

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

***MINUTES OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL STEERING
COMMITTEE***

Arusha, 2-3 December 1999

Summary of the main Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Committee adopted the minutes of the fourth meeting of the Steering Committee with some modifications. (Section 4.3 & 4.4)
2. It was decided not to pursue the recruitment of a Regional Training, Education, and Communication's Co-ordinator. Given the current travel constraints and possible language limitations it was felt it would be better for the current National TECCs to operate as a co-ordinated team. rather than selecting one to co-ordinate the others. (Section 4.4 last para.)
3. The Committee agreed that UNOPS should approach the consultants who carried out the Mid-Term Evaluation, for a second time and ask if they would consider amending their report to incorporate riparian country's and NRI's responses in order to produce a consolidated report. If they declined the UNOPS would send GEF separate documents with cover note explanations. (Section 4.5 last para.)
4. UNDP informed the Committee that under the current UN security ratings it was forbidden for non-national project staff to visit Burundi and eastern DRC without explicit exemption. (Section 4.6)
5. It was agreed that UNOPS would retain \$87,960 from the budget presented by NRI to be used for preparatory activities for the next phase, bridging activities between phases and PR. (Section 4.7 and 4.9)
6. The Committee approved the summary of project progress, achievements and final phase work programme presented by the Project Co-ordinator. (Section 4.8)
7. The Committee approved and appreciated the progress being made with the Strategic Action Programme. (Section 4.8)
8. All delegations firmly supported the continuing development of the Convention, noting that it would be a unique instrument for the management of Lake Tanganyika and something that no other project on lake had so far attempted. (Section 4.11, para 7)

9. Regarding concern by UNOPS with respect to the possible future inclusion of Rwanda in the Convention, all delegations agreed that the Convention should have provision for the inclusion of "other states" in the future. (Section 4.11, para. 9)
10. It was recommend by UNOPS that managers and scientists from the project countries should be present at the forthcoming STAP meeting in Malawi (Section 4.12, para 3)
11. UNOPS expressed its hope that by the next SCM there would be available a PDF request for a next phase (4.12, para 8)
12. The Committee agreed on dates and venues for all regional meetings up to the end of the project. (Section 4.13).

1. Introduction

The following minutes are a summary of the issues that were discussed 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.

2. Venue

The Fifth Regional Steering Committee Meeting took place at the Arusha International Conference Centre in Arusha, Tanzania on Thursday 2 December and Friday 3 December 1999. The complete list of participants is given in Annex 1, together with a list of documents tabled at the meeting in Annex 2.

3. Selection of Chairperson

Given that the four previous meetings of the Steering Committee had been chaired by Zambia, Tanzania and Burundi respectively, Zambia proposed that the Democratic Republic of Congo chair the current meeting. Tanzania seconded the proposal and Mr Mbusu Ngamani, head of the Congolese delegation, was duly elected to chair the meeting.

4. Proceedings

4.1 Welcome by Chairman

Mr Ngamani, thanked the participants for having elected him as Chairperson and after thanking Tanzania for hosting the meeting welcomed all delegates to the Fifth Meeting of the Regional Steering Committee, which he declared formally open.

4.2 Adoption of the agenda

The Chair presented a 14 item provisional agenda to participants. It was decided that item no 8 should be switched for item no 9 and vice versa. The final agenda was agreed as follows:

ITEM

- 1 Opening of the meeting and selection of chairperson
- 2 Review and adoption of agenda
- 3 Confirmation of minutes of 4th SCM
- 4 Matters arising from 4th SCM and Project Progress
- 5 Status of Mid-Term Evaluation Report
- 6 Security in Bujumbura and DR Congo
- 7 Overall budgetary disbursement
- 8 Summary of Project Achievements, final phase work programme and expected outcome
- 9 Budget and workplan to July 31, 2000
- 10 The Strategic Action Programme
- 11 Future of the Convention
- 12 Overview of the GEF Strategy for additional project phase
- 13 Date and venue of next SCM and other regional meetings in 2000
- 14 AOB
- 15 Closure

4.3 *Item 3: Confirmation of minutes of SCM 4 held in Nairobi on the 27th of May 1999.*

The Project Co-ordinator (PC) presented the minutes for review by participants. The following amendments/corrections were made:

On page 1, point 3 stating that “The meeting authorised the project to employ Ms Karen Zwick...”, Tanzania delegation suggested to include the words “in principle” between “authorised” and “the project”. This was agreed.

On page 4, point 5.4.1, par 3, saying that “the Steering Committee unanimously accepted the proposed recruitment”, Tanzania delegation suggested to include the words “in principle” between “accepted” and “the proposed recruitment”. This was agreed.

On page 8, the name and title no.14 was misspelled; it should read “ Mr George Munshimbwe Chitalu, Assistant National Co-ordinator, ECZ/LTBP”.

Tanzania suggested that UNDP participant's titles should be included in the list of participants. This was agreed.

4.4 Item 4: Matters arising from minutes of 4th SCM and Progress on Principle Resolutions of SCM4

The Project Co-ordinator, Dr Andrew Menz, presented document SCM5/5, "Summary of Progress on Principal Resolutions of 4SCM" following which the Chairperson invited participants to give their comments.

Page 1 No 3, where stating "The meeting authorised the project to employ Ms Karen Zwick...", Tanzania suggested that "in principle" be inserted between "authorised" and "the project to employ...". This was **agreed**.

Page 1 point 4, concerning the recruitment of counterparts for the four regional facilitators, Dr Menz stated, that while drawing up a recruitment scheme, the Project Co-ordinator became concerned regarding the time required for this process and other matters such as, operational logistics, financial implications and questions of sustainability associated with the proposed counterpart facilitator posts. These were drawn to the attention of country National Co-ordinators (NCs) and an alternative was proposed that would achieve the aims of the counterpart facilitator posts and in addition provide more, both short-term and long-term sustainable benefits to the project. The alternative was to use the resources that would have been used for this purpose to make more use of the National Special Study Co-ordinators for each special study, most of them already identified and involved with the project. This proposal was accepted by all countries and has subsequently been put into effect.

On Page 2 point 5, regarding the recruitment of a Regional Training, Education, and Communications Co-ordinator originating from the region, the Project Co-ordinator explained that at the same time that he wrote to NCs concerning facilitator's counterparts he had recommended a process for recruitment of the Regional TECC. This required NCs to advertise the post and send best 3 CVs received from each country to the PCU. A shortlist of 4 for interview was to be made from the total of 12. The whole process was to be completed by October 1999. However, only CVs from Zambia had so far been received, (in October). Given the time and budgetary constraints the project is currently under, Dr Menz strongly recommended that instead of recruiting new personnel, the project continue to work with the 4 National TECCs, with support from the two external consultants. He said this had been successful to date and was a more cost effective and sustainable strategy for progress. He added that considering it was now December and Special Studies activities will be coming to an end soon the PCU needed guidance on how to proceed

The different delegations related a variety of reasons for not submitting CVs and made their suggestions for the way forward:

Tanzania suggested to use current resources to appoint someone from the existing TECC team like Mr Tarimo from NEMC, Tanzania, to do the job and support the other country National Co-ordinators. Zambia supported Tanzania's suggestion

without mentioning any particular name. DRC and Burundi also supported this proposal.

After further discussion and clarifications by the Project Co-ordinator it was **agreed** that given the current travel constraints, and possible language limitations it would be better for the current National TECCs to operate as a co-ordinated team rather than selecting one to co-ordinate the others.

Page 2 point 6, the Project Co-ordinator explained that following the recommendations of SCM4, the PCU and NRI had prepared a revised workplan and budget up to July 2000 and these were provided to the Committee as briefing documents SCM5 and SCM5/8.

Page 2 point 8, the Project Co-ordinator explained that owing to continuing security difficulties in the region, all participating countries and involved parties had agreed to meet in Arusha, Tanzania, instead of Bujumbura, Burundi.

4.5 Item no 5: Status of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report

In presenting this item the UNOPS' representative, Mr Ingolf Schuetz-Muller, recalled that at the second Tripartite Review (TPR) it had generally been felt that in their report the evaluators seemed to have judged the project implementation largely on the basis of what they felt the original project design should have been (with the emphasis and structure of a modern international waters project) rather than on what it was according to original project documents. This together with some factual inconsistencies had, in turn, elicited a robust response from NRI. All parties at the 2nd TPR & 4th SCM had reviewed both the MTE recommendations and NRI responses. At these meetings the countries had dealt in detail with each of the recommendations, accepting some with or without modification and rejecting others.

He noted that it was the desire of UNOPS to present a unified single document to GEF as this was normal practice. With this aim he had recently approached the evaluators and asked them to prepare a consolidated report (combining the original MTE report, with NRI's factual corrections and the countries reactions to the recommendations). Although initially amenable the evaluators had later declined to make any changes to their original report. If a single final report could not be obtained Mr Schuetz-Muller indicated that another option would be for UNOPS to send to GEF separate documents as they stand, accompanied with cover notes.

As it was now urgent to resolve this issue considering the short time remaining before the end of this project, Mr Ingolf Schuetz-Muller proposed that on his return to New York, he would once again approach the evaluators and ask if they would consider meeting with Dr Menz to discuss the report and subsequently produce a consolidated report. If they declined then UNOPS would send to GEF separate documents with cover notes explanations.

The Committee **agreed** to this approach.

4.6 Item no 6: Security in Bujumbura and DRC

The Tanzanian UNDP representative explained that, given the Phase IV security status prevailing in Burundi and the Eastern part of DRC, the Dar es Salaam UNDP Resident Representative in a meeting with the PC and SLO had explained that under UN regulations it was prohibited for any expatriate to travel to, or work in, Burundi or Eastern DRC unless explicit exemption was given. She instructed LTBP to adhere strictly to this ruling, whatever past practices might have been.

The Burundian UNDP representative supported his colleague from Tanzania, but said there were signs for hope of some improvement on the security situation in the near future.

DRC and Burundi responded that, despite this decision, field activities should not be affected. The Project Co-ordinator confirmed that planned field activities would, as far as possible, continue with the aid of the project's co-ordination office in Bujumbura, administered by local employees, although some changes of plans were inevitable. He further added that even if the security situation were to change to Phase III, the project international staff would not, at this late stage in the project, be relocated on a permanent basis to Bujumbura, but would make visits as and when required, and of whatever duration was considered necessary.

The Scientific Liaison Officer made a plea to the representatives from Bujumbura and Uvira stations that, despite the desire to continue activities, special studies teams should not be exposed to danger through travel to insecure zones and that National Co-ordinators should maintain constant communication with the station teams on the status of security. The SLO added that all activities in these areas should be conducted with her and the PCU's prior knowledge.

DRC suggested equipping the Uvira station with adequate communication equipment to facilitate advice given by Dr West. They added that there should also be a communication link between the National Co-ordinators in the capitals and the stations on the lake.

In response to DRC, Dr. Menz informed the delegation that HF radio equipment has been purchased some time ago for the DRC and Burundi stations but permits had not yet been secured from the respective authorities, and that these were unlikely to be forthcoming in the near future owing to the sensitive attitude toward such equipment by military authorities. He noted, however, that the Director of CRH Uvira had been provided with a mobile phone by the project and that this should allow adequate communications.

4.7 Item no 7: Overall budgetary disbursement

Ms Margaret Chi presented this item for UNOPS. She described the budget from a general and then more detailed perspective. The general summary of overall disbursement of the \$10,000,000 allocated to the project is given at Annex 3.

There was some confusion and concern over the table presented by Ms Chi, especially with regard to the allocation of funds to international versus national participants and funding for future project preparation.

In response, Mr Schuetz-Muller explained that Ms Chi had been dealing largely with funds allocated for UNOPS activities and that funding for nationals etc was within the amount set against budget line 2101 of Ms Chi's table and would be dealt with during the presentation of the project budget by Mr David Silverside of NRI under agenda item number 9.

With regard to concern over planing for any future project, it was explained that there was approximately 80,000 remaining of the budget portion managed directly by UNOPS and that a further 87,960 would be retained from the "Development of the Lake Management Body and the New Project" and would be used by UNOPS for bridging activities, preparatory activities for the next phase and PR efforts.

4.8 Item 8: Summary of Project Achievements, final phase work programme and expected outcome

A comprehensive presentation of project achievements was made by the Project Coordinator, using two parallel computer screens, one showing text in English and the other simultaneously displaying text in French. He noted that his presentation would also include the contents of the briefing documents SCM5/6 and SCM5/8, Project Progress report April to October 1999 and Workplan to July 31, 2000.

Dr Menz first explained the overall project purpose and the infrastructure that had been set up in the four countries by the project. He then went on to present details of the achievements of the various project components including: Biodiversity, Pollution, Sedimentation, Fishing Practises, Socio-Economics, Geographic Information Systems, Training and Environmental Education. He described and stressed the importance of the Strategic Action Programme, and the Legal Convention and finally described the initiatives the project had taken for the collation, dissemination and archiving of all types of information about the lake generated by the project or collected from other sources.

All delegations declared that they were impressed by this long but valuable presentation. Their was, however, some concern at the level of national involvement in all these achievements, and the amount of work undertaken in DR Congo.

Zambia commented that they were experiencing difficulty in accessing the LTBP web site.

Dr Menz reiterated what he said in his talk, namely, that all the work he had described could not have been achieved without the considerable involvement of national technicians and scientists at all levels. He further clarified that the choice of national

institution was done with full participation of nationals. He noted that given the remoteness of the lake in relation to three of the countries capitals some Steering Committee members were not perhaps always fully aware of the real level of national participation.

Regarding work in DRC, he said that the security situation had made it difficult to achieve similar levels of activity there as in the other countries. He pointed out, however, that in spite of this the DRC station was now equipped with all the basic requirements to carry out the required studies on the lake. He added that it was not always necessary for all countries to repeat all experiences in the different countries zones because Lake Tanganyika is one entity and lessons learnt from one area of the lake could be applied to others, especially when management measures were being considered.

Concerning the difficulty of accessing the web site from Zambia, Dr Menz suggested that a local expert be consulted as the problem was most certainly internal to ECZ.

The Committee accepted the briefing documents presented.

4.9 Item no 9: Budget and workplan up to July 30, 1999.

Mr Silverside from NRI presented to the Committee the budget contained in briefing document SCM5, "New Budget Allocations". The budget showed expenditure to 1 October 1999 and allocations based on the current workplan to 31 July 2000 (doc. SCM5/8). He went through the budget in some detail explaining how allocations had been made and what they were for. He ended by raising the major concerns he was foreseeing, especially that of line 1.4.11 "General Operating Expenditure", for which approximately an additional \$100,000 would be required to complete the project.

Mr Silverside therefore recommended the following management options in order to be able to attain successful closure:

- Special studies are to be concluded as soon as possible. Reports are required for compilation of the draft SAP and these schedule for November. There will opportunity for extra inputs in March.
- Discontinuation of PRAs and DSAs between December and March for all Special Studies. This of course is a natural consequence of Special Studies ending and the countries themselves taking over fully monitoring programmes. In addition and as a further demonstration of commitment to the lake and any future interventions from GEF, it is recommended payments to lead organisations for basic co-ordination activities cease at the end of the first quarter in 2000. Any actual costs for NWG meetings etc would continue to be paid.
- Serial closure of lakeshore project support offices and administrative staff as activities draw to a close.
- Maintaining an extra diligent watch on all expenditure.

Questions of clarification mostly concerned budget line 10 “ Development of Lake Management Body and New Project” where participants wanted to understand how the balance of \$87,000 was to be used.

Tanzania said it was concerned about the majority share in the budget allocated to international staff and travel. They stated that this was an indication that the project had problems of involving nationals in some of the project components and a situation they would not like to see in the continuation of the project. They requested the project management not to reallocate funds set aside for national and regional activities so as to allow national consultation on issues such as SAP, special studies, the legal convention and most importantly the preparation of the next phase.

Zambia stated that national expert's involvement is very crucial and if Tanzania's proposal is carried out than Zambia has the existing mechanisms that could be used in the next steps of the project. They further suggested that these funds be dispersed through UNDP country offices.

Burundi added that these funds should be properly managed and if possible increased.

DRC supported the statements of the previous delegates and added that active participation of national experts was essential.

Concerning budget line 10, the Project Co-ordinator explained that the amounts indicated here were now to be retained by UNOPS (as mentioned under agenda item 7) for the development of the new project, and that it was not yet allocated to any specific activities. It was expected that GEF would be able to say what such activities might comprise after the forthcoming meeting to review GEF projects on Lakes, Tanganyika, Malawi and Victoria, planned to take place in January 2000.

With regard to monies allocated to national project co-ordination activities Tanzania suggested that economies should not be sought in these allocations as suggested by Mr Silverside. In response, Dr. Menz suggested that if these quite large sums were to be left intact it would be wise for him to discuss with the National Co-ordinators regarding the most effective way of utilising the funds. He explained that the level of expected consultations and output within countries as indicated in the TORs of National Co-ordinators, their assistants and the National Working Groups had not been as good as might be expected and that it would be beneficial to try and improve this over the final phase of the project to ensure value for money.

As to the concerns of the relative size of international staff budget versus national budgets, Dr Menz noted that this was always a concern and stressed that for the future it would be important for the countries to examine in detail project budgets such that the origins of such apparent imbalances were clear at the onset.

4.10 *Item no 10: the Strategic Action Programme Status*

The SAP facilitator, Mr Nicholas Hodgson went over some of the background and described the current status and the proposed future activities. He commented on different aspects of the SAP, namely: the Project objectives, cornerstones of the SAP (TDA, SAP, and Legal Convention), the seven steps in developing the SAP, the Justification (shared resources), the proposed Lake Management Authority, the Prioritised Programme of Actions, and the next steps.

Participants congratulated the presenter for his important contributions. The importance of using national expertise in the development of the SAP was reiterated by the delegations. The Zambian delegation stated concern on the lack of emphasis on socio-economics. Tanzania commented that the SAP development was one of the activities that was highly participatory in nature.

In response, the presenter thanked Tanzania for encouraging the PCU's participatory attempts. He then addressed the concerns of Zambia, to which he said it was true that socio-economics is not highlighted because it was felt that it should not be separately mentioned, as socio-economics is fundamental to every activity. He said this could be discussed further at the forthcoming SAP drafting meeting in January 2000.

4.11 *Item 11: The future of the Convention*

Mr Schuetz-Mueller of UNOPS presented this topic. He noted the importance of the triangular relationship between the three key project documents, namely the SAP, TDA and Convention.

He explained that UNOPS had, in May 1999, sent the second draft of the Convention to Mr. Timoshenko, the head of the International Water's treaties department at UNEP, the eventual custodians of the Convention, for their comments. This was important as very few treaties have been concluded except the Black Sea & Danube River basin Convention, a UNDP/GEF project implemented by UNOPS. UNEP had commented that the Convention was a very good document and had offered some suggestions that have been incorporated at the last drafting workshop.

Regarding the future process he said that it was hoped that it would soon reach the stage where the document could at least be initialled by the parties, and although this may look like a minor step it would in fact have far reaching impact for future GEF support as they will see it as a cornerstone of countries commitment to the process.

He clarified that initialling does not mean that the convention has been ratified, as ratification is a complex process that in the case of the Danube River Convention, for example, took 4 years. He added that normally, it is the case that where two thirds of the countries have once ratified and deposited the Convention with the UNEP, the convention becomes a real international treaty and hence part of domestic law. In the case of LTBP, this will happen after 3 of the 4 riparian countries have ratified the Convention, probably several years down the road. He stressed that the Convention, like the SAP is a living document and that in common with standard international

practice, protocols could be added to initiate certain concrete actions. He cited the example of the Vienna Convention, on the Ozone layer, now better known as the Montreal Protocol. People talking about the protection of the Ozone layer generally referred to the Montreal Protocol because this protocol set into motion the mechanism which allowed funds to be donated by the donor countries and allowed developing countries to receive financial and technical assistance. The Convention is thus a framework document which shows the will and intention of the participating countries and is seen by the GEF as probably the most serious manifestation of their commitment to the protection of Lake Tanganyika.

He went on to say that at the last Convention drafting workshop, he understood that it had been decided not to allow for the possible future inclusion of Rwanda in the Convention. He regretted this, drawing attention to the fact that all the good intentions of the four riparian states would go to waste if Rwanda did not follow good practices and polluted the Ruzizi river that flows from Rwandan territory into lake Tanganyika. He felt it would be wise to leave the door open for eventual inclusion of all basin states, as not only would this have benefits from a purely practical point of view but it could also benefit from a funding aspect.

He informed the Committee that in line with what had been promised at the last meeting of the Steering Committee, UNOPS had sent project documents to UNDP in Rwanda and asked them to seek an indication of interest from the Government of Rwanda, in order to sensitise them to the project and its objectives. To date no response had been received.

In their responses all delegations firmly supported the development of the Convention, noting that it would be a unique instrument for the management of Lake Tanganyika and something that no other project on the lake had so far attempted. Delegates noted that in some countries there was still much to be done in terms of consultation at different departments and levels of government, and recommended that funds be made available for further development of the convention. They were however committed to the process.

Dr Menz encouraged the country delegations to take it upon themselves to ensure proper circulation and comment on the current draft of the legal Convention as this would greatly aid the process and be a further indication of commitment.

Concerning the inclusion of Rwanda in these processes, all delegations declared that it had not been the intention to exclude the possibility that Rwanda may become a signatory at some future date; they had merely felt that, in the absence of any representation from Rwanda during the drafting process it would not be correct to name that country specifically. The general consensus was that the Convention should be flexible enough to allow for the inclusion of "other states" in the future.

4.12 Item no 12: Overview of GEF Strategy for additional project phase

Mr Schuetz-Muller from UNOPS presented this item on behalf of GEF who, he explained, regrettably had not been able to participate owing to conflicting commitments. Mr Schuetz-Muller, had, however, been well briefed by Mr David Laroche of GEF.

He regretted that in terms of concrete documents related to moving toward a new phase, not as much had been done as had been hoped after the TPR meeting in May 1999. Nevertheless, he said he was pleased to report that the current likelihood for further GEF intervention into Lake Tanganyika was excellent. This, he explained was due primarily to two reasons, first, Lake Tanganyika contains an incredible and important array of biodiversity in an International water environment which cannot be ignored by GEF or the International community and second, the GEF has a very specific programmatic approach in areas which it decides to go into, and once GEF involves itself in a particular area, it is very unlikely that it would do a one shot project and leave.

Referring to the STAP (Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel for GEF) meeting to be held in January 2000 he said this would be a unique opportunity for this project to present itself. He said the Lake Tanganyika project should be presented by Dr. Menz and local scientists who had contributed to the project and thus demonstrate that local capacity had been utilised. It is expected that the results of this meeting will stimulate the interest of GEF to further commitment of funding Rift lakes projects, in particular LTBP, which seems to have achieved basically everything it wanted to achieve. This is provided it keeps to the workplan which would provide by the end of this project the 3 key documents – SAP, TDA and Convention - that are considered crucial indicators of national commitment.

Notwithstanding the importance of the STAP meeting he explained that he had insisted that GEF not wait until the meeting had concluded before beginning the process of outlining a concept for the next phase. GEF in turn had promised that once Mr David Laroche had received the draft Convention, preliminary TDA and outline SAP he would, based on his knowledge of GEF International waters project requirements, start the process. In discussing this Mr Laroche had emphasised that there were some important criteria that GEF would use when assessing these documents especially the SAP. GEF would be looking for evidence that the countries have made concrete commitment to continue the work this pilot phase had started. This should include committing some financial resources, no matter how modest at this stage to the lake management body/Secretariat and showing evidence that the countries will try and seek co-financing (bilateral), for lake basin management interventions. He also indicated that the SAP will need to be precise in identification of further needs of the lake basin- both strategic and at the technical level. The SAP will also need to identify specific national agencies that will assume responsibility for the concrete actions that have been identified as being necessary within the participating countries. The SAP should also have an agreed mechanism for the

operation of an interim secretariat until the convention is ratified and there is a formal international body in force.

Mr Schuetz-Muller explained that all remaining project funds in 2000 are to be utilised for the development of the new phase of the project. He went on to stress that it was intended that the process be fully participatory at every stage. He noted however that the lack of participation in the early stages of some of the GEF pilot phase projects such as this and the Danube, was due to lack of interest at the time, by the countries involved, and it was not until later, that countries began to take a real interest in these projects and show a desire to be fully involved.

He explained that in addition to using funds from this project to develop a new project there was also the possibility of obtaining what is known in GEF as Project Development Funds (PDF) of around 200,000 to 300,000 USD as seeding money for further development of a full project and to fund a bridging period between the first and second phases.

He also pointed out that when NRI stops working on LTBP at the end of July 2000, it does not mean that everything else has to stop. As far as UNOPS is concerned, he said, it will still be in charge of executing the project and if there are funds available, which he hoped there would be, either from this project or from an interim funding mechanism, UNOPS will continue to see that the momentum which has been developed is kept up into the next phase.

Mr Schuetz-Muller ended by expressing his hope that by the next SCM there should be available a PDF request for a next phase.

In response all delegations thanked UNOPS for the information they had given noting that it had put many of their concerns to rest especially with regard to national scientists and decision makers being fully involved from the start in the formulation of the next phase project.

With regard to the STAP meeting delegates recommended that National Co-ordinators should participate in addition to national scientists.

With regard to national participation in general the project co-ordinator commented that the matter had been mentioned and brought forth on many occasions during this and previous meetings. He said that he believed the project had endeavoured to have as much participation as possible, and although this might not always have been entirely successful for a number of reasons, the intent had always been there. He stressed however, that the countries also had obligations and that in particular it was important to ensure consistent participation of appropriate individuals in important meetings and processes. He explained that quite often delegations differ quite markedly from one meeting to the next with some individuals being present with no background on the topic at hand and seemingly there only for their own edification, and capacity building. He requested that once a process of development of whatever

activity is agreed, it is essential that a consistent and appropriate level of participation be provided by the countries.

4.13 Item 13: Date and venue of next SCM and other regional meetings in 2000.

The Project Co-ordinator went through the proposed schedule of upcoming regional meetings and together with the participants, they agreed on the following venues and dates for the various meetings:

- SAP Workshop : Arusha Jan 4 - Jan 7
- Regional TDA : Lusaka Mar 27 - Mar 30
- Regional SCM 6 : Lusaka Mar 31 - April 1
- Regional SAP : Arusha May 2 - May 5
- State of the Lake
Conference : Arusha July 3 - July 4
- Final TPR : Arusha July 5

4.14 Item 14: AOB

Mr Roger Kanyaru from Burundi told the meeting that he was currently the regional co-ordinator for a sister project - LTR, comprising the same four countries, and informed the meeting that they had created a website, and produced a CD that will be distributed free of charge. He added that LTR has now reached the executing stage and is about to evaluate national execution, and that LTBP should take inspiration from LTR in evaluating national expertise.

Another participant asked details about participation in the upcoming STAP meeting in Malawi, the Project Co-ordinator responded that he was still waiting for the details.

A member from Burundi enquired about the work that had been requested from FAO related to the Circulation Model on Lake Tanganyika and in response was told that the work had been completed and that copies of the report were available from the Bujumbura office.

5. Closure

The chairman officially closed the meeting at 12:30 on 3 December 1999, after having expressed his thanks to all participants for their participation and enthusiasm. Participants also congratulated the chairman for having successfully conducted the meeting.

ANNEX 1:

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BURUNDI

Mr Boniface Nyakageni	Coordonateur National, Directeur General INECN
Mr Roger Kanyaru	Directeur, Dept des Eaux, Peche et Pisciculture
Mr Stany Nsabimana	Professeur de Geographie, Universite du Burundi
Mr Gaspard Ntakimazi	Professeur de Biologie, Universite du Burundi

DR CONGO

Mr Mbusu Ngamani	Secetaire General, Ministere de l'Environnement
Mr Mady Amule	Coordonateur National, Directeur, Min. de l'Env.
Mr Nshombo Mudherwa	Directeur General du CRH-UVIRA

TANZANIA

Mr Rawson Yonazi	National Coordinator (Assistant Director - DoF)
Ms Hawa Msham	Assistant National Coordinator
Ms Catherine Msigwa	Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division

ZAMBIA

Mr George Munshimbwe Chitalu	Assistant National Coordinator, ECZ/LTBP
Mr Aswell Bikoko Chisanga	Legal Counsel - Environmental Council of Zambia
Ms Maureen Chungu Nsomi	Head, Water Resources Research Unit, National Institute for Scientific and Industrial Research.
Mr Mazingaliwa	Senior Aquaculture Research Officer, Department of Fisheries

UNDP

Mr Louis Nduwimana	Environmental Programme Officer, Burundi
Mr Silvester Sisila	Assistant Res Rep, Environment and Natural Resources, Tanzania
Ms Debra Kahatano	Programme Officer, Environment/GEF, Tanzania

UNOPS

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

NRI

Mr Nicholas Hodgson	SAP Coordinator
Mr David Silverside	Project Finance Manager

PCU

Dr Andrew Menz	Project Coordinator
Dr Kelly West	Scientific Liaison Officer
Mr Pierre Claver Nzimpora	Rapporteur
Ms Maria Hiza	Meeting Secretary/Administration

ANNEX 2.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Bound Herewith:

1. SCM5/1 List of documents
2. SCM5/2 Schedule
3. SCM5/3 Provisional agenda
4. SCM5/4 Minutes of Fourth meeting of Regional Steering Committee*
5. SCM5/5 Summary of Progress on Principle Resolutions of SCM4
6. SCM5/6 Project Progress report
7. SCM5/7 Overall Budgetary Allocation
8. SCM5/8 Project Budget and Workplan to July 31, 2000
9. SCM5/9 Proposed Regional Meeting's Outline
10. SCM5/10 List of participants
11. SCM5/11 Travel Itineraries
12. SCM5/12 GEF (?)

Reference Documents

13. Strategic Action Plan outline
14. Convention*
15. Text of Slides presented by Project Co-ordinator

Additional Separate Documents

16. Second Tripartite Review Minutes
17. Third edition of Project News Letter*
18. Updated Project Equipment Inventory

*** These documents provided as separate documents in your folder.**