

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

***MINUTES OF THE THIRD & FINAL TRIPARTITE REVIEW MEETING***

**Nairobi, 13 July 2000**

---

**1. Introduction**

The present minutes are not a verbatim record of interventions, but gives the important points arising from discussions as well as outputs of the meeting without taking account of the chronological order in which they appeared during the meeting.

**2. Venue and Participation**

The third and final Tripartite Review took place at the Safari Park Hotel in Nairobi, Kenya on Thursday 13 July 2000. The complete list of participants is given in Appendix 1, together with a list of documents tabled at the meeting in Appendix 2.

Thirty-one participants took part in the meeting: 5 from Burundi, 4 from DRC, 4 from the United Republic of Tanzania, 4 from the Republic of Zambia, 4 from UNDP, 1 from UNOPS, 4 from NRI, 5 from PCU and 1 Invited Guest.

**3. Proceedings**

Mr Jérôme Karimumuryango, Director General for INECN Burundi, was designated to chair the meeting.

**3.1 Welcome from Chairperson**

Participants were given welcome by the elected chairman, Mr Jérôme Karimumuryango, Director General for Burundi National Institute Environment and Conservation of Nature (INECN).

**3.2 Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved as follows.

1. Welcome from Chairperson
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Minutes and matters arising from TPR2
4. Review of the Draft Final Evaluation Report
5. Review of UNDP Terminal Report
6. Progress on PDF project. Next steps.
7. Fate of Project Equipment
8. AOB
9. Final comments
10. Closure

### **3.3 Minutes and matters arising from TPR2**

The main conclusions and recommendations of TPR2 recorded in the minutes of that meeting were reviewed one by one. The 18 recommendations were those that had been accepted by the previous Tripartite review stemming from the report of the mid-term evaluation that had taken place in November 1999.

In summary it was concluded that all the recommendations had been successfully incorporated into project activities except for recommendation No 15 stating that “The project should prepare and implement before the end of the project sustainable mechanisms/procedures for professional exchanges between the national experts....”

It was noted that within the current project the preparation of some such mechanisms had been achieved and these were embodied in the SAP and the Convention in the form of the Regional Secretariat and Technical committees that would form part of the future Interim Lake Management Body and eventual Lake Management Authority. The actual implementation of these mechanisms would probably have to await the implementation of a follow on project as they were currently beyond the current means of the riparian states.

Tanzania sought clarification about documents to be produced by the project. The PC explained that the documents were essentially to be in a three tier set. First there would be an overall synthesis of the results of the special studies together with a summary of important aspects of project implementation and processes that would be of value to future project development. This would most likely be a one or two volume document and would be produced under UNOPS auspices after the end of the current project phase on 31 July 2000. Second there would be a set of all the major final reports being produced in both languages from each of the project components, including the Baseline Review SAP, TDA, draft Convention etc. These reports would be bound and distributed in hard copy. Finally the full complement of all substantive documents, including the ones mentioned above, produced during the five years of the project will be made available on the Project’s Website and on CD-ROM once all reports are complete.

Mr Schuetz-Mueller supported the PC in saying that it was of utmost importance that a synthesis document be produced, explaining what the project has been doing in five years. The document would be made available for anyone who would like to have information on the project, especially those who released substantial amounts of money for this project. Then, more detailed individual documents would be produced to allow for any interested person to go deeper into specific information. He applauded the fact that thanks to current technology, all these documents will be put on CD-ROMs for easy accessibility. He further clarified that although the NRI facilitated project activities end on 31<sup>st</sup> of July, UNOPS will continue working with the four countries until PSCU officially opens and takes over from LTBP, to avoid hiatus and loss of momentum.

The following errors were noted in the minutes: In Annex 1, List of Participants, Zambia, Georges Chitalu should read George Chitalu. Also, the institutional affiliation

for Ms Nsomi should be "National Institute for Scientific and Industrial Research (NISIR)". Under Tanzania in the same list the title "Assistant Director, Division of Fisheries" should apply to Mr W.V. Haule and not to Ms Hawa Msham as shown

After these corrections, the Minutes of the Second Tripartite Review were adopted.

### **3.4 Review of the Draft Final Evaluation Report**

The PC reported that the final project evaluation took place between April 28 and May 26, 2000. Two consultants undertook the evaluation; they were: Mr Lothar Gündling who dealt exclusively with the legal and institutional component of the project and the Team leader, Stanislaw Manikowski who dealt with all other project components. After comments from GEF the draft report was delivered to the region on 3 July 2000.

The meeting reviewed in detail the bulk of the draft report containing 26 specific recommendations made by the evaluation team. It was proposed that meeting would either accept, reject or accept pending some modification or clarification each of the recommendations. In addition to the specific recommendations the evaluators had highlighted in their report and number of summary comments or statements referring to various aspects of project implementation. These were also reviewed by the meeting.

After examining the first few comments and recommendations several delegations expressed difficulty in understanding exactly what it was the evaluators were trying to recommend. It was felt that terminology and structure made some recommendations ambiguous or simply unclear. The meeting recommended that the evaluators be asked to make the necessary clarifications in the final report.

In addition, it was felt that as some recommendations were directed to the current project management, others to government institutions and yet others seemed to apply to the PDF project, they should be grouped in this manner in the summary of the report.

The following is a list of the comments (C ) and recommendations ® that were analysed and the meeting's decision on each of them.

*C. The fact that despite remarkable obstacles the project succeeded so well, is an outstanding achievement. **Agreed.***

*C. The overall conclusion is that the Draft Convention is a good quality document. **Agreed.***

*C. Globally, the management, monitoring and backstopping were judged by the Project Management as helpful, supportive and important in implementation of project activities.*

**Agreed.**

*C. The Regional Steering Committee played an important role in project execution. Unfortunately, the national bodies require revitalization. **Rejected in its current form:** Not at all clear what is being stated. Which bodies need revitalisation – when?*

*C. What characterized the governments' involvement in the project activities was a steady increase in sharing the project's goals, and contributing to realization of the project's objectives. **Agreed.***

*C. The project management successfully responded to the changing environment. **Agreed** but requires to be more specific with respect to the term "project management"*

*R1. The Project Management should prepare a synthetic document actualising the knowledge about Lake Tanganyika, indicating the remaining important studies to conduct, both to better understand the Lake's uniqueness and ways to protect it. Such a document will be of great value for future Lake Tanganyika management projects and for other countries of the region currently engaged in similar water protection activities. It will raise as well the Lake's visibility in the opinion of the public and decision-makers of the riparian countries.*

**Accepted,** this is to be undertaken see comments above.

*R2. It is recommended to the governments that future research or applied research efforts aiming at Lake Biodiversity protection involve the stakeholders as well, and their results contribute to solving specific practical problems. **Accepted but requires clarification with respect to which stakeholders are being referred to .***

*R3. It is further recommended that future Lake protection projects sponsored by GEF compare expected benefits from the financed research with the research costs. **Rejected,** as currently formulated. Not clear what precisely is being recommended.*

*R4. It is recommended that the UNDP/GEF projects incorporate into their working programs activities that will help them follow the project's perception in the eyes of the key stakeholders.*

**Accepted,** but requires more precise formulation.

*R5. It is recommended that further editions of the Strategic Action Plan and the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis use fully the results of the specific studies. It is also recommended that the final documents describing the results of the studies clearly indicate the link between the achieved results and national actions aimed at Lake protection.*

**Accepted,** but it was noted that The final TDA did have the final input of the SS (bar PSS) in the form of documents prepared for the SAP, which were not and did not need to be the final technical SS reports.

The final SAP therefore did have the final results of the SS and these did feed in to the SAP priority programme of actions. However, in the end these were not much different from the first TDA.

*R6. It is recommended that the governments of the riparian countries maintain the SAP groups (or equivalent bodies) and charge them to promote the SAP implementation, and guide the country administration and private sectors investing in the SAP priorities. **Accepted**, assumed to refer to post project (PDF) activities.*

*R7. The Project Management jointly with the national governments install national interim bodies that will be responsible for facilitation of the Convention signature and ratification process. **Accepted** but with reformulation along following lines for clarification "...“ The project management jointly with National Governments should ensure the undertaking of wider national consultations for facilitating the Convention signature and ratification process”*

*R8. It is recommended that the Convention addresses as well the threats to the Lake originating in non-riparian countries. **Accepted**.*

*R9. It is recommended that the project describes the first results of the launched activities, evaluates their costs, and reports about the achieved impact in terms of improvement in fishing practices, sustainable land use and reduced deforestation. **Rejected**, as currently stated because it is not clear what activities are referred to or how costs might be evaluated in the time remaining.*

*R10. It is recommended that the national institutions continue monitoring impact of the project’s launched environmental education. **Accepted**, with addition of “programme” to end of sentence.*

*R11. The government and donors should incorporate recommendations and lessons from the project’s launched environmental education into other development activities in the Lake Tanganyika region. The expected benefits to Lake protection of the planned projects should be one of the criteria for their funding priority. **Requires clarification**.*

*R12. Future poverty alleviation projects for the people living in the Lake’s surroundings should take into account the results of the special studies. Regional co-ordination of such future projects would be most beneficial both for the population and for the Lake. **Accepted**.*

*R13. That the Project Management and National Co-ordinators facilitate the creation of national structures charged with implementing the Authority’s decisions on the national level. These structures can act as a counterpart to the regional initiatives launched by the Authority, and transmit national preoccupations to the Authority. **Clarification required**. Which Authority is being referred to, which component of project management, and what sort of “structures”*

*R14. It is recommended that the Project before its termination, propose such a structure in the form of an Interim Regional Steering Committee as a supervisor and Interim National Co-ordinating Committees as national counterparts.*

First element **Rejected** as it is currently included in the SAP, second element **Accepted** as part of future requirements.

*R15. It is recommended that the Project Management, and after the project termination, the national institutions and concerned technical ministries assure the highest visibility of the results of the sedimentation reduction and land management studies and raise awareness of the countries' citizens and the authorities about the importance of these problems both for the Lake and for the well being of the rural populations.*

Accepted, but noted that that the evaluators have missed mention of some important project outputs that address this recommendation, namely:

The project website

The GIS system and its extensive metadatabase

In addition BLOSS has developed two databases to support its field programme, one to manage the data recorded from the field programme and another to collate historical data from earlier studies and in the literature. Both have been designed to be compatible with the LTBP GIS.

*R16. It is recommended that the Project Management identify the steps needed to implement an integrated pollution monitoring system. This integration means from one side integration of pollution monitoring with biodiversity and sedimentation monitoring, and from the other side creation of permanent links with law enforcement and awareness-raising national agencies.*

**Accepted**, with clarification concerning project management.

*R17. It is recommended that the Project Management and National Co-ordinators identify the governmental structures that will be in charge of Lake Biodiversity monitoring and creation of areas for the biodiversity and fish reproduction protection.*

**Accepted.**

*R18. It is recommended that the available data concerning fishing in the lake are analysed from the standpoint of requirement of specific priority programs identified in the SAP. The Project Management may recommend to the national agencies to assure complementary or follow-up studies.*

**Accepted.**

*R19. It is recommended that social studies aiming at reducing impact of human activity on the Lake's biodiversity are attached to any project dealing with sustainable management of the Lake and its catchment. The present project should identify the most appropriate institutions within the region that may continue to collect and analyse the information from all social and socio-economic studies.*

**Accepted.**

*R20. It is therefore recommended that the project and national institutions that will assure the follow-up of the launched activities, closely collaborate with local administrations and existing poverty-alleviation programs*

**Accepted.**

*R21. It is recommended that the Project Management and the National Co-ordinators assure the transfer of all information sources and databases to the countries.*

**Accepted.**

*R22. The project and its national partners should prepare an inventory of the research areas and prioritise them according to their importance to the Lake management, SAP implementation, and the Lake biodiversity understanding.*

**Accepted.**

*R23. It is recommended that the national authorities include these suggestions in the future version of the SAP.*

**Accepted.**

*R24. It is recommended that the national authorities evaluate the level of awareness of the concerned stakeholders. Such an evaluation will indicate the effort needed for awareness-raising, the stakeholders to address, and inform the authorities about the most appropriate tools.*

**Accepted.**

*R25. It is recommended that the Project Management and the National Co-ordinators assure large visibility of the project's results that may have a short and medium – terms impact both on the countries' citizens' welfare and the Lake environment.*

**Accepted.**

*R26. It is therefore recommended to the Regional Steering Committee and governments of the riparian countries to identify donors susceptible to support the next phase of the Lake Tanganyika biodiversity protection projects. During this phase, that may correspond to the interim period between the present project termination and the Convention implementation, the projects may concentrate on such activities as:*

- Promotion of the SAP integration in national development programs, and the Convention signature and ratification facilitation*
  - Assistance in formulating specific Lake protection projects in accordance with the SAP*
  - Test the importance of benefits generated by Lake protection activities*
  - Promote the Lake protection approach among donors for the riparian countries*
- Disseminate the present project results among all stakeholders. **Accepted.***

Under Section 3.2 Objectives Realization, of the report the evaluators made the following summary comments all of which were **Agreed** by the meeting.

*C. The project successfully established a regional long term management program.*

*C. The project also formulated a regional framework for cooperative management of the lake in form of The Convention on the Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika.*

*C. In summary, the third immediate objective was partially achieved.*

*C. In summary, the regional coordination structures were elaborated, but only the project's regional structure was tested.*

*C. The project launched five special studies. Their results contributed to formulation of a global Lake biodiversity protection strategy and helped identify the priority actions that were included in the Strategic Action Program.*

*C. The environmental management proposals were not implemented by the project.*

*C. In summary, the project successfully realized four immediate objectives. Realization of two others was delayed directly or indirectly by insecurity prevailing in the region. The project outputs are of very high quality and of great regional importance.*

The substantive comments made in Sections 3.3 Lessons from the Project, and 3.4, Further Actions, were **Accepted** by the meeting.

### **3.5 Review of UNDP Terminal Report**

The PC presented the item using the UNDP Terminal Report document. He mentioned that the document was still incomplete because he was still awaiting contributions from the National Co-ordinators. Thus as it stood the report contained only contributions from the Project Co-ordinator and UNDP.

It was agreed that the National Co-ordinators would meet with Dr Menz after the meeting to go through what was required from each country and that contributions would then be sent to the PCU by 21 July 2000. Failing that they would have to be sent directly to UNDP office Dar es Salaam.

Tanzania and UNDP enquired about the urgency of the matter. The PC responded that it was quite urgent as ideally it would be submitted before the GEF consideration of the PDF proposal on 27 July 2000.

Concerning procedure, UNDP further indicated that UNOPS as executing agency would have to approve the report before transmitting it to UNDP for final consideration.



### **3.6 Progress on PDF project. Next steps.**

The PC reported that all countries had approved and signed the PDF-C proposal and that it would be considered by GEF in their meeting of 27<sup>th</sup> July. Additional supporting documents would be the SAP, the Final Evaluation and the minutes of current meetings.

Mr Schuetz-Mueller explained further the whole process of getting to final acceptance of the document. He said that UNDP, in consultation with the countries, is responsible for drafting the Project Document based on the proposal. Once agreed and signed by all parties funds can be disbursed. He expected the whole process, if unhindered, could be complete by October 2000.

### **3.7 Fate of Project Equipment**

The PC presented inventories and a series of recommendations to the committee. These were discussed and the following points raised.

The PC that it should be kept in mind that the PDF-C project that will take over had no provision in its budget for capital equipment of any kind.

Burundi suggested that equipment and vehicles should remain where they are now, awaiting for the new PDF-C project to start, but that they should continue to be used during follow-on activities. They should also continue to wear UNDP label.

DR Congo that some planned equipment never arrived on destination, and that this should be forwarded to the places where they were intended to go despite the closing of the project. The PC explained that this would indeed be done before the project ended.

Tanzania asked whether GIS main centre would not better be situated in Dar es Salaam (Institute of Resource Assessment) while awaiting the second phase and that the vehicle in Kigoma should not be given to the project National Co-ordination office. The PC said GIS will not be used by PDF-C project because the number of staff having been reduced to fit the budget no longer had a data handling specialist.

Zambia suggested to go with simple principles saying for instance that 1) All equipment and vehicles, except PCU's, should remain where they are on condition that they are accessed by any service that usually utilises them, and 2) All PSU intended equipment should be kept with UNDP before effective transfer.

Mr Schuetz-Mueller explained that project equipment is generally kept under UNDP scrutiny, and that they are free to use it for any other body. However, when there is another project following, equipment is usually kept for that project. He therefore suggested that equipment should remain where they are awaiting the new project to start. It would then be up to the new project to decide what to keep and what to hand to Government Institutions.

Having considered the various options it was **Agreed** that in the main all equipment and vehicles should remain UNDP title and in their current locations. The exceptions being a) Office equipment and reports held in the PCU office Dar to be stored at UNDP Dar es Salaam until the PSCU was established b) Computers and reports held by the PCU office Bujumbura to be shipped to UNDP offices Dar es Salaam and stored there for eventual use by the PSCU c) the PCU vehicles in Bujumbura to be made available for use by INECN.

It was further **Agreed** that should any institutions currently be using project equipment held by another institute, for post project monitoring then that institute should continue to have access to the equipment.

The final fate of the equipment would be decided once it was clear what any follow-on projects might require.

The PC was directed to send the meetings proposals and full inventories to UNOPS and country UNDP offices.

#### **4.8 AOB**

No other business was raised under this item.

#### **4.9 Final comments**

The chairman asked for final comments from different delegations and individuals.

Burundi expressed their thanks to everybody for their spirit of collaboration, and wished the project to continue without discontinuity.

DR Congo thanked the Chairman for reducing the duration of the meeting, and also thanked the PCU and everybody for the good climate of work. He asked everybody to applaud the happy end of this project.

Tanzania congratulated the Chairman for his efficient handling of the meetings. They expressed their satisfaction with the implementation and its main outputs of the project and reaffirmed their commitment to the implementation of the SAP. They thanked everybody for having chosen them to host the PDF-C project, and mentioned they had already an office to host it. He urged every country not to lose momentum and go ahead with the new project. He paid tribute to all the bodies and individuals who made all efforts to successfully conduct the project.

Zambia expressed their thanks to the PC, the Chairman, the whole organisation as well as national and international experts.

UNOPS thanked the Chairman and all participants for their participation. He mentioned that NRI would separate from the project on 31<sup>st</sup> July, but that co-ordination of activities will continue under Margaret Chi from UNOPS. He expected that a Committee Meeting would take place towards the end of the year.

UNDP thanked the Chairman and the four delegations. They also thanked UNOPS, PCU, experts etc, and were happy that Evaluators had concluded that the project had been an overall success.

The PC thanked institutions and individuals who had contributed to the success of the project, as well the four governments for their support. He said he would leave Tanzania on 29<sup>th</sup> July, but wished a successful continuation of the project.

Dr Kelly West said she had been happy to work for the project and thanked all people who had worked with her. Mr David Silverside wished the project to go ahead. Mr Sisila took the opportunity to introduce Ms Deborah Kahatano as his replacement at UNDP-Dar es Salaam.

Finally, the Chairman thanked everybody for their participation, and the Safari Park Hotel for their facilities.

#### **4.10 Closure**

The chairman closed the Third and Final Tripartite Review Meeting on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2000 at 19:36.

## **APPENDIX 1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

### **BURUNDI**

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr Jérôme Karimumuryango | Coordinateur National, Directeur Général INECN     |
| 2. Mr Boniface Nyakageni    | Conseiller au MINATE                               |
| 3. Mr Benoît Bihamiriza     | Directeur, Dép. Affaires Juridiques et Contentieux |
| 4. Mr Ferdinand Nderagakura | Directeur de l'Environnement, MINATE               |
| 5. Mr Gabriel Hakizimana    | INECN  |

### **DR CONGO**

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| 6. Mr Mbusu Ngamani        | Secrétaire Général, Ministère de l'Environnement   |
| 7. Mr Mady Amule           | Coordinateur National, Directeur, Min. de l'Env.   |
| 8. Dr Nshombo Mudherwa     | Directeur General du CRH-UVIRA                     |
| 9. Amb. Mapango Kemishanga | Directeur, Dép. Affaires Juridiques et Contentieux |

### **TANZANIA**

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| 10. Mr Eric Mugurusi  | Director, Division of Env., Vice President's Office |
| 11. Ms Anna Mayawalla | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Commission     |
| 12. Mr W.V. Haule     | Assistant Director, Fisheries Division              |
| 13. Ms Hawa Msham     | Assistant National Co-ordinator, Division of Env.   |

### **ZAMBIA**

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 14. Mr Luanda Aongola            | Director of Planning, Min of Env and Natural Resources |
| 15. Mr George Munshimbwe Chitalu | Assistant National Co-ordinator, ECZ/LTBP              |
| 16. Mr S.Y. Nsongela             | Senior Inspector, EIA, ECZ.                            |
| 17. Ms Maureen Nsomi             | Senior Scientist, NISIR                                |

### **NRI**

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 18. Mr Nicholas Hodgson | SAP Facilitator                        |
| 19. David Silverside    | Finance Manager                        |
| 20. Dr Graeme Patterson | Sediments Special Study Co-ordinator   |
| 21. Mr Richard Paley    | Biodiversity Special Study Facilitator |

### **UNDP**

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 22. Mr Louis Nduwimana  | Environmental Programme Officer, Burundi             |
| 23. Ms Winnie Musonda   | Sustainable Dev Adviser for Env/GEF Projects, Zambia |
| 24. Mr Silvester Sisila | Ass Res Rep, Env and Natural Resources, Tanzania     |
| 25. Ms Debra Kahatano   | Programme Officer, Env/GEF, Tanzania                 |

### **UNOPS**

- |                               |                            |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 26. Mr Ingolf Schuetz-Mueller | Senior Environment Adviser |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|

### **PCU**

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 26. Dr Andrew Menz            | Project Co-ordinator                      |
| 27. Dr Kelly West             | Scientific Liaison Officer                |
| 28. Mr Pierre-Claver Nzimpora | Rapporteur                                |
| 29. Mr Ritesh Bhandari        | Project Assistant/Conference Co-ordinator |
| 30. Mr Mamert Maboneza        | Conference Secretary/Administration       |

### **INVITED GUEST**

- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 31. Mr George W. Ssentongo | FAO Sec. CIFA Sub-Committee for Lake Tanganyika |
|----------------------------|---|