

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

**SECOND TRIPARTITE REVIEW & FOURTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL
STEERING COMMITTEE**

Nairobi, 25-27 May 1999.

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

27 MAY 1999. Nairobi, Kenya.

Summary of the main Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The meeting adopted the minutes of the third Steering Committee Meeting with some modifications that will be added to the document by the PCU .
2. The summary of progress presented by the Project Co-ordinator was approved.
3. The meeting authorised the project to employ Ms Karen Zwick currently based in Kigoma as regional socio-economic facilitator.
4. The meeting approved the employment of the 4 selected regional bilingual facilitators as well as the recruitment of their counterparts in the region in accordance with the agreed procedure, starting with vacancy announcements in all four countries ; counterparts will originate from one or the four countries and their bilingual capabilities will not constitute a prerequisite to their recruitment.
5. The meeting instructed the project to recruit a Training and Communication facilitator originating from the region.
6. Concerning the budget, UNOPS and PCU shall consult with each other and bring a revised budget document as well as a related workplan to the next meeting of the Steering Committee that will be convened as soon as the budget is ready
7. The Training and Environmental Education strategies, based on the Training Needs Assessment report was approved. The facilitator concerned was directed to make sure that the approved schedule is implemented.
8. At the invitation of the Republic of Burundi it was recommended that the next extraordinary meeting of the Steering Committee should, if possible, take place in

Bujumbura in September 1999. This was not accepted by two of the other three delegations; DR Congo could not however commit themselves at this stage.

MINUTES

1. Introduction

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

2. Venue

The fourth Regional Steering Committee Meeting took place at UNEP Conference Centre in Nairobi on Thursday 27th of May 1999, immediately after the Tripartite Review (reported on separately). The complete list of participants is given in Annex 1.

3. Selection of Chairperson

The head of the Burundian delegation, Mr Jean Berchmans Manirakiza, who had just successfully led the Tripartite Review, was designated and duly elected to chair the meeting.

4. Approval of the agenda

Participants were presented the agenda given below and approved it without modification.

Agenda of the meeting :

- 1° Minutes of the previous Steering Committee Meeting and arising matters
- 2° Matters arising from the TPR
- 3° Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan
- 4° Training and Environmental Education Programmes
- 5° Any other Business
- 6° Date and venue for the next Steering Committee Meeting

5. Proceedings

5.1. Item 1° of the agenda : Review of the minutes of the third Steering Committee Meeting held in Arusha on the 12th of August 1998.

The Project Coordinator presented two documents in this respect : TPR2/SCM4/6.2 and TPR2/SCM4/7 respectively entitled 'Minutes of the Third Regional Steering Committee Meeting, Arusha, Tanzania, 12 August 1998' and 'Summary of progress on the main resolutions of SCM3', and asked the participants to make any comment on them.

Document TPR2/SCM4/6.2 :

Point 3 'Participants' : it was observed that the official title for Mr Mbusu Ngamani from Congo is not 'Director General' but 'Secrétaire Général'. The name Mr Peter Ngumbulu from Tanzania to be corrected to Ngumbullu.

Point 5.6 : it was decided to add the words ‘preferably from the region’ after ‘additional bilingual facilitators /trainers’.

Point 5.11 : translate into French the English sentence in the second paragraph.

Errors in formatting were noted owing to incorrect copying from original.

The Steering Committee therefore adopted the document with some modification on points 5.6 and 5.11, and the recommendation on the improvement of format in order to properly demarcate conclusions and recommendations from the rest of the text.

Document TPR2/SCM4/7 :

Point 5 : the chairman asked for clarifications on who, among the Steering Committee members, had or had not already visited the lake and the Project Coordinator responded to the question in giving the situation country by country: in Zambia, All members had visited together with members of the National Working Group ; in Burundi, everybody has already visited the lake; in DR Congo, one member of the Steering Committee (Dr Nshombo Muderhwa) is living in Uvira, and the National Working Group would like to hold a meeting sometime in Uvira, security permitting. Tanzania had yet to hold its planned NWG on the lake shore.

Point 6 : the Project Coordinator raised two questions : 1) is it still the participants’ wish to recruit a training and communication regional facilitator? 2) if so, will the selected person have to be necessarily bilingual? The answer to the questions was that first of all, all participants accepted the idea of recruiting a regional facilitator. Then, concerning the bilingual ability of the candidate, participants declared that this was not to be considered as the primary criteria, but that the technical capabilities would be the first criteria to consider. Otherwise, only a good knowledge of one language for reporting purposes, and a working knowledge of the other one in order to be able to express ideas without assistance from interpreters would be enough.

Point 8 : some suggestions to improve the contents and the format of the project newsletter were given by participants, e.g. . picture numbering, inclusion of scientific articles, mention of places and scientific names under each picture, mention of photographers’ names, and production of leaflets in Kiswahili for rural populations. For all the suggestions, the Project Coordinator promised to circulate a short questionnaire to gather all ideas in order to improve the newsletter presentation. He nevertheless recalled that the aim of the newsletter was not to replace the other reports of the project, and that the question of leaflets in Kiswahili was being dealt with by the Environmental Education component of the project.

Point 10 finally : it was recommended that the Project Coordinator advise delegates in a timely fashion when there is change of date for the meetings so that participants can make preparations accordingly.

5.2. *Item 2 of the agenda : Matters arising from the TPR*

5.2.1. *The Socio-Economic Special Study Facilitator.*

The Project Coordinator explained that as reported in his progress report, the project had identified a Socio-Economic Facilitator in accordance with the agreed procedure (vacancy announcements, analysis of CVs, preselection, etc.). Unfortunately, although the candidate initially accepted the post he withdrew at the last moment, and there was no immediate replacement.

Fortuitously, a potential, highly suitable, candidate recently took up residence in Kigoma, and rather than repeat the whole recruitment procedure again resulting in further delays of this important component of the project, the PC recommended to the Committee that this person, Ms Karen Zwick be taken on as regional facilitator for the Socio-economic and Environmental Education components. The facilitator will have high level technical backup from a new NRI specialist assigned to the project.

After further clarification Steering Committee accepted the proposed recruitment.

5.2.2. *The counterparts to regional facilitators*

The Project Coordinator requested clarification regarding whether the counterparts to the current regional facilitators the recruitment of which had been recommended by the MTE ,and accepted by the TPR, were also to be bilingual, and if they had to be recruited one from each riparian country or if, for example, all four could originate from a single country.

After discussions between participants and different clarifications by the Project Coordinator, the Steering Committee decided that the bilingual aspect was not an obligation for the counterparts for special studies facilitators, but is rather an ideal. Also, the counterparts will not necessarily originate from each of the four countries. The only requirement is that they originate from the region.

The Project Coordinator noted there is a risk linked with the lack of bilingual ability, because in such conditions, it may be impossible for a counterpart to work in another country of the region. Participants noted the risk. All of them nevertheless hope that good bilingual candidates will be found, although this criteria will not constitute a constraint in the recruitment process.

The Project Coordinator will therefore send a correspondence to all four countries to announce the beginning of the recruitment of counterparts to special studies regional facilitators, and will explain clearly the whole process to which all four countries will be associated.

5.2.3. *The project budget*

The question of the project budget was raised by participants. Though the project budget amounts to US\$10 million, it seems that the project has received only US\$7.9 million. The difference would therefore be US\$2.1 million which remained under UNOPS control. The question was how had this difference been spent ?

The Project Coordinator responded to the question of budget in the following way:

To his knowledge, the sum of US\$ 7.9 million is the value of the contract signed between NRI Consortium and UNOPS. A further US\$ 925,000 was taken out from the original 10 million to finance the interagency agreement to carry out the hydrological model of the lake under the auspices of Lake Tanganyika Research Project and this has been successfully completed. There is also another US\$200,000 which was earmarked by UNOPS for the hiring of R/V Explorer chartered by FAO under a specific legal agreement. LTBP twice used the vessel for about half of this amount, i.e. around US\$80,000, which means there is still US\$120,000 retained by UNOPS. For the remaining sum, the Project Coordinator appealed to UNOPS to explain how it was allocated within the UNOPS/UNDP system.

The UNOPS representative stated that the Project Coordinator had largely explained the matter ; he only indicated that another sum of US\$ 250,000 had been earmarked to finance consultancies and had been spent notably on the formulation of the project and the Mid-Term Evaluation as well as on other miscellaneous activities. The UNOPS representative said that of the amount remaining with UNOPS there would be a total of about US\$ 300,000 to 400,000 that could be made available for the period up to mid-late 2000. He added that UNOPS would calculate the exact sum on return to New York and provide delegates with a full break-down of expenditure

Participants in the meeting regretted the lack of precision about the details regarding the US\$2.1 million retained by UNOPS. They took note of the outstanding amount of US\$300,000 to 400,000 to finance the remaining period, and of the fact that UNOPS, NRI and PCU would sit down together and calculate exactly the remaining budget and allocate it to different project activities. Participants made an urgent appeal to UNOPS that this be done as soon as possible and that they make proposals for programmes that will serve to plan for Phase II of the Project. They noted that it is on the basis of these figures and of these proposals that the delegates will be able to plan effectively Phase II of the Project, and that authorities in the region will be able to take important decisions related to the project. UNOPS representatives took note of the participants' wishes, while mentioning the complexities linked to this work. They assured the participants that there is still enough money to finance all on-going activities and other activities planned up to the end of the project. In addition, they declared that it was important not to lose the momentum between the present phase and the possible Phase II of the Project.

The GEF representatives emphasised that, in order to secure Phase II funding, countries' commitment must be made obvious, and must particularly be materialised by the creation of their Lake Management Body (a Secretariat or something similar), in order to prove to

donors that they are committed and able to assume responsibility for the future management of their lake. UNOPS promised to provide more details during the next extraordinary Steering Committee Meeting.

5.2.4. Project Phase II Planning Process

This issue will be analysed during the forthcoming extraordinary Steering Committee Meeting when NRI/UNOPS provides details concerning the budget and proposals for future activities. .

5.3. Item 3° of the agenda : Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Plan (SAP)

The item was presented by Mr Nick Hodgson. The presentation summarised the Strategic Planning Process, presented for approval Preliminary Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, that was formulated at the workshop that took place in November 1998. He also gave an overview of the next steps.

Participants listened carefully to explanations concerning the genesis of the project, the objectives, the main threats facing Lake Tanganyika, the main actions to counter these threats, the SAP and the lake Tanganyika TDA planning process, the riparian countries responsibility in the process, the necessity for the future Lake Management Body, etc.

Participants appreciated the work and approved the draft Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis by acclamation with some minor corrections that will be directly transmitted to PCU for integration into the document. Moreover, it was recommended to Mr Nick Hodgson to make sure that the approved SAP planning schedule is well implemented.

5.4. Item 4° of the agenda : Training and Environmental Education Programmes

Ms Rachel Roland briefly presented to participants, the Training Strategy prepared after a series of consultancies and meetings by herself and Ms Monique Trudel throughout the region and presented in the Training Needs Assessment report. She discussed the work that was already done and the remaining work in the sector of training, communication and environmental education in all four countries.

Some participants complained that they did not receive all the documents on training, but the Project Coordinator declared that in principle every document is sent to everyone and that he will examine the reasons why some documents do not get to their destination. After some words of congratulations for the facilitator, the document explaining the training strategy was also adopted by acclamation.

5.5. Item 5° of the agenda : Any Other Business

Some participants remarked that participants in the Tripartite Review are always the same as those of the Steering Committee, which makes them both judge and jury. The remark

was noted by the Project Co-ordinator agreed that this was less than ideal but stemmed from the original design of the project.

Another participant issued the wish that the special studies are completed as soon as possible and that the Convention is also readily made available.

One delegate mentioned that the logical framework should be discussed first on national level before it is brought before the Steering Committee. The same participant also evoked once again the issue of improving document circulation.

Finally, one participant declared that he was happy with the increasing quality of project documents and the forthcoming Convention, which both constitute positive factors for the project second phase to come. The same participant (Congolese) issued the wish that the issue concerning the venue for the next Steering Committee Meeting takes into account the sensitivity and interest of all participants in a collegiate spirit.

All participants who took the floor presented their congratulations and their thanks to the chairman of the meeting and to the Project Coordinator for the excellent way they organised and conducted the present meeting. They also congratulated all delegations for their active participation in the meeting.

5.6. Item 6° of the agenda : Date and venue for the next meeting

All delegations (except the Congolese delegation who declared that they could not express an opinion on the issue for the moment) accepted the invitation made by the Republic of Burundi to host the next Steering Committee Meeting in Bujumbura. Given the urgent matters to examine, particularly the details promised by UNOPS and GEF, the Project Coordinator suggested that this should be an extraordinary meeting to be held within about 4 months from now. He promised to make sure the necessary documents are distributed in time.

6. Closure

The chairman officially closed the meeting at 17.00 after having first recalled the main conclusions and recommendations (see point 5 of the present minutes), and after having expressed his thanks to all participants for their enthusiasm and to the interpreters for their conscientious job.

7.

ANNEX 1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BURUNDI

Mr Jean Berchmans Manirakiza	National Coordinator ; Director General INECN
Mr Roger Kanyaru	Director, Département Eaux, Pêche et Pisciculture
Mr Boniface Nyakageni	Advisor, Ministère de l'Environnement
Mr Gaspard Ntakimazi	Lecturer, Université du Burundi

RD CONGO

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

TANZANIA

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

ZAMBIA

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

UNDP

Mr Louis Nduwimana	Burundi
Mr Sylvester Sisila	Tanzania
Mr Amos Muchanga	Zambia

GEF

20. Mr David Larouche

UNOPS

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

LOGFRAME FACILITATOR

23. Mr Maxim Bélot

NRI

Mr Nicholas Hodgson	SAP Coordinator
Mr David Silverside	Project Finance Manager
Ms Rachel Roland	Training Coordinator

PCU

Dr Andrew Menz	Project Coordinator
Dr Kelly West	Scientific Liaison Officer
Mr Pierre C. Nzimpora	Rapporteur
Ms Maria Hiza	Conference Secretary/Administration
Mr Ritesh Bandhari	Project Assistant