation, pollution and inappropriate fishing practices. She concluded by saying that it was the desire of the riparian states and the international community to counteract these threats, and hence protect the Lake and its resources, that the LTBP had been created.

In the second presentation, Dr Andrew Menz highlighted ‘Key LTBP Events in 1998’. The presentation was based on the tabled documents TPR-SCM4/5 “Report of the First Tripartite Review” and TPR-SCM4/8 “Project Progress Report, February 1998 – March 1999”. The presentation gave a brief overview of progress with each of the major project components i.e. management, monitoring and co-ordination, staffing, infrastructure improvement, strategic action programme, convention and the special studies (biodiversity, fishing practices, sedimentation, pollution, socioeconomics and environmental education). Finally he discussed the next steps including finalising the Strategic Action Programme, the need for a Lake Management Body, and the proposed Convention that will provide international legal support to the SAP.

Item 4. Country Presentations

Each country in turn made a presentation to the meeting, commenting on the project in general, specific activities and/or the MTE report.

Zambia’s presentation concentrated primarily on the MTE report and NRI’s response. They emphasised aspects concerned with ownership of the project by riparian countries, communication and exchange between countries, project refocusing, and capacity building. They also expressed their views on other issues raised in the report such as the location of the PCU office, project structure, the involvement of Rwanda, project extension and some aspects of the special studies.

Tanzania in their presentation mentioned the work carried out since the last Lusaka Tripartite Review, including working meetings, field activities, and their participation in SAP planning process Tanzania also raised the issue of implementing special studies results, and capacity building which remains of paramount importance for riparian states.

DR Congo's presentation talked of special studies, need for training and the location of the head office. DRC felt that the MTE report was adequate in its overall views and in its re-iterations that the project document remains the main point of reference for assessing progress and/or success of the project. DRC noted and regretted that the mission did not visit their country.

The Burundi presentation mentioned their wish to have the head office in Bujumbura, as originally proposed and spoke of the role of national institutions in training, the usefulness of regular information flow to national authorities of riparian nations. The spokesperson finished by reaffirming the total support of his country to the project.

A common point from all country presentations was a wish that in order to support the sustainability of lake management activities in the post-project phase, all efforts should be made in the remaining project period to increase a sense of national ownership and participation through increased training and capacity building activities.

Item 5: General Discussion

The preceding presentations and tabled documents were reviewed and discussed.

Some questions of clarification were raised concerning such matters as: The recruitment of the SE facilitator. It was explained that the proposed SE facilitator had not in fact been recruited as this was awaiting Steering Committee approval. It was noted that the recruitment of the regional TECC facilitator had been delayed. It was explained by the PCU that owing to concerns over the logistical operation of this post, clarification on certain points was required from delegates before proceeding with recruitment. A query was raised concerning the apparent differential in spending between some budget lines concerned with international experts compared to others concerned with regional expertise. The former being heavily drawn down compared to the latter. It was explained that in the instances referred to it was due to new budget lines having been introduced after the last Tripartite review and thus expenditure was not so great against these lines.

A number of minor discrepancies and errors were noted in the inventory and budget. The PCU was requested to correct these.

Questions regards document format were raised and resolved as was a query concerning the fact that project DSA rates were not equivalent to UN rates. Regarding the latter it was recalled that in order to get maximum benefit from the limited resources available the project applies its own rates based on the actual cost of reasonable accommodation in

each of its operational locations. This policy had been discussed and accepted at all previous meetings of the Steering Committee.

After this, the documents TPR/SCM4/5 and TPR/SCM4/8 tabled were adopted with some corrections that will be made by the project.

Item 6. GEF/UNOPS Comments

The GEF representative spoke of the project with respect to past and current GEF programming policy. He noted that at the time when this project was formulated, GEF was not differentiating so clearly between the sectors of International Waters and Biodiversity. He pointed out that the current project was essentially two projects with the resources of one. Current GEF policy is to fund Biodiversity and International Waters projects under separate programs. In addition the representative for UNOPS noted that while a positive aspect of the MTE is that it is forward-looking, the MTE seems overly critical of the project document and progress made to date, as it should be remembered that the project is still in its pilot phase.

He emphasised that the opportunity is now offered to the project to focus towards the planning of future projects acceptable, by GEF for financing. For this purpose, all four countries must first prove their firm commitment to take in hand the future management of their lake, by for example, forming committees, agreements, conventions, protected areas, etc. He further explained that the only way of leveraging funds from GEF or other donors is for the four countries to prove to GEF that they have achieved together a certain number of things that would not have been achieved if GEF had not funded this first project. The GEF representative recommended that the four beneficiary countries, through their representatives in this meeting, show to GEF that they are fully committed to take in hand the future management of their lake.

In addition the representative from UNOPS noted

Item 7. Review of MTE Recommendations

NRI had produced a document in response to the MTE report recommendations, distributed to all participants in advance of the meeting. NRI accepted some of the MTE recommendations as judicious, but they also noted that some were based on factual errors or misconceptions. The NRI document tried to clarify these points.

The meeting agreed to proceed one by one with the MTE recommendations, deciding which were to be retained, modified or rejected in the light of the NRI comments and their own understanding and views of the matter under consideration. To do this, the chairman read each recommendation first, and sought comments from NRI representatives first (represented here by Dr Andrew Menz, the Project Coordinator) and then from the rest

of the participants. Thereafter, the chairman summarised the decision of the meeting on each recommendation.

Thirty recommendations from the total number of 72 were examined in detail. Those that were not dealt with in detail were estimated to be of minor importance or were of a technical nature and best considered by the Special Study teams.

The following is the list of recommendations that were analysed and the meeting's resolution concerning each of them. The number of the paragraph refers to the paragraph number in the MTE report.

Para 72: *Refocus the project on the GEF concentration area "International Waters"*.

Modified. It was noted that the current project focus was properly oriented and that the project should continue along these lines.

The recommendation was therefore modified as follows: *‘The project should continue to aim at the joint management of a shared water resource. All the activities and the results of the project should strive for this objective. The results should be presented in coherence with the use that will be made of them by the policy decision makers and the operators of the future managerial entity of the Lake’*.

Para 81: *Continue to ensure the consistency of the project with the principles for integrated management of water resources and with the pertinent conventions in this field, at a world wide as well as at regional level.* **Modified.** The words “Continue to” were inserted at the start of this resolution as the relevant international principles and conventions have been, and will continue to be, taken into account throughout the development of the project.

Para 91: *Reformulate and stabilise the logical framework.* **Rejected.** The recommendation was not considered necessary and it was noted that rather than reformulate the current project, it would be better to concentrate energy into formulating subsequent projects.

Para 95: *The evaluation mission recommends: (1) that the logical framework (including OVIs) is established according to the restructuring of the objectives and outputs proposed in para 3.1.8 and (2) that the national operators in the field are clearly informed of the use of their work and of the way of evaluating this work.* **Rejected.** Same reasons as previous.

Para 98: *Revise the organisation chart of the project, write down the mandates and/or the terms of reference for each organ as well as detailed descriptions of each position.* **Rejected.** Some of the proposed organs already exist, other recommended changes were considered redundant or unnecessary at this stage in the project.

Para 104: *For each of the project organs or positions the evaluation mission recommends that the terms of reference are written down, taking into account the other relevant recommendations.* **Rejected.** The recommendation was considered irrelevant.

Para 109: *Respect the logical order of the production of results.* **Rejected.** The order recommended was not acceptable; participants preferred to follow the order proposed at the Lusaka Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis workshop.

Para 113: *The evaluation mission recommends that the Rwandan Government is invited to participate, as observer, in the next meeting of the Project Steering Committee and that the practical details in connection with its association with the project is put on the agenda for this meeting.* **Rejected.** After lengthy discussion on this recommendation, the meeting recommended that the issue be postponed to further meetings and that meanwhile UNDP/UNOPS approach that country for sensitisation.

Para 118: *For the rest of the project, the evaluation mission recommends that UNOPS reinforces its role of technical control according to the decisions that would have been taken at the next regional Steering Committee meeting as a result of the present evaluation report.* **Adopted.** participants agreed with the recommendation.

Para 123: *The evaluation mission recommends that UNOPS presents a summary table at the next COP meeting, indicating the present situation as well as the expenses that have been undertaken but still not settled, among these the UNOPS (and FAO) costs.* **Adopted.** Participants agreed with the recommendation.

Para 130: *The evaluation mission recommends that the relations between the project and the UNDP local offices are reinforced and that the Programme Officers are more closely involved in the implementation of activities and in the harmonisation of these with the activities of other development projects in their respective countries.* **Rejected.** This recommendation was considered unnecessary since the UNDP representatives claimed to be well involved in the project.

Para 133: *Identify which institutions are (or will be) mandated to fulfil each of the follow-up/evaluation functions that are planned for the future.* **Adopted.** The participants agreed that this was an important recommendation, and noted that this had already been done as a part of the SAP process.

Para 134: *Involve the nationals further in the definition of the work programmes.* **Adopted.** It was noted that project policy is to involve nationals as much as possible in the definition of the work programmes. The project will continue to strive to do this.

Para 136: *Make the best qualified national experts on the regional level, work in close relation with the recently recruited facilitators.* **Adopted.** As a matter of fact, national experts will be the ones to manage the future Lake Management Body.

Para 139: *The evaluation mission recommends that the mission expenses (for expatriate or national experts) for project meetings should be limited to the minimum compatible with the achievement of expected outputs.* **Adopted.** Participants supported the recommendation having been informed by the PCU that this was, and always had been, project policy and practice.

Para 141: *The evaluation mission recommends that any charging of time to expatriate experts on the project budget should be limited to tasks carried out in the region, tolerating, however, (according to the agreement to be made between UNOPS and the NRI Consortium) the time spent on preparing and writing reports, if necessary.* **Adopted.**

Para 143: *In accordance with the decision of the Project Steering Committee concerning the transfer of the project head office to Dar es Salaam, the evaluation mission recommends that the project head office is moved back to Bujumbura as soon as the two conditions, which make it possible, have been fulfilled: lifting of the curfew and of the embargo.* **Rejected.** This recommendation did not find unanimous support.

Para 144a: *The Project Coordination Unit should already now start preparing the scenarios concerning the restarting of the activities in DR Congo. Since the human resources are already in place, the PCU should pay a special attention to the procedures of a rapid transportation and installation of the necessary logistics in Uvira.* **Rejected.** The recommendation was considered unnecessary as the project has had a strong presence in DRC since December 1998.

Para 144b: *Direct the production of the project results towards the needs for a joint management of the Lake.* **Rejected.** The recommendation was considered superfluous as the project is already doing this.

Para 146: *Establish database of the legal and regulation texts concerning water and environment in the countries of the Lake Basin, in the region and at international level.* **Modified.** The verb 'establish' should be replaced with 'update'.

Para 148: *It is necessary to make a study of the economic context of the Lake Region and studies of "water" and "fisheries" sectors.* **Rejected.** The recommendation was not considered necessary.

Para 149 a: *Complete the databases regrouping the existing data and install them in the appropriate institutions.* **Adopted.** Participants considered this work to be of paramount importance.

Para 149 b: *Make the synthesis of all the pertinent scientific knowledge acquired till now, which is necessary for the definition of the special studies and for the elaboration of management tools for the Lake.* **Adopted.** Participants agreed with the recommendation.

Para 155: *Treat as a major problem of the project the question of verifying (or invalidating) the basic hypothesis concerning the environmental impacts that are threatening the Lake.* **Adopted.** This recommendation has been well underway since the onset of the special studies.

Paras 159-214: It was agreed that the recommendations contained within these paragraphs were concerned with specific technical aspects of the special studies and as such should be evaluated by the special study teams and incorporated into their work plans as appropriate.

Para 156: *Maximum effort should be laid in a timely implementation of all the special studies and the overall planning of activities shall assure that they can provide the necessary background for the Strategic Action Plan.* **Adopted.** Participants noted that this recommendation fits well with current project activities.

Para 157: *Prepare a document (as a supplement to the present 'standing instructions' concerning the sampling and the laboratory work) on the overall technical approach and on the way the collected data may contribute to a better knowledge of the problems and to the development of the future management tools.* **Adopted.** The project will comply with this.

Para 158: *Prepare and implement before the end of the project, sustainable mechanisms/procedures for professional exchanges between the national experts in order to meet from now on the future needs for exchange of information, of experiences and of continuous harmonisation.* **Adopted.** The Project Coordinator noted that the key word to keep in mind here is 'sustainable'. The project will continue to endeavour to provide a firm base for this proposal.

Para 216: *Target training towards the identified needs for the post-project phase.* **Adopted.** Participants agreed that training for the future is of paramount importance, and that the training undertaken to date and proposed is aimed to achieve this.

Para 221: *Target the equipment of the national structures towards the needs of the monitoring post-project as well as against the intercalibration and the exchange of data.* **Adopted.** This is, and has been, the project's strategy and in doing so, the project has tried to respect the different needs among special studies and among countries.

Para 239: Considering the present state of progress of the project and the necessary time for these recommendations to give the expected effects and considering its experience with projects of this scope, the evaluation mission estimates that it is necessary to prolong the project period by approximately one and half year, postponing the date of completion to December 31, 2001 instead of July 31, 2000 as originally anticipated. This prolongation should be made within the limit of the available budget.

For that purpose the Project Co-ordination Unit should submit to the Project Steering Committee a new working plan and a revised budget which complies with the new deadlines and follow the direction of the above mentioned recommendations.

Rejected. After a lengthy discussion, the meeting found that, given the fact that the budget allocated to NRI can not cover a prolongation of one year and a half as proposed by MTE, it was considered desirable that, if possible, UNOPS/PCU use available financial resources to fund a shorter additional period to the first phase in which to undertake planning for a possible second project.

4. Closure

The chairman closed the meeting on Thursday 27 May 1999 at 10.15am. The meeting was immediately followed by the 4th Meeting of the Steering Committee, reported on separately.

Annexe 1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BURUNDI

1. Mr Jean Berchmans Manirakiza National Co-ordinator ; Director General INECN
2. Mr Roger Kanyaru Director, Département Eaux, Pêche et Pisciculture
3. Mr Boniface Nyakageni Advisor, Ministère de l'Environnement
4. Mr Gaspard Ntakimazi Lecturer, Université du Burundi

RD CONGO

5. Mr Mbusu Ngamani Secrétaire Général, Ministère de l'Environnement
6. Mr Mady Amule National Coordinator; Directeur Min. Environnement
7. Mr Kayembe Ditanta Director, Pêche et Ressources en Eau
8. Mr Nshombo Muderhwa Director General, CRH- Uvira

TANZANIA

9. Mr Eric Mugurusi Director, Division of Environnement, Vice President's Office
10. Mr Rawson Yonazi National Coordinator (Principal Environment Officer, DoE)
11. Ms Hawa Msham Assistant National Coordinator/Assistant Director, Division of Fisheries
12. Mr W.V. Haule

ZAMBIA

13. Mr James Phiri National Coordinator (Director ECZ)
14. Mr Georges Chitalu Assistant National Coordinator
15. Ms Maureen Nsomi Senior Scientist, National Council for Scientific Research
16. Mr Kenneth Mazingaliwa Department of Fisheries

UNDP

17. Mr Louis Nduwimana Burundi
18. Mr Sylvester Sisila Tanzania
19. Mr Amos Muchanga Zambia

GEF

20. Mr David Larouche

UNOPS

21. Mr Ingolf Schuetz-Mueller Chief, Division of Environmental Programmes, UNOPS
22. Ms Margaret Chi Project Management Officer, UNOPS

LOGFRAME FACILITATOR

23. Mr Maxim Bélot

NRI

24. Mr Nicholas Hodgson SAP Co-ordinator
25. Mr David Silverside Project Finance Manager
26. Ms Rachel Roland Training Co-ordinator

PCU

27. Dr Andrew Menz Project Co-ordinator
28. Dr Kelly West Scientific Liaison Officer
29. Mr Pierre C. Nzimpora Rapporteur
30. Ms Maria Hiza Conference Secretary/Administration
31. Mr Ritesh Bhandari Project Co-ordinator's Assistant

Annexe 2. PROVISIONAL AGENDA

	Day 1	TRIPARTITE REVIEW
1	0830	Welcome from Chair (Leader of Burundi delegation)
2	0840	Approval of Agenda
3	0850	Why we are here! Scientific Liaison Officer
4	0900	Overview of project progress. Project Co-ordinator
5	0910	Country presentation - Burundi
6	0925	Country presentation - DR Congo
7	0940	Country presentation - Tanzania
8	0955	Country presentation - Zambia
9	1010	Points of clarification on presentations
10	1020	GEF comments & introduction to MTE review
	1035	Coffee
11	1050	Review of MTE report recommendations
	1300	Lunch
12	1400	Review of MTE report recommendations continued
	1630	Session ends – resumed on Day 2.
	Day 2	Note: If review of recommendations not complete this continues until coffee after which Logical Framework update begins. At this point the Chairperson steps down until Steering Committee meeting on final day. Log-Frame review led by facilitator.