

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW (PIR) 1999

UNDP/GEF PIR Report '99

For all regular UNDP/GEF projects that have been under implementation for over 1 (one) year, as of June 30, 1999 (excluding enabling and pre-investment activities such as PPAs, PRIFs, and EAs).

1 Basic Project Data

1.1 Identifiers

Official Title:	Pollution Control and Other Measures to Protect Biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika
UNDP Project Number:	RAF92G32
Bureau:	RBA
Country/Host:	TANZANIA
Focal Area:	BIODIVERSITY/INTERNATIONAL WATERS
Operational Program:	Waterbody
Date of entry in WP (MM/DD/YY):	12/1/91
ProDoc Signature date (MM/DD/YY):	February 1995
Duration (months):	60

1.2 Brief Project Description

Lake Tanganyika is one of the world's great lakes and it has an important role in the economies of Burundi, Tanzania, Democratic Republic of Congo and Zambia. It possesses perhaps the highest biodiversity of any lake on earth. The lake is very vulnerable to pollution because of its natural characteristics and there are presently few efforts to conserve its biodiversity. The most immediate threats to the lake environment and biota are pollution from excess loads of sediment and nutrients caused by erosion in the watershed, industrial and urban pollution including boat discharges, and intensive fishing with inappropriate methods. These problems and their effects are increasing, and others such as oil exploration and transportation on the lake cause concern. Immediate attention is required to assess and control pollution and protect biodiversity. The 5-year project aims to improve understanding of the ecosystem function and effects of stresses on the lake system; to take action on all other measures necessary to maintain the health and biodiversity of the ecosystem; and to coordinate the efforts of the four countries to control pollution and to prevent the loss of the exceptional diversity of Lake Tanganyika. This will be done by establishing a regional framework for cooperation, including endeavours to harmonize legislation; investigating pollution including sources, effects and control; and investigating biodiversity and conservation measures leading to the setting up of protected areas as underwater parks. Activities will closely involve government environmental ministries and agencies, and sectoral departments; a major objective is to strengthen national capabilities and community participation. The project will be supported by international and local staff and contractors. NGOs will be involved particularly through community education and conservation, and the private sector through promotion of tourism and the control of industrial pollution. Recommendations will be made regarding the establishment of a lake management body to continue the work of the project beyond July 2000.

1.3 Executing Agency Type: UN Agency
Name: United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)

1.4 National Implementing Agencies
(note: lead coordination agencies only listed here- full list in attached sheet)
Burundi: Institut National pour l'Environnement et Conservation de la Nature
D. R. Congo: Ministrie de l'Environnement et Conservation de la Nature
Tanzania: Vice President's Office, Division of Environment
Zambia: Environmental Council of Zambia

1.5 Contacts

Burundi

Resident Representative: Madame Kathleen A Carvero-Kristofferson
Country Office Focal Point: Mr Louis.Nduwimana
National Project Coordinator: M. Jean Berchmans Manirakiza, Directeur General, L'INECN

DR Congo

Resident Representative: Monsieur Aliou M. Diallo
Country Office Focal Point: Mr Mathieu Ciowela
National Project Coordinator: Mr Pascal Mady Amule, Coordinateur National, Directeur- Ministere de l'Environnement

Tanzania

Resident Representative: Mrs Sally Fegan-Wyles
Country Office Focal Point: Mr Sylvester Sisila
National Project Coordinator: Mr Rawson Yonazi National Co-ordinator (Principle Environment Officer DoE)

Zambia

Resident Representative: Mr Quazi M.A. Malek
Country Office Focal Point: Mr Amos Muchanga
National Project Coordinator: National Co-ordinator (Director ECZ)

Project Coordination

Regional Project Coordinator: Dr Andrew Menz
Scientific Liaison Officer: Dr Kelly West

1.6 Basic Financial Data

Funding Source	Institution Name	Acronym (if any)	Amount \$
GEF funding:			\$10,000,000.00
Co-financing:			
UNDP (TRAC):			
UN Agency:			
Multilateral Donors			
Others (Please specify using the list of funding sources provided in the instruction sheet):			
Total Funding for Co-financing:			\$0.00
Total Funding for project:			\$10,000,000.00
Associated Project Funding:			

2 Project Performance

2.1 Development Objective: Project Impact (progress towards achievement of development objective)

Please see instruction document for details on how to fill out this section.

Development Objective	Indicator(s) (incl. target value)	Actual level achieved	Source of Verification	1998 Rating	1999 Rating ¹
The ultimate objective of the project is to demonstrate an effective regional approach to control pollution and to prevent the loss of the exceptional diversity of Lake Tanganyika's international waters. For this purpose, the development objective which has to be met is the creation of the capacity in the four participating countries to manage the lake on a regional basis as a sound and sustainable environment.	<i>There are no indicators given in original prodoc.</i>			U	S

¹ Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see instruction sheet for further explanations.

2.2 Assumptions Related to the Achievement of the Development Objective:

Please list the major assumptions and state the probability that the assumption will not continue to hold in a parenthesis at the end: high (H), substantial (S), modest (M), low (L).

NO	DETAIL	HIGH	MODEST	LOW
Ass 1	Govt support continues and commitment demonstrated		X	
Ass 2	Security situation improves substantially in DRC and Burundi	X		
Ass 3	Communities willing to participate communally			X
Ass 4	Donor interest maintained to support SAP management body		X	
Ass 5	Lake Management Body in place before project ends	X		
Ass 6	Appropriate staff maintained in place by implementing agencies	X		
Ass 7	SAP actively supported by all stakeholders		X	
Ass 8	Alternatives to damaging practices are found which are acceptable		X	
Ass 9	Early acceptance and signing of Convention		X	

If an assessment of the achievement of the development objective (and thus the impact of the project) is not possible, please briefly explain why:

2.3 Descriptive Assessment of Project Impact (achievement of development objective)

In the light of (a) the level of indicator achievement, (b) rating assigned and (c) assumptions listed in section 2.1 and 2.2, please provide a brief narrative assessment of the progress made towards the achievement of the development objective (e.g. project impact).

Please indicate also how the project activities contributed to the respective GEF operational programme (for example, conservation and sustainable use of mountain ecosystems, promoting the adoption of renewable energy, etc.).

If there has been a change in ratings since 1998 please briefly discuss the reasons.

2.4 Immediate Objectives: Implementation Progress

Please see instruction document for details on how to fill out this section.

	Immediate Objective	Indicator(s) (incl. target value)	Actual level achieved	Change during FY 99	Source of Verification	1998 Rating	1999 Rating
1.	Establish a regional long-term management program for pollution control, conservation and maintenance of biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika.	<p>1.1 When a Management Plan (the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Action Programme) is accepted by all riparian states, is supported by appropriate legislation and a Regional Management Committee and supporting technical committees are formally constituted and supported by legislation;</p> <p>1.2 When nationally defined action programs contained within the management plan are funded and operational.</p>	<p>1.1 Through a process of broad stakeholder consultation an agreed framework for a SAP has been established.</p> <p>1.2 A preliminary Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis has been formulated by Technical, Advisory and SAP planning Committees and endorsed by the Regional Steering Committee.</p> <p>1.3 Currently all committees are essentially within and maintained by the project, country commitment and/or provision of funding for permanent structure has yet to be obtained.</p>	Thanks to clear formalization of intended process, and broad stakeholder involvement, much more rapid progress than hitherto	SAP/TDA workshop reports; Minutes of 2 nd , 3 rd and 4 th Regional Steering Committee Meetings	S	S

			1.4 As part of the development of the TDA and SAP preliminary national action programmes have been developed. None outside existing project activities is funded or operational.				
2.	Formulation of a regional legal framework for cooperative management of the lake environment.	2.1 When a draft regional agreement for the co-operative management of the Lake (“the Agreement”) has been drafted and approved by representatives from each of the countries. 2.2 When the Agreement has been formally signed by all, or the majority, of the countries.	Contents of a legal Convention have been agreed upon and the 1 st draft due August 1999. Dependant on finalization of Convention		Legal workshop reports, Minutes of Regional Steering Committee meetings.	S	S
3.	Establish a programme of environmental education and training for Lake Tanganyika and its basin.	3.1 When national environment education programmes involving NGOs and Government agencies are underway which address the specific issues related to the lake. 3.2 When the effects of such programmes can be seen in	3.1 Following false starts and setbacks with staffing, coordinated programmes are now getting underway. EE and training officers are assigned in all countries and joint workplans have been developed.		Reports from Training and EE workshops	U	U

		<p>terms of increased awareness at all levels, including policy level, and changes brought about in activities identified as deleterious to the well-being of the lake.</p> <p>3.3 When a cadre of trained environmental scientists and technicians are available to provide governmental institutions and the Regional Lake Basin Management Committee with the information and recommendations required to take rational management decisions.</p>	<p>3.2 Some courses have been run but it is too early to assess the results</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

4.	Establish tested mechanisms for regional coordination in conservation management of the Lake Tanganyika basin.	<p>4.1 When an operational Lake Tanganyika Basin Management Committee, as the principal body for regional co-ordination in policy management, exists that has demonstrated its ability to tackle the issues effectively by engendering appropriate action through a strategic planning process.</p> <p>4.2 When regular meetings of technical working groups take place within an overall monitoring and management structure with a clear mandate and the necessary resources to collect and analyse data from monitoring programs and formulate recommendations for mitigation of threats to the lake's biodiversity.</p> <p>4.3 When a regional information exchange network exists to support national activities.</p>	<p>4.1 Precursor to this is the project's Regional Steering Committee that has effectively directed the project. There is currently no agreed structure to the final body.</p> <p>4.2 The technical working groups have been established under technical special studies. Future requirements re type, structure and number not yet determined. Will be part of SAP. Expected by May 2000.</p> <p>4.3 a) Project website developed also distributed on CD. Provides all information on project activities and reports.</p>		Project Progress Reports. Minutes of Steering Committee Meetings.	S	S
----	--	--	--	--	---	---	---

			4.3 b) GIS developed, soon to be placed in region will provide regionally accessible repository of information required for lake management.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5.	In order to produce a full Strategic Plan for long-term application, some specific studies need to be undertaken. These special studies will also add to the understanding of the lake as a whole and in some cases provide the baseline and framework for long-term research and monitoring programmes.	<p>5.1 Successful completion of the various special studies with published results and recommendations. These will identify trends in current and potential threats to the lake, make recommendations for mitigation and cost effective monitoring.</p> <p>5.2 Successful integration of monitoring and scientific research programmes proposals into a strategic planning process supported by the necessary institutional mechanisms.</p>	<p>Special studies on track to be fully completed by May 2000.</p> <p>Special studies leaders are scheduled to report in November 1999 as contribution to the draft TDA and SAP documents</p>		Special study progress reports	S	S
6.	The implementation and sustainability of the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Plan and incorporated environmental management proposals.	<p>6.1 When underwater conservation areas are established in all four countries with operational management plans;</p> <p>6.2 When long term research and monitoring programs are operational with funding for the time horizon of the Strategic Plan and which include the participation of all stakeholder groups;</p> <p>6.3 When operational</p>	<p><i>Indicators re conservation areas no longer valid. Others refer to implementation of Strategic action Programme, this will not be achieved within the current project period.</i></p> <p>.</p>				

		management interventions are funded that are fully effective in identifying and responding to environmental threats to the lake and the needs of the communities affected.					
Project as a whole:						S	

2.5 Assumptions Related to the Achievement of Each Immediate Objective:

Please list the major assumptions for each Immediate Objective and state the probability that the assumption will not continue to hold in a parenthesis at the end: high (H), substantial (S), modest (M), low (L).

Immediate Objective Number	Assumptions
1 & 6	Improved security situation in DRC and Burundi (M) Govt support and commitment continues (M) Community support maintained (M) Donor support maintained (M) Regional acceptance of legal convention (M)
2	Regional acceptance of legal convention (M-S)
3	Govt support and commitment continues (M) Community support maintained (M) Donor support maintained (M)
4	All governments agree and support (M) Govt institutions implement effectively (M-S) Donor support identified (M)
5	Work programmes and trained staff maintained by implementing institution (S)

2.6 Descriptive Assessment of Implementation Progress and Achievement Ratings

In the light of (a) the level of indicator achievement, (b) ratings assigned and (c) assumptions listed in sections 2.4 and 2.5, please provide a brief narrative assessment of project progress in implementation and risks associated with the potential failure of assumptions. Please refer in detail to the progress achieved in the last fiscal year (July '98 – June '99) and the problems encountered in this period.

Please include in your discussion any significant policy, institutional, scientific and technical issues that have arisen during project implementation, including changes in project assumptions.

If there has been a change in ratings since 1998 please briefly discuss the reasons.

The project was prepared under Phase 1 of the GEF. The project goal and objectives were established and agreed under the Phase 1 conditions. As a result the phrasing of objectives and identification of supporting indicators is not as clear as would be expected under current GEF guidelines. This is particularly the case with establishing value ratings.

Nevertheless in general terms the rate of project progress and achievement has increased markedly over the last year in the following areas:

- Development of the Strategic Action Programme with the formulation of the preliminary Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis

- Sediment, biodiversity, pollution and fishing practices special studies nearing completion

- A sound training strategy has now been established and implementation is underway. Socio-economics and environmental education are now considerably improved.

The mid-term evaluation exercise, that included a Tripartite review, raised a number of important issues particularly with regard to original project design, the focus of the project and its current dual identity (Biodiversity and International waters) under current GEF programmes. The MTE suggestion that focus should make a radical shift to integrated water resource management was considered inadvisable owing, *inter alia*, to the particular nature of the Lake Tanganyika water body and the currently advanced stage of project implementation. The issue of what happens next also arose and is, of course, crucial as it has always been acknowledged that this project could only be first step in a long chain of interventions. While it was made clear by UNOPS that some additional funds remained from the original total allocation and would be made available to complete its work, it was noted that this would result in only a short extension to the current time frame of the project. The review asked UNOPS and NRI to draw up a final workplan and budget to take the project to the end of its current phase and make provision for a strategy to secure funds for a second project to build on the current one.

Inadequate or unsuitable staffing in implementing institutions continues to be a significant constraint on efficient project implementation esp vis-a-vis technical studies and capacity building. Appeals to institutions are received with sympathy but little effective action owing to internal constraints.

Security in eastern DR Congo continues to be of great concern not only because of its obvious effect of dramatically limiting progress in DRC, (and to a lesser extent in Burundi owing to its security problems) but also because the project has received no official guide lines from UNDP concerning the operations it is able to undertake there. Currently the decision of whether or not to operate in this war zone at any particular time rests with project personnel alone; clearly a highly undesirable situation.

2.7 Project Rating

For all projects rated “unsatisfactory” on either measure (impact or implementation progress), and for projects where ratings have declined since 1998, please include here a description of actions being taken to address implementation problems.

Coordinated programmes for environmental education and training are now underway. EE and training officers are assigned in all countries and joint workplans developed. Several training courses have been run, including a Training of Trainers course. It is expected that the programme will fulfil the major part of the implementation plan

2.8 Lessons Learned/Good Practice

Please describe briefly the “lessons learned” and examples of good practice that have resulted from project implementation to date.

The Mid-Term Evaluation made special mention of the 'lessons learned' to which a coordinated response was made in April 1999. Reviewers of this document are invited to consult these two documents.

The establishment of the <http://www.ltbp.org> web-site for the collection of scientific and other data, project activities and project internal reports is seen as an example of good practice. Not only are data stored but they are freely available to the public generally and project staff in detail.

2.9 Land Degradation Issues

2.9.1 *Does the project or components of the project address land degradation¹ issues, even if it is not classified as such? (see definition in footnote).*

YES NO

If your answer is YES, please answer the following questions:

¹ Land degradation issues include = soil erosion by wind and/or water; soil denudation (e.g. through over-cultivation, mining and other industrial use); chemical pollution of soils (fertilizers, salinization); organic pollution of soils; vegetation degradation of all strata including woody, herbaceous and micro-organism (in terms of vegetation productivity, composition and density); habitat conversion/loss (condition, diversity); loss of soil organic matter; aquifer degradation (lowering of water table, pollution); riparian degradation (river bed erosion, sedimentation, chemical and waste pollution, aquatic weeds); coastal zone degradation (pollution, over-use, erosion of coastal strip, sedimentation/pollution of in-shore reef and shellfish beds, mangrove destruction); mountain zone soil stability; fuelwood crisis; uncontrolled bush/forest fires; overgrazing; land use changes; sedentarization and urbanization; drought and desiccation.

2.9.2 Activities/Outputs that Address Land Degradation Issues: Performance and Impact in Reducing Land Degradation and Enhancing Sustainable Use

Activity/Output	Quantitative assessment of results achieved	Qualitative assessment of results achieved
Special study on sediment discharge into Lake Tanganyika and its consequences	Identification of key source areas and key degrading activities. Quantitative assessment of changing rates of erosion from selected catchments	Identification of possible priority management interventions to counteract degradation and downstream impact

2.9.3 Activities/Outputs that Address Land Degradation Issues: Lessons Learnt and Impact on Focal Areas and Other Conventions.

In light of the performance of land degradation activities, please provide a brief narrative assessment of :

- a) *lessons learnt, and risks associated with, land degradation Activities/Outputs;*
- b) *positive or negative impact of land degradation activities on achieving the objectives of the Focal Area(s) of the project;*
- c) *the impact of other project activities on land degradation issues: do these activities directly or indirectly aggravate or resolve land degradation;*
- d) *linkages, if any, between the project's land degradation activities and the Host Country's objectives concerning the Convention to Combat Desertification.*

The project aims to quantify current and historical rates of sedimentation and the impacts of this on habitat and other limnological features of the lake in order to assess its impact on biodiversity.

Project activities have no direct bearing on land degradation but will provide data on changing rates of erosion/sedimentation (five countries) including assessment of the key factors of slope/vegetation/rainfall affecting erosion rates.

2.9.4 Please specify the amounts and sources allocated to address land degradation issues. Please use the same categories of activities/outputs as in question 2.5.1 above.

Activity/Output	GEF Resources	Government In-kind	Government In-cash	Other Co-financing (and indicate source)
Special study on sediment discharge into Lake Tanganyika and its consequences	US\$602,752	Support from various government departments in four riparian countries	None	

3. NGO Involvement

Please enter the following information into the table below for each NGO involved in the project:

- Full Name:** Please list the full name of the NGO.
Acronym: The official initials of the NGO's name.
Type: IGO: international NGO; NGO: national NGO; CBO: community based organization or local NGO, NAI: national academic and training institutes; and IAI: international academic and training institutes (which are not governmental or quasi-governmental institutions). Do NOT include private sector profit-making entities.
Project Stage: Please indicate where the NGO involvement took place, e.g. PDF A or PDF B or FULL project stage.
Role: Role of the NGO: Please enter one of the following roles: (a) non-compensated policy or advisory role (e.g. service on advisory or steering committee), (b) provider of project services (in project identification, design, implementation or monitoring and evaluation).
Activity: Brief description of services provided by NGO.
\$ Value: \$ value of contracted project services assigned to NGO (if applicable).

Full Name (Do not give acronym only!)	Acronym	Type	Project Stage	Role	Activity	\$ Value of contracted services
Lake Tanganyika Fisheries Research Project	FAO/FI NNIDA	IAI				
Organisation pour la Défense de l'Environnement au Burundi)	ODEB	NGO				
Mouvement des Ecologistes de Bukavu	MEB	NGO				
Nouvelles options de Pêche pour le lac Tanganyika	NOPTA	NGO				
Centre d'Etude et de promotion pour les Actions de Dev. Communautaire	CEPAC	NAI				
SOCODEFI		??				
Comite d'Action pour le Developpement Integral	CADIC	??				
lake Tanganyika Catchment	TACAR	NGO				

Reforestation and Education	E					
Wildlife conservation society of Tanzania	WCST	NGO				
Diocese of Western Tanganyika	CARITAS	CBO				
Zambian Ornithological Society	ZOS	NGO				
The World Conservation Union	IUCN	IGO				
World Wildlife Fund	WWF	IGO				

Please indicate factors that have facilitated or contributed to NGO involvement:

As part of the development of the regional SAP a series of national preparatory meetings have been held with the full participation of national NGOs.

Please indicate factors that have constrained NGO involvement:

Much of project has strong technical/scientific bias for which NGOs are not usually appropriate. Project components that are likely to make more use of NGO involvement will be the Environmental Education/Socio-economic components once mitigation actions are agreed upon as part of the SAP process, and parts of the training strategy.

4. Leveraging Additional Resources and Actions

4.1 Financial Leveraging

Apart from the co-financing contributions reflected in the budget, how has the project mobilized additional financial resources for either addressing global environmental concerns or financing baseline activities during implementation? Please indicate the amounts and sources of leveraged resources.

UNICEF US\$ 22,922

Several free or subsidized consultancies, particularly with the University of Brussels

4.2 Actions “Leveraged”

4.2.1 *How has the project contributed to bring about changes in Implementing Agency, other donor, or country strategies – or private business practices – to give stronger emphasis to global environmental issues? This refers also to activities that are taking place “around the project” without being part of the project itself but which are stimulated or initiated by the project.*

UNICEF has funded a separate study of the Tanzanian Electricity Supply Company (TANESCO) and the Water Supply Company, Kigoma. A description will be given of the possible significant polluters around Kigoma that may effect surface water quality. Prevention measures will be described

Several joint research projects have been set up between the Universities of Brussels and Burundi

4.2.2 *How has the project contributed to bringing about policy or legislation changes?*

Legislation concerning a convention for the management and protection of the lake and the establishment of the Lake Management body is in draft. This is a product of meetings of senior legal representatives of the riparian states

4.2.3 *Have there been any interactions/synergies with similar projects in the country/region during project preparation and/or implementation?*

Close liaison with the Lake Tanganyika Fisheries Research Project LTR has been maintained throughout the project, particularly in the last year. Progress has been made with the establishment of joint lake management priorities

5. Financial Information

5.1 **Financial Status** *(Please enter information if available in Country Office, otherwise this section will be filled out in HQ)*

Planned disbursements (\$millions) 6.6 as of 6/30/99

Actual disbursements (\$millions) 6.3 as of 6/30/99

Timing of disbursement (percentage of planned vs actual expenditures): 82%

Date/Period of First Disbursement: December 1995 (Invoice No 1 to UNOPS) to cover period from 1 August 1995

5.2 Procurement Data

*Please report the US\$ value of UNDP/GEF Payments to Supplying Countries for Procurement for all countries. Please enter Project **expenditure** from project start up until June 30, 1999 into the matrix against the country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project.*

Supplying Country	Personnel	Sub-contracts	Equipment	Training	Total

Please calculate the following ratio:

Procurement from donor countries as a % of total project expenditure from project start up to June 30, 1999:

6. Monitoring and Evaluation

6.1 *Please describe briefly the Monitoring and Evaluation procedures and tools in place.*

- Quarterly progress reports, No 13 available
- Progress review at National working group meetings
- Progress review at Regional Steering Committee Meetings Minutes of No 4 available
- Tripartite reviews, Minutes of No 2 available
- Mid-term evaluation/review - expected in November 1998, arrival April 1999.

6.2 *Please indicate dates for Tripartite meetings held in the past and/or scheduled for the future.*

First January 1998
Second May 1999

6.3 *What steps have been taken to put in place a monitoring system that extends beyond the term of the project to monitor impact?*

None.

6.4 *Reports:*

Please list any mid-term or final evaluation report, annual programme/project report (APR), completion report, etc. available for further reference and indicate date of final draft or publication date. Please also list any ongoing or planned evaluation through June 2000.

- Project Performance Evaluation Report. October 1997
- Report of Tripartite Review Meeting, Lusaka, Zambia, 19-20 January 1998
- Minutes of Tripartite Review Meeting, 25-27 May 1999

Your Opinion:

Please make any comments you might have on the PIR questionnaire, the PIR process or other PIR related matters. Your comments will help us to improve the PIR process for the next year.