

BACK-TO-OFFICE-REPORT

(VS 3912)

Pollution Control and other measures to Protect Biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika (RAF/92/G32). Special Studies: 'Pollution of International Waters', 'Sediment Discharge and Its Consequences' and Related biodiversity studies

Draft back to office report for country visits by G. Patterson - Natural Resources Institute (NRI)

8 August 1996 - to 31 August 1996

Project code - C0767

Separate copies

A. Menz (PCU)
K. Banister (PCU)
T. Bostock (NRI)
J. Ryder (NRI)
B. Fisknes (NRI)
B. Blake (NRI)
T. Bailey -Watts (IFE)
I. Payne (MRAG)
R. Duck (UoD)

1. Introduction

1.1 This document is meant to deal with particular points raised by the visit which demand immediate action. A complete report will be provided at a later date (Section 2.3).

2. Background

2.1 The task of the mission was to make a practical assessment to follow up the baseline review and draw up plans for detailed studies to be initiated in Stage II of the project. The mission was to determine which institutions can most suitably undertake the studies in each country, enlisting their support in setting specific objectives, development of terms of reference and implementation of different elements of the special studies, and also consideration of contractual arrangements.

2.2 This visit follows for the Inception Workshop of the project where the principal objectives of each special study were agreed and a number of Institutions were identified which may play a role in the study.

2.3 The Terms of Reference of this visit are available. These were jointly prepared to cover visits by four members of the consortium in the 'sediment' and 'pollution' special studies. A joint report addressing these Terms of Reference will be provided by the end of September 1996.

3. Summary of visit

3.1 Due to time constraints the team split and the visit undertaken by G. Patterson included only Tanzania and Zambia. The timetable is given below.

Dates	Activity
9 August 1996	Arrive Dar es Salaam
9-11 August 1996	Consultation with PCU and other members of consortium involved in country visits
12 August 1996	Travel from Dar es Salaam to Kigoma (Tanzania)
12 - 14 August 1996	Consultation with TAFIRI and LTR staff at Kigoma (including assessment of facilities)
14-16 August	Travel from Kigoma to Mpulungu (Zambia) on Lake ferry
16-17 August	Communication with Fisheries Department (and other local institutions) in Kigoma
18-19 August	Visit to Nsumbu National Park and Nsumbu Town. Meetings with Parks Dept. and Fisheries staff.
20-21 August	Further meetings in Mpulungu
22 August 1996	Visits to Regional offices of Northern District in Kasama
22 August 1996	Flight from Kasama to Lusaka
22-28 August 1996	Meetings with National Institutions in Zambia
28 August 1996	Flight Lusaka to Dar es Salaam
29-31 August 1996	Meetings with National Institutions in Tanzania and also with PCU
31 August 1996	Flight Dar es Salaam to UK

4. Principal Action Points

4.1 Publicity material. I encountered frequent difficulty traveling with no obvious Project credentials. At least some publicity material and visitors card would smooth meetings and help to introduce the main aims and structure of the project.

Action Point. PCU to send draft and design to UK Project manager (TB). NRI to arrange visitors cards for ALL project personnel.

4.2 Burundi. Due to the security situation in Burundi it was not possible to visit. It is hope the country visit to Burundi can be made as soon as the security situation allows.

Action Point Brief v isit to Bujumbura should be planned and executed when possible. GP.

4.3 LTR staff. LTR are currently in the process of winding down operations. LTBP should maintain a close watch on staff availability with the view to recruitment. There are a total of 4 Dutch APOs seconded to FAO and active in the LTR programme. Two are based in Kigoma and two in Mpulungu. Though they a re contracted to LTR for the next 18 months they were concerned that they would not be required for the whole of this period. The possibility of seconding them to LTBP should be investigated. Though not top rate scientists their experience in the field is extensive.

Action Point. AM to approach LTR with inquiries.

4.4 Tanzanian Visas. The Visa obtained in UK is not recognised in Tanzania and multiple re-entry. Therefore the US\$50 required each time Tanzania is re-entered is proving expensive to the project. Also we paid UK£50 for our visas in UK when the official price is US\$ 50. Why?

Action Point. Brit Fisknes to check on Tanzanian Visa status and to attempt t o ensure that future visas obtained are multi entry and clearly marked so.

4.5 Contractual arrangements. The next step in getting activities going in the field will in many cases involve the drawing up of contracts (or letters of understanding) between national institutions and the project. Assistance is required in establishing protocols for this.

Action Point Steering committee and project management committee to discuss.

4.6 Remote sensing. KB now has design specifications and agreed location for the building of an office and a support plinth for the NOAA receiver equipment in Kigoma. This should proceed as soon possible.

Action Point. KB to activate.

4.7 Equipment. It would appear that all labs visited are wholly under-equipped and that a package of basic equipment, glassware, consumables and chemicals could be agreed and ordered as a complete package (at least 1 package for each country) without fear of duplicating current stocks. These packages could be sent immediately and would form a known resource for visiting scientists.

Action Point. GP and TB-W to provide list and arrange ordering with project management agreement.

4.8 Laboratories. A fuller report on lab facilities and refurbishment requirements will be included later. The possibility exists of shipping out complete portable labs which would allow activities to start sooner and would also be simpler for providing lab space where currently none exists (e.g. Nsumbu Game Park)

Action Point. GP to investigate suppliers in UK.

4.9 Staffing of Local Institutions. I believe, in general, that the quality of staff at lakeshore institutions is not sufficiently high to manage a project of this technical complexity. The project should urgently address this matter and seek ways to appoint qualified technical managers - at least one in each of the four countries.

Action Point. Project Management to Discuss.

G. Patterson
3 September 1996