

RAF/92/G32 - POLLUTION CONTROL AND OTHER MEASURES
TO PROTECT BIODIVERSITY IN LAKE TANGANYIKA

MINUTES OF TRIPARTITE REVIEW MEETING

Lusaka, Zambia

19 January 1998

AGENDA

- Welcome from Leader of Zambian Delegation
1. Selection of Chairperson
 2. Approval of Agenda
 3. Overview of Project Progress
 4. Country Presentation - Burundi
 5. Country Presentation - Tanzania
 6. Country Presentation - Congo
 7. Country Presentation - Zambia
 8. Presentation by UNOPS - additional item, see Item 2
 9. Presentation by UNDP - additional item, see Item 2
 10. Matters Arising from presentations
 11. Recommendations of PPER
 12. Project Work Plan 1997/98
 13. Discussion of Work-plan
 14. Decisions and Recommendations
 15. Meeting Closure

WELCOME

A formal welcome to the delegates was given by the leader of the Zambian Delegation. An explanation was provided for the delayed arrival of the Burundian Delegation.

ITEM 1: Selection of Chair

Zambia was nominated to Chair the Tripartite Review Meeting by Tanzania. The meeting approved this nomination.

ITEM 2: Agenda

It was agreed that additional inclusions of presentations by UNOPS and UNDP/GEF should be made following the presentations by countries. With these additions, the agenda was re-numbered and approved.

ITEM 3: Overview of Project Progress - Project Co-ordinator

The Project Co-ordinator led the meeting through the Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER). Progress was generally held to be satisfactory, though there had been some delays.

Two action points were suggested:

- merging of Objectives 1 and 6 - relating to 'establishing' and 'implementing' the Strategic Action Plan;

- agreement was requested for the perceived need for ‘facilitators’ for each of 5 special study activities.

ITEM 4: Country Presentation - Burundi (provided on 20/1/98)

The Burundian delegate wished the project success and expressed satisfaction with its progress since the Inception phase. He confirmed that his government intended to sign the biodiversity convention for the lake (the draft Strategic Action Plan).

He recommended that:

- the programme for Burundi should start as quickly as possible;
- there should be transparency in the recruitment of project personnel;
- the capacity of national co-ordinators should be strengthened by defining the roles of their offices;
- that they should be provided with facilities to ease communication difficulties and with project transport;
- the project duration should be extended for the francophone countries because of their later start;
- a tripartite mission to visit Bujumbura to investigate the possibility of establishing the project centre in Burundi as specified in the original project document.

(Although the Burundian delegation was delayed, and unable to participate in drafting the recommendations made on 19/1/98, the delegate supported all those recommendations).

ITEM 5: Country Presentation - Tanzania

The Tanzanian delegate outlined the activities within his national institutions since project inception. Progress on the project has been encouraging.

Two constraints were identified:

- increased workload for National Co-ordinator would come about as the Strategic Action Plan and the legal studies activities become more important;
- low remuneration for highly qualified local personnel in relation to their skills was identified.

The Tanzanian delegation looked forward to improved regional co-operation and improved ownership within the project.

ITEM 6: Country Presentation - Democratic Republic of Congo

The Congo delegate supported the project as part of national support to the International Convention on Biodiversity, but felt that there had been very little project activity in Congo in relation to that in the English-speaking countries.

He identified a need for:

- better communication between Kinshasa and Uvira;
- better communication between national capitals and the PCU;
- must consider training in more detail;
- problems of evaluation visits;
- Uvira centre needs upgrade;
- equipment needed for Uvira centre.

He accepted that Congo had suffered from project inactivity during the liberation struggle, but insisted that activities in the country must now catch up. An office in Bujumbura should not be considered to represent Congo.

ITEM 7: Country Presentation - Zambia

The Zambian delegate was satisfied that the PPER was a good representation of project activities. He reported that Zambia's National Working Groups had started off meeting monthly, then went to quarterly, then back to monthly in order to provide continuity of interest. Of five areas of achievement (socio-economics, biodiversity, pollution, sedimentation and legal studies) the only notable national progress was on the socio-economic work.

Constraints to progress included:

- project ownership - not 'locally owned'; a fault in initial design;
- project activities not attractive to local highly qualified staff - need enhanced allowances;
- essential equipment needs not yet met;
- co-ordination difficult and expensive - need for transport.

Lessons learned included:

- identification of the need for a full time co-ordination assistant;
- environmental awareness generation/publicity costs need to be met.

ITEM 8: Presentation by UNOPS

UNOPS has been independent from UNDP for 3 years, and is involved in managing most of the international GEF water-related projects. This meeting needs to consider the views of the riparian countries, UNOPS and UNDP/GEF, while co-ordinating these with the views of other actors including NRI, FAO and UNDP country representatives.

UNOPS is accountable to UNDP for the management of project funds.

GEF decided that Lake Tanganyika needed world preservation. It expects the project to lead to the lake being viewed as a connecting element rather than separating the four countries.

The meeting should list the points for decision making arising from its discussions. The UNOPS delegate would like to leave the meeting with a review which shows the project is back on its approved track.

ITEM 9: Presentation by UNDP

Lake Tanganyika falls into both categories of primary interest to GEF - 'biodiversity' and 'international waters'. GEF is intended to go further than UNDP in providing funds for conservation and sustainable use of the environment.

The PPER shows that the project is making significant progress in some areas, but has weaknesses in others.

The UNDP/GEF delegate identified five problem areas:-

Local ownership: This is of concern and needs to be enhanced. While GEF projects sometimes show limited local ownership in their early stages, experience shows that they usually finish with participants fully satisfied on ownership issues.

Stakeholder ownership: There is a need to ensure that local people, NGOs and private enterprise are all part of 'local ownership'.

Communication: Are partners now communicating effectively in terms of means and in terms of languages?

Objective assessments of progress: Attention is needed particularly to indicators of national ownership. It must be possible to assess these quantitatively at mid term review.

Differential rates of implementation: Some *force majeure* on project activities is evident as a result of national struggles, but the project must now show as much movement as possible to redress this situation.

ITEM 10 Matters Arising: Clarifications on Identified Constraints

- *Increased Workloads of National Co-ordinators:* Discussed in December 1997. Agreed to bring recommendation to this meeting to recruit assistants.
- *Remuneration levels:* Distinction made between civil servants and freelance consultants. (Discussed in depth - see later)
- *Uvira Office:* Will be rehabilitated and equipped.
- *Training:* Strategy will be clarified at Steering Committee Meeting tomorrow.
- *Francophone Activity Progress:* Will receive early attention through differential implementation. Lessons learned in anglophone countries will be adapted.
- *Need to Extend Project Completion Date:* Probably, but financial implications need consideration before decision can be made.
- *National Working Group Meetings on Lake-shore:* Can certainly take place, but need budgeted programme forwarded to PCU.
- *Ownership:* Have to clarify what is meant. Will need specific proposals to improve level of ownership by countries and communities.
- *Communications:* Telephones operate everywhere except Uvira. Elsewhere phones and e-mails work - generally well. Have relied on UNDP offices in past for communication with Kinshasa. Considering CODAN H-F radio stations for communication between 4 lake shore stations. Perhaps consider for capitals as well.
- *Transport for National Co-ordinators:* Needs raising with UNDP/UNOPS for budgetary implications - see later.
- *National Steering Committees:* Needed in each country to keep leadership well informed. Would also help to redefine role of National Working Groups.
- *Relocation of Project Headquarters to Bujumbura:* Although the project document initially anticipated that the Project HQ would be in Bujumbura, UNDP rules concerning project safety at the time of project inception prevented this. It was agreed that the HQ should be based in Dar es Salaam. The possibility of a later relocation to Bujumbura as the security situation improved was never envisaged.

ITEM 11: Recommendations of PPER

Considered with 'Overall Conclusion and Recommendations' - Item 14.

ITEMS 12 & 13: Project Work Plan, 1997 - 1998

This six page table was explained by the Project Co-ordinator, and approved subject to a request that subsequent plans should be placed in the context of the five year life of the project. The work plan should be viewed along with objective indicators against which its progress could be assessed.

ITEM 14: DECISIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

The Tripartite Review recommends that:-

- 1. National Steering Committees are set up by the four riparian countries. (UNDP/GEF will supply information on composition/TORs of similar groups on other GEF projects).**
- 2. Electronic communications should be enhanced between the capital cities, and between the capitals and the lake-side field sites.**
- 3. Rates of remuneration for private consultants (including university staff) and allowances for all staff to remain under present guidelines. Rates for National Co-ordinators to be reviewed.**
- 4. Countries may recruit full time Assistant National Co-ordinators to take work load off National Co-ordinators. Measures should be put in place to allow officers to function efficiently.**
- 5. A Mid Term Evaluation of the project should take place in April 1998.**
- 6. A decision for any extension of project duration should be considered after the Mid Term Evaluation.**
- 7. The Steering Committee should be asked to consider whether the project would benefit from further publicity. The PCU may be directed to take the necessary funds from the Environmental Education budget, if approved by the Executing Agency.**
- 8. Objective and measurable indicators of project progress need to be put in place.**
- 9. Lakeside meetings of National Working Groups should take place to the extent possible and feasible.**
- 10. The Project should make every effort to bring the schedule of activities planned for the francophone region in line with those of the anglophone region.**
- 11. More attention should be directed toward the broader aspects of institutional mechanisms required to develop and maintain a coherent and practicable Strategic Action Plan for the management of the lake that involves stakeholders at all levels (including the private sector and NGOs).**
- 12. The process leading to a Lake Tanganyika Strategic Action Plan proposed under Output 1.4 of the PPER should be adopted by the project.**
- 13. The role of the National Working Groups should be strengthened through clear terms of reference, and the enhancement of their role in the planning process.**
- 14. An in-depth institutional analysis and assessment exercise should be carried out as indicated under Output 5.6 of the PPER. This should incorporate broad stakeholder involvement and be non-academic in nature.**

15. Additional full time bilingual facilitators/trainers should be placed in the field, one for each of the project special study areas: Socio-economics, Fishing Practices, Sediment Studies, Pollution Studies and Biodiversity Studies.

16. The Project Budget, as amended in Annex 1 of the PPER should not be approved until cost implications of other recommendations are incorporated. This process should be initiated without waiting for the Mid Term Evaluation.

ITEM 15: Closure

The Chairman closed the meeting at 17.00 hours.

NGW: Rapporteur, 19/1/98