



**UNEP**

**United Nations  
Environment Programme**



**Global Environment  
Facility**

## **UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB PROJECT**

***ADDRESSING LAND BASED ACTIVITIES  
IN THE WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN***



**PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE**

**The Third Regional Meeting**

*Victoria, Seychelles 13<sup>th</sup> March 2007*

First published in Kenya in 2007 By the United Nations Environment Programme.

Copyright © 2007, United Nations Environment Programme

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit purposes without special permission from the copyright holder provided acknowledgement of the source is made. UNEP would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication that uses this publication as a source.

No use of this publication may be made for resale or for any other commercial purpose without prior permission in writing from the United Nations Environment Programme.

UNEP/GEF WIO-LaB Project Management Unit  
United Nations Environment Programme  
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri,  
P.O Box 47074, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254 020 7621248/7621270  
Email: [violab@unep.org](mailto:violab@unep.org)  
Website: <http://www.wiolab.org>

**DISCLAIMER:**

The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of UNEP or the GEF. The designations employed and the presentations do not imply of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the UNEP, or of the GEF, or of any cooperating organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, of its authorities, or of the delineation of its territories or boundaries.

Cover illustration:

**For citation purposes this document may be cited as:**

*UNEP, 2007. Addressing Land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean. Report of the Third Meeting of the Steering Committee. UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/2007*

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The third meeting of the UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee was held in Mahe, Seychelles on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2006. The meeting was officially opened by the Principal Secretary in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Dr. Rolph Payet. The meeting was attended by Government officials from each of the participating countries (the National Focal Points of the Project) as well the representatives of the Implementing Agency, UNEP (i.e. Division of the Global Environment Facility-UNEP/GEF and the Global Programme of Action for the protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment from Land-based Activities-UNEP/GPA), the Executing agencies (Nairobi Convention Secretariat), Non-Governmental Organizations, as well as representative of the UNDP/GEF Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems Programme (ASCLME). The representative of Somalia attended the meeting as an observer.

The main objective of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee was to review the progress made in regard to the implementation of project activities in the year 2006 and to consider and approve the workplan and the budget for the implementation of activities in the year 2007.

Although it was noted that progress in the implementation of project activities in participating countries had been hampered by limited capacity in participating institutions, the Steering Committee was generally satisfied with the progress made in the implementation of project activities in the year 2006. However, it was noted that there was a need to take remedial measures based on the recommendations of Steering Committee and the Mid-Term Review in order to expedite implementation of the project workplan. In particular, it was also noted that it would be important to come up with a deliberate strategy of providing the support requested by the Focal Points in order to expedite the implementation of project activities at the national level in participating countries.

Other issues that were discussed in the meeting focussed on the process for the preparation of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) for the Western Indian Ocean with special focus on Land-based Activities that impact on the coastal and marine environment.

The decisions and recommendations of the third Regional Meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee are presented in the following pages.

## **RESUME ANALYTIQUE**

La Troisième réunion du Comité directeur du Projet WIO-LaB PNUE-FEM s'est tenue le 13 mars 2006 à Mahé aux Seychelles. Elle a été officiellement ouverte par le Dr. Rolph Payet, Secrétaire principal du Ministère de l'Environnement et des Ressources naturelles. Y ont assisté des responsables du gouvernement de chacun des pays participants (les points focaux nationaux du Projet) ; des représentants de l'Agence de mise en œuvre, le PNUE (à savoir la Division du Fonds pour l'environnement mondial - PNUE/FEM et le Programme d'action mondial pour la protection de l'environnement marin contre les activités terrestres - PNUE/PAM) ; les agences d'exécution (le Secrétariat de la Convention de Nairobi) ; des organisations non gouvernementales, ainsi qu'un représentant du Programme pour les grands écosystèmes marins d'Agulhas et de la Somalie (ASCLME). Des représentants de la Somalie ont assisté à la réunion en tant qu'observateurs.

L'objectif majeur de la Troisième réunion du Comité directeur du Projet WIO-LaB était d'évaluer les progrès réalisés au niveau de la mise en œuvre des activités du projet en 2006 ainsi que d'examiner et approuver le plan de travail et le budget pour la mise en œuvre des activités pour l'année 2007.

Bien qu'il ait été noté que l'avancement de la mise en œuvre des activités du projet dans les pays participants a été entravé en raison des capacités limitées des institutions participantes, le Comité directeur était généralement satisfait des progrès réalisés au niveau de la mise en œuvre des activités du projet en 2006. Cependant, il a aussi été noté qu'il faut prendre des mesures de redressement basées sur les recommandations du Comité directeur et sur le Bilan à moyen terme de manière à accélérer la mise en œuvre des composantes du plan de travail du Projet. Plus particulièrement, il a également été noté qu'il serait important d'établir une stratégie relative au soutien requis par les points focaux en vue d'intensifier la mise en œuvre des activités du projet au niveau national dans les pays participants.

Les autres questions abordées lors de la réunions portaient sur le processus de préparation de l'Analyse diagnostique transfrontalière (ADT) pour la région de l'océan Indien occidental, en prêtant une attention particulière aux activités terrestres qui ont un impact néfaste sur l'environnement marin et côtier.

Les décisions et les recommandations de la Troisième réunion du Comité directeur du Projet WIO-LaB sont présentées ci-dessous.

**THE DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE THIRD REGIONAL MEETING OF THE WIO-LAB PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE**

The Third Regional meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee, held in Mahe, Seychelles on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2007, having taken into consideration the progress made in the implementation of the UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project since 2005 and also taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the previous meetings of the Steering Committee held in Tanzania (2005) and Kenya (2006), made the following decisions and recommendations:

1. *Noted* with appreciation the Report on the Status of Implementation of the WIO-LaB Project activities prepared by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit and congratulated the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit and Nairobi Convention Secretariat for the effort put in coordinating the implementation of various project activities in the WIO Region.
2. *Noted* the difficulties experienced in the implementation of some of the Project activities in participating countries as detailed in the presentations made by the National Focal Points in their reports to the Steering Committee and *urged* all institutions involved in the implementation of the WIO-LaB Project to expedite outstanding activities.
3. *Reviewed* the Report on the financial expenditure in the year 2006 presented by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit and noted the need for an improvement in the rate of expenditure in the year 2007.
4. *Noted* with appreciation the Report on the partnerships established by the WIO-LaB Project including the leveraged resources, and requested for furtherance of such collaborations including that with the newly formed NGOs Consortium (WIO-C), particularly with regard to the implementation of the outstanding activities.
5. *Noted* with appreciation the workplan and strategy for the preparation of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme (TDA and SAP) for the Western Indian Ocean region as prepared by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit and called for its expedited implementation, taking into consideration the need to present the early outputs of this process to the 5<sup>th</sup> Conference of Contracting Parties (COP-5) to Nairobi Convention (scheduled to be held in Cape Town, South Africa in September 2007).
6. *Considered* and *approved* the WIO-LaB Project work plan for the year 2007, as prepared by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit and called for expedited implementation of the approved Workplan taking due considerations of the recommendations for enhancement as deliberated upon by the Steering Committee.
7. *Considered* and *approved* the WIO-LaB Project budget for the year 2007, including the inclusion of the costs of Focal Point coordination support and called for expedited implementation of project activities.
8. *Agreed* that the activities earmarked for the Incomati Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM) Demonstration project should be downscaled and be focussed on the preparation of an environmental profile and management strategy and

allocate the saved resources for development of demonstration projects in countries that currently do not have any.

9. *Agreed* that additional support should be extended to the National Focal Points in order to enable them build the required capacity for enhanced and efficient coordination of implementation of the project activities in participating countries. Modalities of provision of such support to be discussed further between the project management and the Focal Points of respective countries.
10. *Agreed* that the interim Regional Coordinator of Nairobi Convention will communicate with the National Focal Point Institutions/Ministries highlighting concerns of the Nairobi Convention with regard to the difficulties in the implementation of some of the activities in participating countries and indicate the need for enhanced implementation of agreed activities at national level. Where appropriate the NEPAD framework led by Kenya on coastal and marine programmes will be used.
11. *Welcomed* the participation of Somalia in the meeting as an observer and called for concerted efforts to be made in order to assist Somalia participate more actively in the Nairobi Convention activities for the protection, development and management of the coastal and marine environment in Eastern Africa.

**LES DECISIONS ET RECOMMANDATIONS DE LA TROISIEME REUNION  
REGIONALE DU COMITE DIRECTEUR DU PROJET WIO-LAB**

Après avoir pris en considération les progrès réalisés au niveau de la mise en œuvre du Projet WIO-LaB PNUE-FEM depuis 2005 ainsi que les conclusions et recommandations des réunions précédentes du Comité directeur tenues en Tanzanie (2005) et au Kenya (2006), la Troisième réunion régionale du Comité directeur du Projet WIO-LaB, tenue le 13 mars 2007 aux Seychelles, a pris les décisions et émis les recommandations suivantes :

1. Noté avec appréciation le Rapport sur l'état d'avancement de la mise en œuvre des activités du Projet WIO-LaB préparé par son Unité de gestion et félicité cette Unité de gestion du Projet WIO-LaB et le Secrétariat de la Convention de Nairobi pour les efforts fournis dans le cadre de la coordination de la mise en œuvre des diverses activités du Projet dans le région de l'OIO.
2. Noté les difficultés rencontrées lors de mise en œuvre de certaines des activités du Projet dans les pays participants comme indiqué en détail par les points focaux nationaux dans leurs rapports au Comité directeur et encouragé l'ensemble des institutions impliquées dans la mise en œuvre du Projet WIO-LaB à accélérer les activités en souffrance.
3. Examiné le Rapport sur les dépenses financières en 2006 présenté par l'Unité de gestion du Projet WIO-LaB et noté la nécessité d'une réduction du taux des dépenses pour l'année 2007.
4. Noté avec appréciation le Rapport sur les partenariats établis par le Projet WIO-LaB et cela comprend les ressources requises pour poursuivre ces collaborations, y compris celle avec le Consortium d'ONG (WIO-C) nouvellement constitué, en particulier en ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre des activités en souffrance.
5. Noté avec appréciation le plan de travail et la stratégie de préparation d'une Analyse diagnostique transfrontalière et d'un Programme d'action stratégique (ADT et PAS) pour la région de l'océan Indien occidental qui ont été établis par l'Unité de gestion du Projet WIO-LaB et demandé sa mise en œuvre accélérée en prenant en considération la nécessité de présenter les produits initiaux de ce processus à la 5ème Conférence des parties contractantes (CdP-5) à la Convention de Nairobi (prévue en septembre 2007 au Cap en Afrique du Sud).
6. Considéré et approuvé le plan de travail du Projet WIO-LaB pour l'année 2007 comme préparé par l'Unité de gestion du Projet WIO-LaB et demandé la mise en œuvre accélérée du plan de travail approuvé en tenant compte des recommandations relatives à son amélioration émises par le Comité directeur.
7. Considéré et approuvé le budget du Projet WIO-LaB pour l'année 2007, y compris l'inclusion des coûts du soutien de la coordination des points focaux et demandé la mise en œuvre accélérée des activités du projet.

8. Convenu que les activités prévues pour le Projet de démonstration sur la Gestion intégrée des zones côtières et des bassins fluviaux (ICARM) de l'Incomati devraient être réduites et concentrées sur la préparation d'un profil environnemental et d'une stratégie de gestion. Il faudrait consacrer les ressources ainsi épargnées au développement des projets de démonstration dans les pays où il n'y en a pas à l'heure actuelle.
9. Convenu qu'il faudrait apporter davantage d'appui aux points focaux nationaux afin de leur permettre de renforcer les capacités requises en vue d'améliorer la coordination de la mise en œuvre des activités du projet dans les pays participants. Les modalités d'apport de cet appui doivent être finalisées par l'Unité de gestion du Projet et les points focaux de chaque pays.
10. Convenu que le Coordinateur régional intérimaire de la Convention de Nairobi prendra contact avec les institutions/ministères points focaux nationaux en mettant l'accent sur les inquiétudes de la Convention de Nairobi en ce qui concerne les difficultés quant à la mise en œuvre de certaines des activités dans les pays participants et indiqué la nécessité d'améliorer la mise en œuvre des activités convenues au niveau national. Dès qu'il conviendra, ces dernières s'inscriront dans le cadre du NEPAD mené par le Kenya pour les programmes portant sur l'environnement marin et côtier.
11. Accueilli la participation de la Somalie à la réunion en tant qu'observateur et fait appel aux efforts concertés à fournir afin d'aider la Somalie à participer plus activement aux activités de la Convention de Nairobi pour la protection, le développement et la gestion de l'environnement marin et côtier en Afrique orientale.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>THE DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE THIRD REGIONAL MEETING OF THE WIO-LAB PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>1. OPENING OF THE MEETING</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 OPENING STATEMENTS:</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 OFFICIAL ADDRESS BY THE SEYCHELLES MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>2. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING (ELECTION AND DESIGNATION OF CHAIR AND RAPPORTEUR)</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>4. REPORT ON PROGRESS MADE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES IN 2006</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>4.1 OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>4.2 OVERVIEW OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND STATUS</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>4.3 OVERVIEW OF 2006 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>4.4 PARTNERS AND LEVERAGED RESOURCES</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>4.5 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>5. WORK PLAN FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>5.1 OVERVIEW OF PROJECT WORK PLAN FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>5.2 WORKPLAN AND STRATEGY FOR TDA/SAP DEVELOPMENT</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>5.3 FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>6. ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>7. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>9. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## LIST OF ANNEXES

1. Agenda
2. List of Documents Distributed
3. List of Participants
4. Overview of financial performance in the year 2006
5. Work plan for the calendar year 2007
6. Proposed budgetary allocations for the calendar year 2007

---

## **REPORT OF THE MEETING**

### **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

1.0.1 The meeting was called to order by Mr. Dixon Waruinge, the Programme Officer responsible for the Nairobi Convention for the management, development and protection of the coastal and marine environment in Eastern Africa.

#### **1.1 Opening statements:**

The representatives of UNEP/Nairobi Convention and WIO-LaB Project Management made brief opening statements as presented in the following sections.

##### **1.1.1 Remarks by the Nairobi Convention Secretariat**

1.1.1.1 Mr. Dixon Waruinge, the Programme Officer in charge of the Nairobi Convention brought to the attention of the delegates the precedent that had been set in other previous meetings of the Steering Committee where the host country chairs the meeting. He suggested that the third meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee be chaired by Seychelles which is also the seat of the Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) of the UNEP/Nairobi Convention for the management, development and protection of the coastal and marine environment in Eastern Africa.

1.1.1.2 The Committee members did not raise any objection to this suggestion and Dr. Rolph Payet, who is also the Principal Secretary in the Seychelles Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, accepted the responsibility of chairing the meeting.

##### **1.1.2 Remarks by the WIO-LaB Project Manager**

1.1.2.1 The WIO-LaB Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren, in his remarks welcomed all the delegates to the third meeting of the Steering Committee of the WIO-LaB Project. He noted that the main purpose of the meeting was to review progress and achievements made in the implementation of the project since its inception in 2005. He also noted that the meeting would provide direction on how participating countries could capitalize on some of the preliminary outputs of the project and find out how tools, assessment reports, demonstration projects, stakeholders participation plans could be used in the countries to further enhance the management of the coastal and marine environment.

1.1.2.2 Dr. Scheren also expressed his appreciation to Seychelles for hosting the present meeting of the Project Steering Committee, noting that it was the first time that the WIO-LaB Project was holding one of its meetings in Seychelles. He in particular thanked Dr. Rolph Payet, the Interim Regional Coordinator of Nairobi Convention for the support his office had continued to offer to the project.

1.1.2.3 Dr. Scheren also thanked all members of the Steering Committee for accepting the invitation to the present meeting, noting that it was a demonstration of their commitment to the achievement of project's goals and aspirations.

## **1.2 Official address by the Seychelles Minister of Environment and Natural Resources**

1.2.1 Mr. Dixon Waruinge invited Dr. Rolph Payet, the Principal Secretary in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and the interim Coordinator of the Nairobi Convention to address the members of the Steering Committee and officially open the meeting.

1.2.2 Dr. Rolph Payet in his official speech noted that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee was an important event as the members would have an opportunity to discuss implementation issues as the project's mid-term review process was ongoing. The process would prove to be instrumental in determining the final lap of the project in the WIO region. He noted that when the project was conceived, it was regarded as an important project emanating from the African Process and it aimed at putting the Nairobi Convention in its proper place in the region. However, there were a number of important and critical issues to be tackled by the Committee in order to ensure that there were value-added benefits to participating countries that are party to the Nairobi Convention. Such value addition would ensure that the coastal and marine environment would be in a better state than it was two years ago, and that a sense of ownership and political commitment for taking action for the protection and management of the coastal and marine environment at both national and regional levels would be achieved.

1.2.3 Dr. Payet recalled the decision made by the Steering Committee during its first meeting held in April 2005 in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, that required '*participating countries to explore suitable mechanisms for efficient inter-ministerial coordination in accordance with the tasks. Where such mechanism does not exist, Inter-Ministerial Committees should be set up*'. He wondered whether countries have implemented that decision.

1.2.4 Dr. Payet also recalled that the Steering Committee had directed that '*countries should ensure a small secretariat that will coordinate the work of the inter-Ministerial Committees through the national Focal Point. The National Focal Points as the members of the PSC are to oversee and coordinate on a national level the implementation of activities defined in the WIO-LaB Project document*'. He noted that the above were important decisions, and challenged the representatives of participating countries to evaluate how effectively those decisions had been implemented in their countries. He further noted that the focal points need to be totally engaged in this process and urged them to contribute extensively in the present meeting.

1.2.5 Dr. Payet also re-iterated that it was the focal points that provide strategic direction to the WIO-LaB Project at the level of the Steering Committee. As the WIO-LaB Project approaches its conclusion, he called upon the Focal Points to make a serious commitment to get the demonstration projects off the ground and fully engage stakeholders in the implementation of the project. He further noted that it was through these simple steps that the focal points would pave the way for further growth of the Nairobi Convention. He noted that it was the national focal points that would make it work at the national level, and without their input and support, the project would generate very little benefit to the target countries.

1.2.6 Dr. Payet further observed that the WIO-LaB project should not be a means to an end, but rather part of a long strategy to implement the goals and targets of the Nairobi Convention programme of work. He recognised this to a vital link as the priorities are set by the Conference of the Parties, and whilst implementation is often constrained by lack of adequate finances, such cannot be said of the WIO-LaB Project.

1.2.7 Dr. Payet further noted that limited impact of the WIO-LaB project at this juncture, was reminiscent of *l'etat d'affaires* in many of the countries in the region. Whilst there were resources in the project, Focal Points have not adequately mobilised national entities and bodies to ensure proper action on the ground.

1.2.8 Dr. Payet noted that there was widespread consensus that governments and civil society in general were becoming intolerant to large reports, but would in fact prefer action on the ground. The WIO-LaB project has offered two distinct possibilities for action to occur on the ground; (a) the Demonstration projects and (b) the Small Grants Programme (SGP). He noted that funds were available and requested countries to find out how do translate these opportunities into action on the ground. He further noted that whilst organisations such as the GEF were demanding for greater transparency and accountability, countries must be able to implement activities on the ground in the most responsible manner. He urged countries to show that the Nairobi Convention countries can do this effectively.

1.2.9 Dr. Payet noted further that many regional and global organisations were presently watching the Western Indian Ocean. So far the region has almost 40 million dollars of approved funding primarily from the GEF and the European Union. He noted that the way this money was spent would depend a lot on national priorities and implementation arrangements. He emphasised the importance of pro-active inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder mechanisms at the national level.

1.2.10 Dr. Payet encouraged members of the Steering Committee to make the 3rd meeting of the Steering Committee an active one, so that the WIO-LaB Project and Nairobi Convention can return to the office with clear guidance and a renewed commitment for a fruitful legacy of the WIO-LaB project in the region.

## **2. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING (ELECTION AND DESIGNATION OF CHAIR AND RAPPORTEUR)**

2.1 Following suggestions made earlier by the Programme Officer responsible for the Nairobi Convention, the meeting decided to use the existing structures established by the Nairobi Convention where the chair would be provided by Seychelles represented by Dr. Rolph Payet, interim Coordinator of the Nairobi Convention and the Principal Secretary in the Seychelles Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. The Chair of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the WIO-LaB Project would be supported by the Chair and Rapporteur of the Bureau of Nairobi Convention provided by Madagascar and Mozambique, respectively.

2.2 Subsequently, the elected Chair introduced the local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that were represented at the meeting. Thereafter, he invited the delegates to introduce themselves. The list of delegates is shown in Annex 3 (background document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/INF.2*)

2.3 The delegates introduced themselves stating their names, designations and institutions/organizations they represented. Following the introduction of the Project Steering Committee members and other invited guests, the WIO-LaB Project Manager took the floor for presentation of the next agenda item.

### **3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

3.1 The Chair, Dr. Rolph Payet, introduced the provisional agenda and with the assistance of the WIO-LaB Project Manager brought to the attention of the Committee all background documents listed in document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/INF.1* that had been prepared by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit in order to facilitate deliberations on various issues listed in the Provisional Agenda.

3.2 Following deliberations on the provisional agenda that was presented, the Committee adopted the agenda without amendments. The adopted agenda is presented in the Report as Annex 1 (*UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/1*).

### **4. REPORT ON PROGRESS MADE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES IN 2006.**

4.0.1 The Chair introduced the above mentioned agenda item and invited the Project Manager of the WIO-LaB Project, Dr. Peter Scheren to provide a short presentation on the WIO-LaB Project for the benefit of new members of the Steering Committee and Seychelles delegation of NGOs. Dr. Peter Scheren briefed the meeting on the three Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded projects namely UNEP Coordinated addressing land-based activities project (WIO-LaB), the UNDP coordinated Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems Project (ASCLME) and the World Bank coordinated Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP). He also briefed the meeting on other regional projects implemented in the WIO Region such as ReCoMaP and ACEP noting that these projects were tackling the same group of LME Problems in the WIO Region.

4.0.2 Dr. Scheren also briefed the delegates on the geographical jurisdiction of the project including the mainland and island States that are participating in the implementation of the WIO-LaB Project. He also highlighted the goals and objectives of the project, and provided details on the key characteristics of the project including the funding provided by the GEF, Government of Norway, UNEP and participating countries.

#### **4.1 Overview of national project implementation**

4.1.1 The Chair introduced the above mentioned sub-agenda item and invited the WIO-LaB Project Manager to provide the Committee with short guidelines for the presentations to be made by the National Focal Points. Each of the National Focal Points was requested to brief the Committee on the progress made with regard to the implementation of the WIO-LaB Project in their respective countries. The presentations by Focal Points were to cover the following issues:

- The establishment and functioning of national coordination mechanisms (National (Inter-ministerial) Coordination Committee, Task Forces and Working Groups).
- Key activities and outputs (such as preparation of the National Pollution Status Reports, National Monitoring Programmes, Legal Review Reports, Marine Litter Assessment Reports and MWW Status Reports).
- The development and implementation of demonstration projects.
- National review of the new Land-based Sources and Activities (LBSA) Protocol to the Nairobi Convention.

- Development of National Programmes of Action (NPA) in particular in the case of Kenya and Tanzania.

4.1.2 Following the above introduction, the Focal Points were invited to present their reports to the Committee. The following section presents the details on the Reports presented by the Focal Points of Comoros, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Seychelles and Madagascar.

#### **4.1.1 Comoros**

4.1.1.1 Ms. Fatouma Ali Abdallah, the Deputy Director in the Direction National de l'Environnement (INRAPE) of the Union of Comoros presented the Report on the progress on the implementation of the project activities in Comoros. Ms. Abdallah reported that a National Meeting that brought together various National Task Forces and Working Groups involved in various WIO-LaB Project related activities was recently held in Comoros. She also reported that the Director-General of INRAPE had approved the formation of these technical groups. She noted that arrangements are being made to establish a National Secretariat for the coordination of various project activities in the Comoros.

4.1.1.2 Ms. Abdallah also reported that all the National Reports that were prepared under the auspices of the WIO-LaB Project have been finalized and forwarded to the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit for further action.

4.1.1.3 With regard to the preparation of demonstration projects, she reported that the final demonstration project document for Moheli had already been completed and circulated to all key stakeholders for their comments. The final document had already been forwarded to the WIO-LaB PMU for presentation to the Steering Committee for approval so that implementation of full scale activities could commence.

4.1.1.4 With regard to the Land-based Sources and Activities (LBSA) Protocol, she reported that the National Legal Task Force discussed the same in its last meeting, and comments were provided to the WIO-LaB PMU.

4.1.1.5 With regard to Small Grants Programme (SGP), she reported that contact had already been established with the UNDP SGP Coordinator in the Comoros and modalities for the implementation of the programme in the Comoros had been established.

4.1.1.6 With regard to the National Programme of Action (NPA), she reported that the National Development Plan developed by the Comoros Ministry of Environment stated certain priorities related to coastal and marine environment that are also given prominence in the Comoros Poverty Reduction Strategy.

#### **4.1.2 Kenya**

4.1.2.1 Mr. Ali Mohamed representing the Director-General of the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) of Kenya reported to the Committee the progress in the implementation of the WIO-LaB Project activities in Kenya.

4.1.2.2 Mr. Mohamed reported that Kenya had established an inter-Ministerial Committee for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and policy development. The same committee was also responsible for the coordination of activities of the WIO-LaB Project.

4.1.2.3 Mr. Mohamed also reported that four National Task Forces on Municipal Wastewater Management (MWW), Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats (PADH), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Legal Review have been formed in Kenya and the four Task Forces had come up with specific outputs such as Reports on legal review, as well as a framework National Plan of Action on Land-based Activities (LBA). He noted that the Key National Reports prepared by National experts had also been deliberated on by the National Task Forces and stakeholders before being submitted to the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit (PMU). He noted that the National Reports offered a true representation of the national view and key issues with regard to the coastal and marine environment in Kenya.

4.1.2.4 With regard to the demonstration projects, Mr. Mohamed reported that the Shimo la Tewa wastewater management demonstration project in Mombasa was considered a very important project for Kenya since there were a number of facilities located along the Kenya Coast that lacked wastewater management systems and that would benefit from lessons and experiences gained at Shimo la Tewa. He noted that the demonstration project would have impacts beyond the place where it is being implemented. He further reported that the WIO-LaB Project Management had been liaising closely with the Coast Development Authority (CDA), the proponent of the project with regard to the implementation of the project.

4.1.2.5 With regard to LBSA Protocol, Mr. Mohamed reported that the protocol is yet to be discussed by the National Legal Task Force. However, plans to discuss/review the protocol during the next meeting of the National legal Task Force were at an advanced stage.

4.1.2.6 With regard to the Small Grants Programme, Mr. Mohamed reported that he had not been briefed by the National SGP Coordinator on the progress that had so far been made with regard to launching of the programme in Kenya.

4.1.2.7 With regard to National Programme of Action (NPA,) Mr. Mohamed acknowledged the support provided to the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) in order to develop the NPA for the protection of the coastal and marine environment from LBA.

4.1.2.8 With regard to the challenges faced by the Focal Point in the coordination of implementation of various project activities, he noted that the major challenge had been the coordination of many institutions involved in the implementation of various project activities at national level. He also noted that the location of the Focal Point institution away from the coast made linkages and coordination with institutions based at the coast difficult. He also noted that the level of support from Focal Point institutions had been limited. In this regard, he suggested that there was a need to strengthen the Focal Point office in order to effectively discharge its responsibilities and achieve the set objectives of the project.

### **4.1.3 Mauritius**

4.1.3.1 Mr. Jogeewar Seewoobaduth, the Acting Divisional Environment Officer who represented the Acting Director of Environment, Ministry of Environment and National Development Unit, Mauritius, presented the Report on the progress in the implementation of the project activities in Mauritius.

4.1.3.2 With regard to national coordination, he reported that Mauritius had decided not to establish many Task Forces for various WIO-LaB Project activities but preferred to use the Nairobi Convention Committee coordination mechanism that was already fully functional. He noted that the selected members of the committee had participated in various Task Force activities.

4.1.3.3 Mr. Seewoobaduth informed the meeting that the draft National Pollution Status Report for Mauritius had been prepared and submitted to the WIO-LaB PMU. He also reported that the National Water and Sediment Quality Monitoring Programme had been finalized and the contract documents were awaiting the signature of the Ministry. He also reported that the two legal review national reports had been prepared and submitted to the PMU for necessary action. Furthermore, he reported that the Marine Litter Assessment Report had been submitted to WIOMSA and the regional consultant. Mr. Seewoobaduth also informed the Committee that the Municipal Wastewater Management Report was in the process of preparation by the National Expert who was at that moment also discussing it with the stakeholders.

4.1.3.4 With regard to the demonstration project, Mr. Seewoobaduth reported that it had unfortunately taken long for the project proponents to update and prepare the project documents as per the recommendations put forward by the PMU. He however, noted that some of the bottlenecks that led to the delays in the preparation of the proposals have been removed. He highlighted to the committee the main focus of two demonstration projects noting also that the projects documents had been re-orientated and re-submitted to the Ministry of Environment. Arrangements would be made to submit the updated project documents to the PMU.

4.1.3.5 Mr. Seewoobaduth reported that the National Parks demonstration project had been re-orientated in order to present the land-ocean linkages more prominently. Also, new stakeholders have been brought onboard. He noted that the project preparation had taken too long because they were waiting for commitment from the key stakeholders. This commitment had finally been secured and they were ready to proceed with the implementation of the project.

4.1.3.6 With regard to the challenges faced by the Focal Point in the coordination of project activities in Mauritius, Mr. Seewoobaduth reported that shortage of staff had been a major bottleneck in the Focal Point Institutions, i.e. the Ministry of Environment. He noted that it would be important to provide some additional support to the Focal Point Office in Mauritius.

4.1.3.7 With regard to the national level review of LBSA Protocol, Mr. Seewoobaduth noted that the document had been circulated to stakeholders in Mauritius and the comments that were received were forwarded to the WIO-LaB PMU. With regard to the Small Grants Programme (SGP), he noted that it would be cost effective if funds would be channelled directly to the countries. He observed the cost of advertising the call of proposals made the entire programme less cost-effective.

#### **4.1.4 Mozambique**

4.1.4.1 Mr. Polycarpo Napica, the National Director of Environment in the Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA), Mozambique presented the Report on the progress on the implementation of the project activities in Mozambique. With regard to the



establishment of an Inter-Institutional Coordination Committee for the coordination of project activities, he reported the National Sustainable Development Group had been acting as such. He also reported that three Task Forces and Working Groups focussing on the (1) legal review issues, (2) Incomati ICARM Demonstration project and (3) water and sediment quality issues, had been formed and were already undertaking various activities.

4.1.4.2 Mr. Napica informed the Committee that the draft version of the National Pollution Status Report and the draft versions of the Legal Review National Reports had been prepared and submitted to the WIO-LaB PMU. He reported that the Department of Food and Water Safety (LNHAA) in the Ministry of Health was discussing with the PMU on issues related to the preparation of the Mozambique National Water and Sediment Quality Monitoring Programme. However, the national reports on the Marine Litter Assessment and the Municipal Wastewater Management were still pending since no national experts had been identified to carry out the assignment in Mozambique. However, an expert to work on the Municipal Wastewater Management Report had subsequently been identified.

4.1.4.3 With regard to the demonstration projects, Mr. Polycarpo Napica reported to the committee that there were two demonstration projects in Mozambique; (1) the Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM) Demonstration project which focussed on the Incomati basin and (2) the mangrove reforestation demonstration project focussed at Lumbo in northern Mozambique. In the case of the Incomati ICARM Project, he reported that a small National Working Group consisting of a hydrologist, a GIS Expert, an Ecologist and two other specialists had been formed. The Group was preparing an environmental profile for the Incomati basin and associated coastal zone in Mozambique including a management strategy. He also reported that the mangrove demonstration project had entered the full implementation stage under the coordination of the Grupo de Trabalho Ambiental (GTA) in collaboration with Eduardo Mondlane University and some results of the project were already evident in the field (he had taken several photographs of established nurseries, planted areas, oyster farms, etc).

4.1.4.4 With regard to LBSA Protocol, Mr. Napica reported that a small National Working Group had been established to deal with legal issues. However, the delays experienced were occasioned by the need to translate the LBSA Protocol into Portuguese since most of the members were not conversant with English. Translation of the Protocol had been done and the national level review would commence soon.

4.1.4.5 With regard to the SGP, Mr. Napica reported that members of the National SGP Committee had already discussed and agreed with the National Coordinator on how to integrate the WIO-LaB SGP with the UNDP SGP so that the two programmes operated under the same arrangements. In this regard, there was an agreement for the preparation of a joint work programme.

4.1.4.6 Mr. Napica reported that special funds to facilitate the work of the Focal Point had been received. He also reported that Mozambique has received support from the WIO-LaB Project for coordination of project activities.

## **4.1.5 South Africa**

4.1.5.1 Dr. Naomi Mdzeke, the Chief Director for Integrated Coastal Management, Marine and Coastal Management in the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT),

South Africa presented the Report on the progress in the implementation of the project activities in South Africa.

4.1.5.2 Dr. Mdzeke informed the meeting that South Africa had a Ministerial led Group chaired by the Minister of Environment and that it also made use of existing Working/Technical Groups such as the EIA Working Group, Environment Working Group and the Provincial Committees to coordinate the work of the WIO-LaB Project in South Africa.

4.1.5.3 Dr. Mdzeke informed the Committee that the National Reports on the Legal Review as well as the Pollution Status Reports (prepared by CSIR) had already been reviewed at national level. However, she was not able to report on the progress made with regard to the preparation of the Marine Litter Assessment report since she had no details.

4.1.5.4 With regard to the demonstration projects, Dr. Mdzeke reported that although the algal ponding systems demonstration project had been approved, the project ran into trouble with the local communities and municipality due to disagreement between the stakeholders. However, efforts to restart the project were being made and the next stakeholders meeting to discuss the way forward would be held in March 2007. She noted however, that it may be decided that the algal ponding system demonstration project would not be acceptable to the community because it is on private land. In this regard DEAT would review the situation and decide whether to proceed with the project or recommend initiation of another demonstration project that is acceptable to the community.

4.1.5.5 With regard to SGP, Dr. Mdzeke reported that documentation had already been received from the WIO-LaB PMU and the same had been circulated to possible participants. She looked forward to receiving some feedback from the stakeholders sometime in April 2007.

4.1.5.6 Dr. Mdzeke further reported that a National Advisory Forum to drive the process for the preparation of the National Programme of Action (NPA) for the protection of the coastal and marine environment had been established. A National workshop to discuss the roadmap was planned to be held by the end of March 2007.

4.1.5.7 With regard to the challenges faced in the coordination of project activities, Dr. Mdzeke noted that weaknesses in sharing of information between the Focal Point and the national experts undertaking various project assignments had been a matter of concern. In this regard, she noted that there were major gaps in sharing of information at national level occasioned by the fact that national experts were contacting the WIO-LaB PMU directly leaving the Focal Point out of the loop. This was however noted to be due to non responsiveness of the Focal Point.

4.1.5.8 Dr. Mdzeke also informed the Committee that there were budgetary limitations since funding arrangements were such that the marine and coastal management activities were funded from levies collected from the fishing companies. With the expansion of the mandate of DEAT into marine coastal environment management, there were questions from the key stakeholders on whether the fisheries sector should continue paying for the work on coastal and marine management and particularly on issues not relevant to fisheries. She reported that in view of stakeholders concerns, DEAT was re-examining this funding arrangement since it could not be sustained by the marine living resources fund alone. She hoped that in

the 2007/2008 financial year, there would be some improvement in terms of funding of DEAT's programmes.

#### **4.1.6 Tanzania**

4.1.6.1 Mrs. Melania Sangeu, Senior Environment Officer representing the Director-General of the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) of Tanzania presented the Report on the progress in the implementation of the project activities in Tanzania.

4.1.6.2 Mrs. Sangeu reported that the National Coordination Committee had been established under the National Standards and Environment Committee in the Vice-President's Office. This Committee comprised membership of several key sectoral Ministries in Tanzania. She noted that this arrangement provided an avenue for the integration of the WIO-LaB Project activities within the existing national framework. She reported that an MOU had been signed with the WIO-LaB Project in order to facilitate the work of the Task Force established within the framework of the National Committee.

4.1.6.3 With regard to demonstration projects, Mrs. Sangeu reported on the two fast track demonstration projects selected for Tanzania; one for the mainland Tanzania and the other for the Zanzibar. She reported that the Msimbazi vetiver grass demonstration project had already entered full implementation stage in October 2006 and various activities were ongoing in the field. However, the preparation of the Pemba wastewater management demonstration project is yet to be finalized.

4.1.6.4 With regard to the LBSA Protocol, Mrs. Sangeu reported that NEMC had signed an MOU with the WIO-LaB Project to facilitate the national review process. With regard to the implementation of the SGP in Tanzania, Mrs. Sangeu noted that she was yet to contact the National UNDP SGP Coordinator in Tanzania.

4.1.6.5 With regard to preparation of the National Programme of Action (NPA) for the protection and management of the coastal and marine environment in Tanzania, she reported that the NPA document was in the final stages of preparation and it was hoped that it would be finalized by end of April 2007.

4.1.6.6 With regard to the challenges faced in the coordination of project activities, Mrs. Sangeu noted that changes in staffing at NEMC had led to new responsibilities and there were problems of properly matching the activities with the existing personnel. Also, in view of the fact that some of the activities were undertaken by other national institutions, it had been difficult for the Focal Point to know what was going on. Also, due to shortage of staff, the Focal Point was dealing with many activities and it was therefore difficult to submit outputs according to the set schedules. She noted that in order to secure more commitment, there is a need to establish WIO-LaB Project Desk or an Office for the Nairobi Convention activities in Tanzania.

4.1.6.7 With regard to the Legal Review National Reports, Mrs. Sangeu reported that a National Consultant was already working on the two review reports and NEMC had already held discussions with the consultant regarding the finalization of the two reports.

#### **4.1.7 Seychelles**

4.1.7.1 Mr. Jason Jacqueline, the Seychelles Focal Point based at the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources presented a report on the progress made in the implementation of

the project activities in Seychelles. He reported that Seychelles decided not to form many Task Forces and Working Groups for coordination of the project activities but had established a single National Inter-Ministerial Committee that brought together various institutions involved in the implementation of the project.

4.1.7.2 Mr. Jacqueline reported that although the National Pollution Status Report was yet to be submitted to the PMU, a small Working Group had prepared a draft version of the pollution status report and had circulated the same for commenting by the stakeholders. He also reported that Seychelles Bureau of Standards had prepared the National Water and Sediment Quality Monitoring Programme and the monitoring activities were set to begin in the course of March 2007.

4.1.7.3 Mr. Jacqueline informed the Committee that the legal review national reports had been reviewed at national level and comments sent to the PMU. With regard to the MWW Reports, a consultant was already working on the report which would be submitted by the end of April 2007.

4.1.7.4 With regard to LBSA Protocol, Mr. Jacqueline reported that the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft LBSA Protocol had already been reviewed and comments sent to the PMU. With regard to the SGP, he reported that they were in the initial stages of establishing the mechanisms of implementing the programme in Seychelles. The SGP National Coordination Committee had been formed and information advertised in the newspapers in order to attract interested NGOs and CBOs.

4.1.7.5 Mr. Jacqueline informed the committee that NPA activities had not started and they were planning to discuss the same in the coming meeting of the National Inter-Ministerial Coordination Committee.

4.1.7.6 With regard to the implementation of project activities, he noted that main challenges included lack of research equipment and laboratory facilities that were very expensive and had to be imported.

#### **4.1.8 Madagascar**

4.1.8.1 Ms. Chantal Andrianarivo, the Chef de Cellule Recherché et Biodiversite Association Nationale pour la Gestion Des Aires Proteges (ANGAP) and the National Focal Point for Madagascar presented the Report on the progress in the implementation of the project activities in Madagascar.

4.1.8.2 Ms. Andrianarivo informed the meeting that the work of Nairobi Convention and the WIO-LaB Project was coordinated by an Inter-Ministerial Coordination Committee under the Ministry of Environment. The main stakeholders included Ministries of Fisheries, Tourism and Education, etc. There were also several national Technical Task Forces that had been established for Municipal Wastewater Management, PADH and Legal review. These Task Forces reported to the Minister of Environment through the National Focal Point.

4.1.8.3 With regard to the National reports, Ms. Andrianarivo reported that the draft versions of the National Legal Review reports as well as the National Pollution Status Reports had been prepared and submitted to the PMU. She also reported that the National Water and Sediment Quality Monitoring Programme was coordinated by Centre National de Recherches sur l'Environnement (CNRE) in collaboration with the Institut Halieutique et

des Sciences Marines (IHSM). She also reported that the National Report on Marine Litter Assessment had been completed and sent to the Regional Consultant through WIOMSA. However, the Report on the Municipal wastewater management was still under preparation.

4.1.8.4 With regard to the demonstration project for Madagascar, Ms. Andrianarivo reported that a demonstration project document had already been sent to the PMU and the Minister of Environment was looking forward to signing an MOU for the full scale implementation of the project. The second demonstration project, although endorsed by the Project Steering Committee, had been put on hold due to scarcity of funding.

4.1.8.5 With regard to the LBSA Protocol, Ms. Andrianarivo reported that the same had been reviewed by the National Legal Task Force and comments sent to the WIO-LaB PMU. However, the Protocol was yet to be discussed further and hoped that this would be done in May 2007.

4.1.8.6 With regard to the SGP, Ms. Andrianarivo reported that she had been requested by the Ministry of Environment to establish a National SGP Sub-Committee for the WIO-LaB Project and she was currently waiting for the nomination of the members of the sub-committee. She hoped that this would be done by June 2007.

4.1.8.7 With regard to the preparation of the National Programme of Action (NPA) for the protection of the coastal and marine environment, Ms. Andrianarivo noted that Madagascar National Development Plan offered the basis with regard to the marine and coastal environmental management issues. She noted that Nairobi Convention was one of the active conventions that received support of the government. She promised to elaborate a proposal highlighting activities to be submitted to the Minister.

#### **4.1.9 General discussions**

4.1.9.1 There was concern over the inadequate involvement of the National Focal Points in signing of MOUs with national institutions undertaking various project activities. It was noted however, that it was only in a few cases that the Focal Points were not effective in responding to messages sent by the PMU. It was suggested that where the PMU had signed MOUs with national institutions, copies of the same should be sent to the Focal Point so that he/she could be aware of what had been agreed upon.

4.1.9.2 Mr. Ali Mohamed representing the NEPAD COSMAR Programme as well Kenya Focal Point noted that WIO-LaB Project was an important project for the WIO Region and that it set the foundation for the SAP that would guide Nairobi Convention and WIO Region in the next several years. He added that it was heartening to note the level of success that had so far been achieved despite the many challenges faced. He suggested that the PMU provide a brief on the challenges faced in the coordination of the project and also provide guidance on what could be done so that the project succeeds. In response, the Project Manager proposed to delay further discussion on this issue to agenda item 4.4.

4.1.9.3 Mr. Dixon Waruinge, the Programme Officer responsible for Nairobi Convention observed that the presentations made by the Focal Points touched on national dialogue on LBSA Protocol. However, this was not happening at the appropriate level and there was a need to lift the notch higher in order to involve all the stakeholders. On the leadership, he noted that some of the Focal Points feel that they do not have a firm grip on the processes in the country. With regard to NPA, he noted that there were a number of activities that had

been undertaken at national level that could feed into the NPA Process. This included the process for the preparation of the various national reports (marine litter, pollution, municipal wastewater management, legal review, ratification of conventions, environmental impact assessment, etc).

4.1.9.4 Following the presentation of the country reports by the National Focal Points and above interventions, the Committee noted with appreciation satisfactory progress that has so far been achieved and requested participating countries, in close liaison with the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit, to expedite the implementation of outstanding activities.

## **4.2 Overview of project activities and status**

4.2.1 Following the individual country presentations, the Chair introduced the agenda item and requested the Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren, to present to the Committee the reports on the progress made in the implementation of various project activities as partly detailed in the project's Annual Report for the calendar year 2006 (presented as document *UNEP-GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/4*). Details on the presentations made are given in the following sections.

4.2.2 Dr. Peter Scheren provided a brief report on the status with regard to the achievement of the objectives defined for the key components of the WIO-LaB Project, focussing on the (1) water and sediment quality, (2) municipal wastewater management and physical alteration and destruction of habitats (MWW/PADH), (3) legal and technical review, (4) environmental impact assessment, (5) National Programme of Action (NPA), (6) Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM), (7) Regional Coordination, (7) Capacity building (training and educational programmes), (8) Stakeholders involvement and (9) Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme (TDA/SAP).

4.2.3 Dr. Scheren observed that with regard to the national coordination framework, some countries felt that the structure defined in the WIO-LaB Project document was too complex and instead of creating too many national coordination structures, it would make sense to place all activities under a single national coordination framework. In view of this change, he hoped that the Steering Committee would take note of this fact and provide appropriate directions.

4.2.4 Dr. Scheren also reported to the Committee that the project had realised many useful outputs such as those related to demonstration projects, water and sediment quality monitoring programme, national legal review, etc. He also noted that considering the workplan, the project was performing quite well and the delays that had been experienced in the initiation of certain activities were not serious.

4.2.5 During the discussions that followed the above presentation, Mr. Jason Jacqueline who is the Focal Point of Seychelles requested for information on whether the project could consider a demonstration project in Seychelles. The WIO-LaB Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren noted that time should not impose limitation in this regard and that the Steering Committee should provide appropriate direction on the request made by Seychelles. He however, noted that the request may be limited due to budgetary considerations since funds for the demonstration projects had already been allocated to other projects in participating countries.

4.2.6 Mr. Ali Mohamed recalled that during the second Steering Committee meeting, it was recommended that there should be equity in the distribution of demonstration projects. He suggested that the Committee should recommend that where resources were available, special consideration should be given to Seychelles since it had no demonstration project at the moment.

### **4.3 Discussion concerning Small Grants Programme (SGP)**

4.3.1 With regard to the SGP, the Chair, Dr. Rolph Payet had a strong argument that the WIO-LaB Project SGP should not be linked to the Global SGP Programme coordinated by UNDP. He noted that in some of the participating countries such as Seychelles, there was no SGP Framework and linking with UNDP SGP would unnecessarily complicate matters. The Project Manager however noted that during the second Steering Committee meeting, it was decided that the facilities offered by the Global SGP could be used where possible, but not exclusively. He noted that the Global SGP Coordinators would facilitate the process and the Focal Points would be in charge of the selection of projects to be implemented. This arrangement would minimize costs. He further noted that the SGP allocation of US\$ 30,000 per country was too little to have any major impact. He suggested that where a Global SGP Coordinator was available, countries should make use of the existing arrangement. However, where such arrangements do not exist, countries were encouraged to establish an appropriate alternative mechanism.

4.3.2 Mr. Takehiro Nakamura, the Senior Programme Office in charge of International Waters Portfolio in the UNEP Division of GEF Coordination briefed the meeting on the discussions between the implementing agencies and UNDP where it was decided that the SGP should not be a UNDP Programme, but should be a GEF component programme for all the three implementing agencies. He further noted that SGP projects were normally approved on the understanding that local NGOs/CBOs may not identify with global environmental benefits. Therefore, the programme aimed at establishing partnerships between the existing international waters projects and local CBOs and NGOs that may not identify the IW priority areas or issues.

4.3.3 Mr. Nakamura further observed that within the auspices of the WIO-LaB Project, WIO region would have a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) that defines the priorities and actions that countries would implement through their own National Action Programmes (NAP). In this regard, there was a good justification for the use of the National SGP Process established under the auspices of UNDP. By partnering with Global SGP, the WIO-LaB Project would accelerate the identification of proposals that touch on priority issues and/or problems at national level.

4.3.4 Mr. Waruinge observed that the first step would be to agree that there was a need for partnership with the Global SGP and then agree on how to proceed with the implementation of the partnership. He recalled the deliberations during the previous Steering Committee meeting where it was indicated that by partnering with Global SGP, it would be possible to secure additional funding or resources to supplement those available under the WIO-LaB Project. He noted the need to establish priorities and areas where implementation can proceed immediately. He gave an example of ICRAN Project where the SGP National Committee for Kenya proposed projects to be funded. The projects that were eventually selected were those that could add value to the work programme of ICRAN. He suggested that the committee recommend or identify the most appropriate model be used in case of the

WIO-LaB Project SGP and emphasis should be put on projects that add value to other activities such as demonstration projects.

4.3.5 Dr. Payet noting that GEF was undergoing review and that he was aware of different SGP models applied in different countries maintained his concern on the delivery of outputs noting the need for flexibility in the implemented of the WIO-LaB SGP. He noted that it would not be advisable to lock the WIO-LaB Project SGP into the Global SGP, unless there was a guarantee that will add value and guarantee delivery of outputs.

4.3.6 Mr. Ali Mohamed acknowledged that the project could leverage future gains through partnering with Global SGP. He however observed that involvement of another player at national level had the potential of complicating the process in participating countries. He further suggested that if the process was country driven, it would have more vivid impacts, particularly if coordinated within the current framework of the national focal points.

4.3.7 Dr. Payet observed that the Global SGP had come up with a graduation policy for countries like Mauritius where after a period of 10 years, the country loses the facility. He noted that GEF was looking at sustainable funding for SGP support so that programmes are ran by the countries themselves and the private sector and other institutions are involved.

4.3.8 Ms. Fatouma Ali Abdallah who is the National Focal Point for the Comoros observed that countries would accrue greater benefits if they partnered with the Global SGP.

4.3.9 Dr. Scheren noted that if countries wanted to stimulate more projects in the WIO region, it would be advisable to collaborate with the Global SGP. He however noted that partnering with Global SGP did not mean that the Focal Points would forfeit their mandate to determine the projects that are selected for funding. He emphasised the need to tap on the Global SGP funds since the amount of money allocated for the WIO-LaB SGP was small and should only be regarded as catalytic.

4.3.10 Mr. Waruinge in summary suggested that the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit should review the different perspectives/ models and options in all the participating countries and adapt the programme as the implementation proceeds, taking into consideration the creativity of each of the participating countries as well the local arrangements.

#### **4.4 Discussion concerning challenges to national project implementation**

4.4.1 Dr. Scheren provided a summary of key issues regarding to the challenges faced in the implementation of the project, noting in particular the following; (1) National dialogue/coordination, (2) leadership, (3) demand on the part of the Focal Points, (4) coordination between institutions at national level and (5) budget constraints.

4.4.2 Dr. Scheren informed the Committee that the ongoing Mid-Term Review of the WIO-LaB Project had revealed that there were delays in the implementation of certain activities and there were doubts whether some activities defined in the project document would be completed in time due to limited capacity to implement them at national level. He suggested that the National Focal Points and their representatives present at the meeting provide some briefing on the above listed challenges.



4.4.3 Following the above introduction, the Chair invited the Focal Points to air their views with regard to the national dialogue and national coordination constraints.

4.4.4 Mr. Ali Mohamed noted that the above were not major challenges since there were mechanisms at national level that could facilitate improved coordination and implementation of the WIO-LaB Project. However, the question was how the Focal Points could be facilitated in order to initiate national dialogue. He noted that most countries had national structures in place. However, because Focal points had numerous activities and the budget was limited and motivation was lacking, there was no commitment in pushing the agenda of the project forward. He suggested that the committee should also tackle the issues related to leadership of the National Focal Point Institutions so that delivery in national structures can be achieved.

4.4.5 Ms. Chantal Andrianarivo who is the Focal Point for Madagascar noted that although her institution had signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the WIO-LaB Project for the coordination of project activities at national level in Madagascar, the work involved was demanding, at times requiring full time attention. She suggested that it would be important if the Focal Point was provided with resources to recruit a Focal Point Assistant who would assist in the coordination of the project in Madagascar. She noted that national dialogue would be possible only if adequate resources were provided to the focal points. She also observed that the support received from the government institutions was very limited and in most cases she operated as an individual.

4.4.6 Mr. Jogeewar Seewoobaduth, the Acting Divisional Environment Officer who represented the Acting Director of Environment, Ministry of Environment and National Development Unit, Mauritius noted that considering all the projects components and activities and meetings, the Focal Point could not effectively deliver and there was need for one or two additional persons to assist in the coordination of project activities in Mauritius. He noted that Mauritius Public Service could not be expected to employ additional staff members to undertake this responsibility. Hence it would be important if the project could provide some support to the Ministry of Environment in order to strengthen the focal point office. He further observed that the focal point as a public servant had many other responsibilities apart from coordinating the implementation of WIO-LaB Project activities in Mauritius.

4.4.7 Ms. Fatouma Abdallah expressed similar sentiments and added that the Focal Point of the Union of the Comoros would need at least one additional person to assist in the coordination of the project activities in the Comoros.

4.4.8 Following the above presentations by the Focal Points, the chair suggested that a small sub-Committee consisting of Focal Points led by Kenya and Mauritius should meet with a view to coming up with a concrete proposal aimed at strengthening the offices of the national focal points in order to improve coordination of project activities in participating countries. He noted that it was the responsibility of the Steering Committee to offer a solution to this critical limitation experienced by the participating countries.

4.4.9 The WIO-LaB Project Manager Dr. Peter Scheren noted that it would be important for the sub-committee to be practical in its recommendation since UN restrictions would need to be observed. Mr. Nakamura echoed on the Project Manager's observations noting that there were restrictions in the UN system with regard to the kind of support that could be provided to the National Focal Point Institutions that are also funded by their

Governments. He suggested that in order to avoid disappointments, it would be important if the representatives of UNEP could first review the proposals to be put forward by the sub-Committee before the same are adopted by the Steering Committee.

4.4.10 Dr. Payet expressed his concerns that under the current GEF Project arrangements, that it was easy to recruit a Regional Project Manager and not the National Project Managers. He further expressed concern that all coordination resources were concentrated at regional level as opposed to national level where they were needed most. As the Interim Coordinator of the Nairobi Convention, he offered to take up the matter with GEF Secretariat noting that GEF needed to be realistic and to provide more resources for national level coordination since it did not make sense if there were weak structures at national level.

4.4.11 During the afternoon session, the representative of the sub-Committee presented the outcomes of the sub-Committee's deliberation on the nature of support required by the Focal Point Institutions. Mr. Jogeewar Seewoobaduth reported that the sub-Committee had two options; (a) first option was to put pressure on the National Focal Point institutions in order to recruit additional staff members who would assist with the coordination of the project activities at national level, (b) the second option was for the WIO-LaB Project to set aside a small budget so that National Focal Points could take the responsibility of recruiting additional staff members to assist the focal points in the coordination of activities and make sure there was adequate linkage with the national processes. The first option was however found not to be feasible since there was little possibility that the Governments would provide resources for recruitment of additional staff members. The second option was more practical and a global figure of US\$ 2,000 per month (totalling to US\$ 384,000 for the remaining two years of the WIO-LaB Project) was suggested. It was noted that this option would guarantee better coordination at national level.

4.4.12 Dr. Scheren noted that the project Steering Committee should consider whether the second option was feasible. He however noted that re-allocation of resources for national level coordination would mean that less resources would be available for actual project activities. He also noted the need to seek the advice of UNEP before taking the proposal onboard.

4.4.13 Mr. Waruinge noted that the proposed budget was high and would probably be beyond the scope of the WIO-LaB Project. The Steering Committee should not put a ceiling on the amount that can be allocated for the national level coordination. He suggested that the actual amounts required should be determined through discussions with each of the participating countries' focal points.

4.4.14 Mr. Nakamura noted that there was need for the sub-Committee to provide further details on how the amount of US \$ 2,000 was programmed since UNEP would not issue a blank cheque. Any such support should be clearly linked to the implementation of specific activities. He was also uncertain if the requested funds could be obtained from the Project's present budget. He suggested that the total amount required be contributed by different sources including the country co-financing.

4.4.15 Mr. Datta supporting Mr. Nakamura's views suggested that recommendation put forward by the sub-Committee needed to be less limiting and had to be consistent with the rules and regulations of the implementing agency UNEP. He also wondered where the funds would come from since there was no such allocation in the WIO-LaB Project's present

budget. He suggested that the sub-Committee revisit its recommendation otherwise it would be difficult to implement it.

4.4.16 Mr. Waruinge noted that the sub-Committee should also state the activities to be implemented. In other words, there has to be a good justification for the option put forward.

4.4.17 Notwithstanding the above interventions, it was finally agreed that additional support should be extended to the National Focal Points in order to enable them build the required capacity for enhanced and efficient coordination and implementation of the project activities in participating countries. However, the modalities of provision of such support would be discussed further between the WIO-LaB Project management and the Focal Points of the respective participating countries.

4.4.18 Following this decision, the WIO-LaB Project Manager, Project Officer and the Programme Officer responsible for Nairobi Convention held separate discussions with each of the Focal Points and agreed on the principles of how the WIO-LaB Project and Nairobi Convention could provide support required by the Focal Points in order to expedite the coordination of activities at national level.

#### **4.5 Discussion concerning the LBSA Protocol**

4.5.1 Mr. Waruinge while introducing discussions on LBSA Protocol, noted that with regard to the ability of the Focal Points to organize national dialogue, he was not certain that if the protocol was taken to the meeting of plenipotentiaries, new issues would not arise due non-involvement of all stakeholders in the review process. He noted that the LBSA protocol would set the basis for the amendment of legislations at national level and emphasised the need to have dialogue by engaging all the key stakeholders at national level. In this regard, the Focal Points would have to organize meetings to discuss the proposed LBSA Protocol and establish its usefulness in their countries.

4.5.2 Dr. Scheren wondered whether the Focal Points were reaching the right people at national level noting that the focus seemed to have been on reaching the technical level experts. He also wondered whether the focal points had the right setting to take the LBSA Protocol to the higher policy making level in their countries.

4.5.3 Dr. Payet observed that situations differ from country to country and the Focal Points would need to review the existing legal, policy and institutional frameworks and clearly establish the gaps at national level. He wondered whether this assignment had been undertaken. Dr. Scheren responded that the WIO-LaB Project had already facilitated countries to review the existing gaps in their policies, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks (most the countries had submitted their draft reports).

4.5.4 Mr. Waruinge noted that there were two processes for LBSA Protocol and what was not clear was the process of taking technical comments arising from national dialogue to inform the LBSA Protocol. Mr. Waruinge further noted that the Steering Committee has been presented with an update on the extent of dialogue at national level that was led by the Focal Points. However, what was required at national level was dialogue with persons who drafted legislation in participating countries. There was a need to broaden the national discussions so that officials responsible for drafting legislation were also brought on board. He suggested that before the LBSA Protocol was presented to the meeting of

Plenipotentiaries, there was a need for each country to organize at least one workshop where the LBSA Protocol would be discussed with all the stakeholders.

4.5.6 Mr. Nakamura observed that there had to be some obligations on the part of the participating governments to implement the provisions of the LBSA Protocol once it entered into force. This obligation should be factored into the National Action Programme (NAP) for the protection of the coastal and marine environment from land-based activities that each of the participating countries would be expected to develop. He noted that without putting such a requirement on the part of the governments, there was a high possibility that the LBSA Protocol would be shelved.

4.5.7 Ms. Andrianarivo asked whether it was possible to re-allocate funds earmarked for other Task Forces in order to facilitate an additional meeting/national dialogue noting that one meeting would not be enough.

4.5.8 Mr. Seewoobaduth was concerned about the view of Nairobi Convention that Focal Points were not reaching the high policy and decision making levels. He clarified that it was not the case for Mauritius. The LBSA protocol had been circulated to all stakeholders for comments and then sent to the Minister before the comments were sent to the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit. He clarified that stakeholders were being consulted since it was not the Ministry of Environment alone that would implement the provisions of the LBSA Protocol. He wondered what other additional consultations were required in Mauritius.

4.5.9 Dr. Naomi Mdzeke, the Focal Point for South Africa informed the meeting that South Africa had to follow the established process in the review of the LBSA Protocol. The Protocol would be sent to the existing structures established by the Minister of Environment including DG Forum and Environment Cluster. She however pointed that there were several steps that the Protocol needed to go through in order to facilitate extensive consultations.

4.5.10 Mr. Waruinge acknowledged the confidence that Mauritius had with regard to the national dialogue on the LBSA Protocol and wondered whether the same is true for other participating countries. He emphasised that before the Nairobi Convention Secretariat takes the LBSA Protocol to the Conference of Plenipotentiaries, it had to be sure that the process was well understood at national level and all stakeholders had been involved. He suggested that each of the participating countries should clearly establish the kind of support required from the WIO-LaB Project and Nairobi Convention in order to facilitate the national dialogue.

4.5.11 Mr. Datta expressed his concerns on the sentiments expressed by Dr. Mdzeke with regard to national dialogue in South Africa and noted that actions at national level should be taken in such away that they do not undermine the authority and legitimacy of the Focal Points. However, the WIO-LaB Project manager clarified the matter noting that in case of South Africa, it was not true that the Focal Point was unaware of what was going on, but rather changes in the holder of the position of Focal Point in South Africa left some gaps in the communication. He clarified that the project maintained the principle that it was the Focal points that decided who was to be recruited as a national consultant and what activities were to be undertaken at national level.

## **4.6 Overview of 2006 financial performance**

4.6.1 The Chair, Dr. Rolph Payet introduced the above mentioned agenda item and requested the WIO-LaB Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren to present to the Committee an overview of the financial performance of the WIO-LaB Project in 2006, as presented in document *UNEP-GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/5*.

4.6.2 Dr. Scheren presented the above mentioned overview and noted that the performance of the project in terms of financial expenditure has been rather modest due in part to the non-finalization of the demonstration project documents and the national monitoring programmes. It was expected that the demonstration projects would have taken a huge chunk of the finances allocated for the year 2006. The project expenditure to date is 44.7%

4.6.3 Dr. Scheren noted that the situation would improve in the year 2007 given that most of the demonstration projects were expected to enter into implementation phase by the end of year 2007.

4.6.4 Following the presentation of the financial expenditure report, the Chair opened the floor for deliberations. The Committee took note of the Report on the financial expenditure in the year 2006 and called for an improvement in the expenditure in the year 2007.

#### **4.7 Partners and leveraged resources**

4.7.1 The Chair introduced the above agenda item and invited the WIO-LaB Project Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren to present to the Committee an overview of the collaboration with other project partners, both international and national.

4.7.2 Dr. Scheren reported on the partnerships established by the WIO-LaB Project including also the leveraged resources in terms of co-financing contributions from the key project partners, including the participating project countries. These details are also presented as Annex 9 of the WIO-LaB Annual Report (*UNEP-GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/4*).

4.7.3 Dr. Scheren reported that the total co-financing as off yet (US \$1.2 million) is comparable to the committed amount of US\$ 1.8 million. However, with regard to distribution between government contributions and contributions made by project partners, he noted that countries are underperforming (US\$ 479,000 against partner's contribution of US\$ 749,960).

4.7.4 Following the presentation on the partnerships established by the project including the leveraged resources, the Chair opened the floor for deliberations. The Committee took note of the report on the partnerships established by the project including the leveraged resources, and called for continuation and furtherance of such collaborations in the remaining period of the project, particularly for the outstanding activities.

#### **4.8 Opportunities for enhancement of project implementation**

4.8.1 Discussions under this agenda item followed up on some of the discussions earlier held under items 4.1 to 4.4.

4.8.2 The Chair while opening discussions on the above mentioned sub-agenda item, sought some clarifications from the Project Management and UNEP on how the issues

discussed at the present meeting of the Steering Committee would feed into the process of the Mid-Term Review of the WIO-LaB Project.

4.8.3 Mr. Nakamura responding to this query noted that the Mid-Term Review of the WIO-LaB Project was being carried out by the Oversight and Evaluation Unit, an independent unit of UNEP and the consultant who was conducting the review was expected to produce her draft report by 17<sup>th</sup> March 2007. Although UNEP was be ready to send the Report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Steering Committee to the consultant, he wondered whether there would be sufficient time for the consultant to consider the outputs of the meeting.

4.8.4 Mr. Ali Mohamed sought some clarification on the reasons for underperformance of the project in the implementation of some of the activities. The chair however noted that the issue of lack of capacity as detailed in the presentations made by the Focal Points was the underlying cause of underperformance. This could be attributed to the fact that the focal points are too busy and they cannot deliver without additional support.

4.8.5 Mr. Datta noted that it would be helpful to the Focal Points if they will provide more details as to why there were underperforming in their responsibilities for the project. He also informed the meeting that were it not for the stringent conditions that were put forward in case of demonstration projects, the number of projects expenditure would have gone up. He also requested for a differentiated analysis of the project performance without considering the demonstration projects. He also requested the committee to state whether the WIO-LaB Project was too ambitious and also explore other possibilities of rectifying the current situation.

4.8.6 The WIO-LaB Project Manager Dr. Peter Scheren presented a detailed report on the financial expenditure in the year 2006 and compared the same with the planned expenditures for the same year. He highlighted areas with significant shortcomings in expenditure noting in particular non-implementation of the demonstration projects that were planned to take a share of the 2006 budget. He noted that most of the shortcomings can be attributed to non- finalization of the demonstration projects by the participating countries and also to a small extent on the non-finalization of the national monitoring programmes by the participating institutions.

4.8.7 Mr. Ali Mohamed wondered why the finalization of demonstration projects documents had not yet been completed in some of the countries and suggested that the Steering Committee should establish the difficulties that are experienced by the countries and find out how the countries can be assisted by the project management in order to finalize their projects.

4.8.8 Mr. Datta recalled that the first and the second meeting of the Steering Committee had set clear deadlines for finalization of demonstration project proposals and the Project Management Unit was given the mandate to provide to the project proponents 5% of the total budget of demonstration projects in order to facilitate the finalization of the projects within a period of three months failure to which funds would be allocated to other demonstration projects. He however noted that this carrot and stick approach did not work and hence there was a need for the Steering Committee to provide concrete directions on this matter.

4.8.9 Mr. Datta noted that UNEP Global Programme for the protection of the coastal and marine environment (GPA) did secure counter-part funding from the Government of

Norway for the WIO-LaB Project and would like to report back on the progress in the implementation of activities. However, he noted that it would be inappropriate to paint a picture of project underperformance to the Government of Norway. He expressed the concerns of GPA on the underperformance of the project attributed to lack of adequate capacity to implement project activities in participating countries.

4.8.10 Dr. Payet noted that carrot and stick approach is already being applied by GEF Secretariat as evidenced by cancellation of US\$ 300 million projects. He noted that the participating countries have to take remedial measures otherwise the stick would be applied at a different level and the WIO Region would loose out. He informed the meeting that major donors and some NGOs are no longer interested in providing support to some African countries due to disappointments in the implementation of projects.

4.8.11 Mr. Waruinge said that addressing the problems faced in the implementation of project activities, should first start with an admission by the participating countries that there were problems. He noted that the structures established by the Nairobi Convention have not been adequately used to address these problems. He gave an example of Madagascar noting that if there was a problem in Madagascar, the UNEP/Nairobi Convention Secretariat would usually write a letter to the Minister in charge of the Environment through the Focal Point. He suggested that if things did not move at the Focal Point level, matters have to be taken higher up to the minister's level. He noted that in case of the WIO-LaB Project, the Nairobi Convention had not yet used this approach.

4.8.12 Mr. Datta noted that UNEP and the Project Management should not be the one to complain to the Ministers on issues related to the underperformance at country level. He emphasised that it was the Focal Points that were supposed to deliver the project at country level and they should be reporting to the Permanent Secretaries and their Ministers if things were not moving as expected at national level.

4.8.13 Mr. Waruinge expressed a different view point noting that Nairobi Convention is executing the WIO-LaB Project and given the fact that the National Focal Points were part of the Nairobi Convention Secretariat, the Convention Secretariat had every right to approach the participating countries if things are not working properly. He reiterated that the Nairobi Convention Secretariat had this mandate.

4.8.14 Dr. Payet suggested that the Nairobi Convention should provide feedback to the countries in the form of a letter addressed to the Minister in charge of the Environment stating specific deadlines for achievement of specific pending outputs at national level. The letter should indicate that if the countries did not meet the set deadlines for implementation of pending activities, the project funds would be allocated to other deserving activities and the countries would be at liberty to renegotiate. This would force the countries to make firm commitments. He noted that if countries fail to implement project activities, it would be difficult to convince the external partners on the reasons for non-delivery of project outputs.

4.8.15 Dr. Scheren suggested that the committee should re-examine the situation country by country and not apply the stick across the board.

4.8.16 Mr. Ali Mohamed suggested that the NEPAD COSMAR framework could also be considered while providing the feedback to the parting countries. Mr. Ali Mohamed also noted that without involvement of the top level decision makers things would not move and this was partly the reason why NEPAD was set up. Without involving the Ministers who

interact with the Heads of States nothing will happen at national level. He suggested that the project should engage senior policy level people e.g. through NEPAD COSMAR. He wondered at what level this should be done considering that the Steering Committee meets once a year and it would be too late if it obtains a similar picture. He wondered whether this discussion could further held electronically so that the committee revisits the matter in the next six months.

4.8.17 Dr. Payet suggested that the Nairobi Convention Secretariat together with the WIO-LaB Project Management spends some time together in order to discuss the specific timetable for each of the participating countries. The Focal Points were requested to go through their projects and agree with the project management on the targets and deadlines for realization or finalization of specific activities. This process was undertaken later in the evening and morning of the second day of the meeting.

4.8.18 Mr. Datta suggested that since the Chair of the meeting was also the interim Coordinator of the Nairobi Convention, he should write a letter to the participating countries providing definite indications on what had been agreed upon at the present meeting and what needed to be delivered with a set deadline. The Project Manager is to compile information that would be used to provide feedback to the countries.

4.8.19 Mr. Nakamura noted that with regard to the country co-financing, the contributions were yet to reach optimal level and the Steering Committee should confirm whether the reported figures were fair representation of the in-kind co-finance contributions made by the countries. He suggested that countries provide additional co-finance contributions that can accelerate the implementation of activities.

4.8.20 Dr. Peter Scheren, the WIO-LaB Project Manager responding to the above sentiments informed the meeting that the co-finance contributions were computed using criteria approved by the Steering Committee and the computed figures were sent to the participating countries' Focal Points for confirmation and/or validation. No objection was received from the countries and therefore the quoted figures were considered to reflect the actual situation on the ground. He further noted that comparison of the co-finance commitments made during the project development phase and the actual contributions made so far show that countries have indeed provided a significant portion of in-kind co-financing they committed to provide.

## **5. WORK PLAN FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007**

5.0.1 The Chair introduced the above mentioned agenda item and invited the WIO-LaB Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren to present to the Steering Committee, the WIO-LaB Project Work Plan for the year 2007, as detailed in the document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/6*.

### **5.1 Overview of project work plan for the calendar year 2007**

5.1.1 Dr. Scheren tabled to the Committee the Workplan for the year 2007 noting that the workplan incorporated some of the recommendations that had so far come up during the Mid-Term Review process. Dr. Scheren referred in particular to the recommendations on downscaling activities related to the Incomati ICARM Demonstration project, including a baseline review of other river basins, and providing more assistance to NPA development



for the countries. Furthermore, he took the Steering through work plan for implementation of activities defined for each component of the project.

5.1.2 Mr. Datta suggested that with regard to the demonstration projects, the projects should not revert back to the Focal Points, but instead the Project Management should be mandated to look at the final project document and make its decision on technical grounds.

5.1.3 Dr. Scheren however noted that the project management unit is still operating on the basis of the decision made by the Steering Committee during its second meeting where it was agreed that once demonstration project proponents submit the final project documents as output of phase 1, the proposals would be circulated electronically to the members of the committee for approval, before the PMU proceeds with final funding arrangements. In this light, he requested the opinion of the Steering Committee with regard to the Comoros Moheli demonstration project that had been circulated to the members of the committee electronically.

5.1.4 Dr. Payet, the Chair of the meeting requested members of the Steering Committee to raise any matter related to the circulated Comoros demonstration project. In view of the fact that no objection was received from the members of the Committee, the Chair declared that Comoros demonstration project was approved by the Steering Committee and the Project Management should proceed with the funding arrangements.

5.1.5 Mr. Ali Mohamed noted that Incomati ICARM demonstration project was regarded as an important project for the WIO Region since it would provide lessons on how to deal with or manage transboundary river basins and their associated coastal zones. He however noted that it was possible to make use of the bad situation by extending the experience to other river basins in mainland Africa. However, he indicated that he supported the recommendation put forward by the project management to downscale the ICARM Demonstration project in Mozambique.

5.1.6 Mr. Polycarpo Napica who is the National Focal Point for Mozambique as well as the National Director for Environment in MICOA, noted that a lot of effort was spent in initiating Incomati ICARM demonstration activities and initially there was a suggestion for the involvement of the Netherlands. He indicated that Mozambique could not afford to loose the project since they still needed to collect basic data and background information that would feed into the management plan of the Incomati.

5.1.7 Mr. Datta noted that Incomati was a suitable area to draw lessons on how transboundary river basins and associated coastal zones can be managed effectively. However, it was also complex since in addition to Mozambique, it involved two other southern African countries namely Swaziland and South Africa. He indicated that instead of completely doing away with the demonstration project, the activities should be downscaled. He provided a brief on how the project came into being through engagement between GPA and the Dutch Government. He however indicated that despite downscaling of the project, there were already lessons that could be learnt.

5.1.8 Mr. Datta also informed the meeting that through a survey that was carried out by the GPA, it emerged that there were only very few (four) similar linked management projects that have been implemented in the world and such projects offered a political challenge that was difficult to overcome. He supported the recommendation of the project

management to downscale the project and allocate more resources for natural resources process.

5.1.9 Mr. Nakamura informed the meeting about the mission made by UNEP to the Incomati in Mozambique in 1998. He noted that the present proposal to focus on the preparation of the environmental profile of the basin was feasible and consideration should be made to expand activities if the situation allows. He wondered whether introducing similar ICARM Projects in other river basins would add value since this has already been done through LOICZ AfriBasins Project. It was also noted that GIWA had undertaken similar activities in selected river basins in the region.

5.1.10 Mr. Waruinge noted that the ICARM project offer made by RIKZ of the Netherlands made a lot of sense at the period when it was made. He suggested that the Committee put a cap on the expenditure of the project and allowed only the preparation of an environmental profile of the basin and the associated coastal zone that will also have information on the activities taking place in South Africa and Swaziland. He suggested that the funds saved be used for other activities in order to secure maximum benefits.

5.1.11 Dr. Payet inquired from Mr. Waruinge about the status with regard to the review of the Nairobi Convention and how this was linked to the process for the preparation of the LBSA Protocol. Mr. Waruinge informed the Committee that there were several clauses in the Nairobi Convention that needed amendment in order to accommodate the LBSA Protocol. Other changes in the Nairobi Convention would include expansion of the definition of the Convention itself as well as expansion of the definition of land-based activities.

5.1.12 Following the above deliberations the Steering Committee agreed that the activities earmarked for the Incomati ICARM Demonstration project should be downscaled and be focussed on the preparation of an environmental profile and the project management should re-allocate the saved resources for development of demonstration projects in countries that do not have any, such as Seychelles, as well as if possible establish basic profiles of other main river basins in the region.

5.1.13 Also, following deliberations on the above mentioned presentation, the Steering Committee considered and approved the work plan for the year 2007 as prepared by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit. The Committee also called for enhanced and expedited implementation of the Workplan.

## **5.2 Workplan and strategy for TDA/SAP development**

5.2.1 The Chair introduced the above mentioned agenda item and invited the WIO-LaB Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren to present to the Committee, the workplan and strategy for the preparation of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme (TDA and SAP) for the Western Indian Ocean region, as detailed in the background document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/7*.

5.2.2 Dr. Peter Scheren, while drawing attention of the Committee to the details contained in background document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/7*, presented the approach to be followed in the preparation of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme (TDA and SAP) for the Western Indian Ocean region. He also expounded on the key principles of the TDA and SAP.

5.2.3 Dr. Scheren also briefed the Committee on the context under which the TDA/SAP would be developed, noting in particular the coordination structure discussed between the three GEF projects within the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystem area (WIO-LaB, ASCLME and SWIOFP). Dr. Scheren invited Dr. David La Roche of ASCLME to provide the Committee with additional details on this matter.

5.2.4 Dr. La Roche informed the Committee meeting that ASCLME project document had been signed by the GEF Chief Executive Officer, although recent changes in the GEF Secretariat management slowed down activities. He also informed the meeting that the World-Bank led Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) was yet to be signed by the GEF Chief Executive Officer.

5.2.5 Dr. La Roche noted that these projects would have enormous implications in the WIO Region countries since in addition to other projects, they would bring into the region huge amounts of money (US\$ 100 million). These projects would also provide a lot of opportunities to the Focal Points.

5.2.6 Dr. La Roche noted that while WIO-LaB Project has been mandated with the responsibility of delivering of a TDA/SAP focussed on land-based activities, the ASCLME Project would deliver two TDAs and SAPs for the Agulhas and Somali Current LMEs, respectively. He noted that the TDA that would be delivered by the WIO-LaB Project would feed into these individual LME-based TDAs and SAPs.

5.2.7 Dr. Payet noted almost all GEF projects were engaged in TDAs/SAPs and wondered how the projects could build on the ongoing activities. He noted that a lot of time was wasted producing outputs that had been realised in earlier projects. He noted that most of the issues had been identified in various reports and there was a need to move on to SAP formulation. He noted that if the projects came up with many SAPs, the countries would be confused as to which SAP should be implemented. He noted the need for three projects to converge at some point in order to produce one SAP that would be implemented in the WIO Region.

5.2.7 Dr. Payet further noted that Nairobi Convention offers an ideal legal platform for the countries in the WIO Region to implement SAP developed within the auspices of the WIO-LaB Project and there is a good chance of obtaining government commitment to implement it. He wondered how SAPs that would be produced by other GEF Projects would be implemented. He noted that culmination of SAP would need to be thought at very keenly.

5.2.8 Dr. La Roche noted that the intention of the ASCLME Programme was not to reinvent the wheel but to use all the available data and information including the preliminary TDA/SAP developed with support of UNEP. He noted that with regard to ASCLME, there will be two SAPs and TDAs and attempt would be made to include new information focussed on oceanographic processes, fisheries and economic valuation of marine resources, etc. The latter would enable the governments to have greater appreciation on the value of the coastal and marine resources.

5.2.9 Mr. Ali Mohamed noted that the WIO Region had no SAP although there were initial attempts to come up with an acceptable and negotiated SAP. He noted that with regard to the SAP to be produced under the auspices of ASCLME Programme, scientists in the WIO Region had realized the peculiar differences of the two LMEs and recognised the need for

two separate SAPs. He noted that already the governments in the region have appended their signatures to this arrangement. He further noted that ASCLME Programme was not implemented within the framework of Nairobi Convention does not mean SAP that will be produced could not be implemented within the Convention's framework.

5.2.10 Dr. Payet however noted that in terms of biogeographical and oceanographic scope, the idea of having two separate TDAs and SAPs would make sense. However, WIO region was considered to be a single entity and SAP was a political document. He wondered which SAP Seychelles would be committed to in view of its location in relation to the two LMEs.

5.2.11 Mr. Waruinge noted that the elements of the TDA that will be delivered by the WIO-LaB Project would be used to prepare the Work Programme of the Nairobi Convention and this will be adopted by the governments of the participating countries during the 5<sup>th</sup> Conference of Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention.

5.2.12 The Steering Committee took note of the workplan and strategy for the preparation of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme (TDA and SAP) for the Western Indian Ocean region as prepared by the WIO-LaB Project Management Unit and called for its expedited implementation, taking into account the need to present the outputs and/or outcomes of this process to the forthcoming 5<sup>th</sup> Conference of Contracting Parties (COP-5) to Nairobi Convention to be held in South Africa in August 2007.

### **5.3 Financial allocations for the calendar year 2007**

5.3.1 The Chair introduced the above mentioned agenda item and invited the WIO-LaB Project Manager, Dr. Peter Scheren to present to the Committee, the budget of the WIO-LaB project for the year 2007 as presented in document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/8*. Dr. Scheren presented to the Committee the budget of the WIO-LaB project for the year 2007 as presented in document *UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/8*.

5.3.2 Following the above mentioned presentation, the Chair opened the floor for deliberations and/or suggestions from the members of the Steering Committee. Following discussions it was decided that the budget need to be amended in order to take onboard the need to provide additional support to the National Focal Points with a view to improving the coordination of project activities in participating countries. It was suggested that the Project Management prepares an amended expenditure plan and circulate the same to the members of the Steering Committee for endorsement.

5.3.3 Following discussions that took place between the Focal Points and the WIO-LaB Project Management including also the Nairobi Convention Secretariat, the Project Steering Committee provisionally approved the WIO-LaB Project budget for the year 2007 and called for expedited implementation of project activities. The approved budget is presented as Annex 6 of this report.

## **6. ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 The Chair Dr. Rolph Payet introduced the above mentioned agenda item and invited the Rapporteur Mr. Polycarpo Napica of Mozambique to present the draft decisions and recommendations of the third Project Steering Committee meeting.

6.2 Mr. Napica presented the draft decisions and recommendations of the meeting and requested the Committee to consider the draft, suggest amendments and finally adopt the draft decisions and recommendations of the meeting.

6.3 Following deliberations on the draft decisions and recommendations of the meeting, the Committee adopted them with amendments and authorized their distribution to the National Focal Points Institutions, UNEP-GEF, project partners including other appropriate institutions and/or organizations.

6.4 The members of the Steering Committee as well as representatives of partner institutions and/or organizations were provided with electronic versions of the decisions and recommendations of the third meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee. The same are presented in this Report of the meeting.

## **7. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

7.1 The Chair Dr. Rolph Payet introduced the above mentioned agenda item and suggested that in view of the fact that all focal points would in any case unite during the forthcoming COP-5 of the Nairobi Convention in September 2007 an extra ordinary session of the Steering Committee be held on the sidelines of this event. It was suggested that this meeting be held a day before the COP-5 since the agenda of the latter would be very crowded.

7.2 Mr. Waruinge briefed the meeting on the changes of the dates of the Joint COP of Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions. He noted that consultations were ongoing with the host country South Africa on the exact dates of the conference.

7.3 The delegate from Somalia Mr. Abdi who represented Somalia as an observer expressed appreciation of his country for having been invited to participate in the meeting. However, he regretted that no discussions were held on Somalia's participation in the activities of Nairobi Convention. He expressed the commitment and readiness of Somalia to play a more active role in the activities of Nairobi Convention. Mr. Abdi also requested for support from Nairobi Convention so that Somalia could participate more actively in the activities of the Convention. The Chair, also the interim Coordinator of the Nairobi Convention promised to discuss with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat how the Nairobi Convention can help Somalia.

7.4 The Committee welcomed the participation of Somalia in the meeting and called for concerted efforts to be made in order to assist Somalia participate more actively in the Nairobi Convention activities.

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

8.1 The Chair, Dr. Rolph Payet introduced the above mentioned agenda item and requested members of the Steering Committee/representatives to raise any other matter that they would like to discuss in the meeting.

8.2 Mrs. Fatouma Ali Abdallah, the National Focal Point for the Union of the Comoros announced that she would be joining the UNDP National Office in the Comoros as a SGP National Coordinator. In close collaboration with the new Focal Point to be appointed by the Government of the Union of Comoros, she promised to continue to following-up matters related to the Nairobi Convention and the WIO-LaB Project in the Comoros.

8.3 The Steering Committee congratulated Ms. Fatouma Ali Abdallah on her new appointment and noted the good work she had done for her country, Comoros, as well as for the Convention.

## **9. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

9.1 The Chair, Dr. Rolph Payet introduced the above mentioned agenda item and announced the closure of the third meeting of the WIO-LaB Project Steering Committee. The Chair expressed his appreciation to the members of the Steering Committee for finding time to attend the meeting. He hoped that their stay in Seychelles had been enjoyable

9.2 Dr. Rolph Payet also reminded the Focal Points that a lot of work was to be done and urged them to come up with realistic time tables and to get the project at its present difficulties.

9.3 There being no any other business, the Chair declared the meeting officially closed at 6.50 pm on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2007.

**Annex 1**

**AGENDA**

1. Opening of the meeting
  - 1.1 Introduction of the Steering Committee members
  - 1.2 Opening statements:
    - WIO-LaB Project Manager
    - Nairobi Convention Secretariat
    - UNEP
  - 1.3 Welcome addresses by the Guest of Honour
2. Organization of the meeting (election and designation of Chairman and Rapporteur)
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Report on progress made in the implementation of activities in the calendar year 2006
  - 4.1 Overview of national project implementation (short presentations by NFPs)
  - 4.2 Overview of project activities and status
  - 4.3 Financial report
  - 4.4 Partners and leveraged resources
  - 4.5 Discussions on the opportunities for enhancement of project implementation
5. Work plan for the calendar year 2007
  - 5.1 Overview of project workplan for the calendar year 2007
  - 5.2 Workplan and strategy for TDA/SAP development
  - 5.3 Financial allocations for the calendar year 2007
6. Adoption of the draft decisions and recommendations
7. Administrative matters
8. Any other business
9. Closure of the meeting

**Annex 2**

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED**

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/1 Provisional Agenda

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/2 Annotated Provisional Agenda

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/3 Decisions of the Second Project Steering Committee meeting.

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/4 UNEP/GEF WIO-LaB Project Annual Report for 2006

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/5 UNEP/GEF WIO-LaB Overview of Performance in 2006

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/6 Work plan for the calendar year 2007

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/7 Concept note on the development of TDA/SAP

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.3/8 Proposed budgetary allocations for the calendar year 2007

**Information Documents**

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.2/INF.1 Provisional List of Documents (this document).

UNEP/GEF/WIO-LaB/PSC.2/INF.2 Provisional List of Participants.



**Annex 3**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

<b>COMOROS:</b>	<b>Ms. Fatouma ALI ABDALLAH</b> Deputy Director Direction National l'Environnement Point Focal de la Convention de Nairobi BP 860, Moroni, The COMOROS Tel: (+269) 756029 Fax: (+269) 736388 Email: alfa@comorestelecom.km
<b>KENYA:</b>	<b>Mr. Ali MOHAMED</b> Representing the Director-General National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) P. O. Box 67839-00200 Nairobi, Kenya Tel: (+254) 20 605522/3/6/7 Fax: (+254) 20 608997 E-mail: amwinzi@nema.go.ke or ammwinzi@yahoo.com
<b>MADAGASCAR:</b>	<b>Ms. Chantal ANDRIANARIVO</b> Chef de Cellule Recherche et Biodiversite Association Nationale pour la Gestion Des Aires Proteges B.P. 1424 Antananarivo 101 Republique de Madagascar Tel: (+261) 20 22415 Fax: (+261) 20 22439 E-mail: val@angap.mg
<b>MAURITIUS:</b>	<b>Mr. Jogeewar SEEWOBADUTH</b> Ag. Divisional Environment Officer Ministry of Environment Ken Lee Tower, Barracks Street Port Louis, Mauritius Tel: (+230) 212 4385/3363 Fax: (+230) 212 6671 E-mail: jseewoobaduth@mail.gov.mu
<b>MOZAMBIQUE:</b>	<b>Mr. Polycarpo NAPICA</b> National Director of Environments Ministry of the Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA) Rue de Kassuende, 167 Maputo, Mozambique Tel: (+258) 1 466407 Fax: (+258) 1 465849 E-mail: p.napica@micoa.gov.mz
<b>SEYCHELLES:</b>	<b>Dr. Rolph PAYET</b> Principal Secretary Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources P. O. Box 445

	<p>Victoria, Seychelles  Tel: (+248) 670500  Fax: (+248) 610648  Email: ps@env.gov.sc</p> <p><b>Mr. Jason JACQUELINE</b>  Policy, Planning and Services Division  Ministry of Environment  P.O. Box 1145, Promenade House  Mahe, Seychelles  Tel: (+248) 670421/670400  Fax: (+248) 384078/670647  Email: j.jac@pps.gov.sc</p>
	<p><b>Other participants from Seychelles:</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Flavien JOUBERT</b>  Acting Director for Pollution Prevention and Control  Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources  Botanic Gardens,  Mont Fleuri, Mahe,  Republic of Seychelles  Tel: (248) 670500, (248) 722 890 (cell)  Fax: (248) 610 648  Email: f.joubert@env.gov.sc</p> <p><b>Mr. Jude BIJOUX:</b>  Manager - Seychelles Centre for Marine Research and  Technology (SCMRT)  Seychelles Centre for Marine Research and Technology  Marine Parks Authority (SCMRT-MPA)  P.O. Box 1240  Victoria, Mahe  Republic of Seychelles  Tel: +(248) 225114  Fax: +(248) 722435  Email : j.bijoux@scmrt-mpa.sc</p> <p><b>Mr. Alain DE-COMMARMOND</b>  Department of Environment  E-mail a.deco@env.gov.sc  Tel: (+248) 670400</p> <p><b>Ms. Joanna ADELINE</b>  Environmental Impact Assessment Section  Pollution Control and Environmental Impacts Division  Department of Environment  Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources  P.O. Box 445  Botanical Gardens  Mahe, SEYCHELLES  Tel: +248 67 05 00  Fax: +248 61 06 48  Email: j.adeline@env.gov.sc</p> <p><b>Mr. Justin PROSPER</b>  Department of Environment</p>

	<p><b>Ms. Nanette PORT-LOUIS</b>  Coastal Zone Management Coordinator  Environmental Engineering Section  Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources  Department of Environment  P.O Box 445 Victoria, Mahe  Republic of Seychelles  Tel: (248) 670443 or (248) 722896  Fax: (248) 610637  Email: n.port-louis@env.gov.sc</p> <p><b>Mr. Vivian RADEGONDE</b>  Seychelles Bureau of Standard  P.O. Box 953 Victoria Mahe  Tel: 248 380400  Fax: 248 373820</p> <p><b>Ms. Norlis NAYA</b>  Public Utilities Corporation  nnaya@puc.sc  P.O Box 34, Victoria mahe  Tel: (+248) 678000</p> <p><b>Mr. Ian CHARLETTE</b>  Public Utilities Corporation  iancharlette@rocketmail.com  P.O Box 34 Victoria Mahe  Tel: (+248) 678000</p> <p><b>Mr. Rodney QUATRE</b>  SCMRT-MPA  r.quatre@scmrt-mpa.sc  P.O Box 124 Victoria Mahe</p> <p><b>Mr. Jerry LABLACHE</b>  Island Development Corporation  idcjerry@seychelles.sc  Tel: (+248) 224640  Fax: (+248) 224667,</p>
<b>SOUTH AFRICA:</b>	<p><b>Dr. Naomi MDZEKE</b>  Chief Director - Integrated Coastal Management  Marine and Coastal Management  Department of Environmental Affairs &amp; Tourism  Private Bag X2  Roggebaai 8012  Cape Town, South Africa  Tel: (+27) 21 402 3331  Fax: (+27) 021 421 3670  E-mail: nmdzeke@deat.gov.za</p>
<b>TANZANIA:</b>	<p><b>Mrs. Melania SANGEU</b>  Senior Environment Management Officer  National Environment Management Council (NEMC)  P.O. Box 63154  Dar es Salaam, Tanzania</p>

	<p>Tel: (+255) 22 3124603  Mob: (+255) 744753179  E-mail: melania_sangeu@yahoo.com</p>
<b>NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT (NEPAD):</b>	<p><b>Mr. Ali MOHAMED</b>  Coordinator, Coastal and Marine Programme  National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)  P. O. Box 67839  Nairobi, KENYA  Tel: (+254) 20 609079/609694  Fax: (+254) 20 608997  E-mail: biofish@africaonline.co.ke</p>
<b>WORLD WILDLIFE FUND (WWF) EARPO:</b>	<p><b>Dr. Amani NGUSARU</b>  Eco-Regions Programme  WWF-Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office (EARPO)  P. O. Box 63117  Dar es Salaam, Tanzania  Tel: (+255) 22 2775346  Fax: (+255) 22 2775535  E-mail: angusaru@wwftz.org</p>
<b>WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN):</b>	<p><b>Dr. Jerker TAMELANDER</b>  Marine Technical Project Officer  Eastern Africa Regional Programme  The World Conservation Union (IUCN)  P. O. Box 13513  Dar es Salaam, Tanzania  Tel: (+255) 22 2669 084/5  Fax: (+255) 22 2669 089  E-mail: jaker.tamelander@iucn.org</p>
<b>AGULHAS AND SOMALI CURRENT LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS (ASLME) PROJECT:</b>	<p><b>Dr. David LAROCHE</b>  Project Manager  UNDP/GEF ASLME Project  New York, USA  E-mail: dal1727@starband.net</p>
<b>UNEP/GPA:</b>	<p><b>Dr. Anjan DATTA</b>  UNEP-GPA Coordination Office  P.O Box 16227  The Hague, The Netherlands  Tel: (+31) 70 3114468  Fax: (+31) 70 311-4485  E-mail: a.datta@unep.nl</p>
<b>UNEP/GEF:</b>	<p><b>Mr. Takehiro NAKAMURA</b>  Senior Programme Officer  Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  P.O. Box 30552  Nairobi, Kenya  Tel: (+254) 20 7624607  Fax: (+254) 20 7624041  Email: takehiro.nakamura@unep.org</p>
<b>UNEP/NAIROBI CONVENTION SECRETARIAT:</b>	<p><b>Mr. Dixon WARUNGE</b>  Programme Officer  Regional Seas (Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions)  Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP  P.O Box 47074  Nairobi, Kenya</p>

	<p>Tel: (+254) 20 7623130  Fax: (+254) 20 7623130  Email: dixon.waruinge@unep.org</p>
<b>UNEP-GEF WIOLAB PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT:</b>	<p><b>Dr. Peter SCHEREN</b>  Project Manager  UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project Management Unit  P.O Box 47074  Nairobi, Kenya  Tel: (+254) 20 7624612  Fax: (+254) 20 7623928  Email: peter.scheren@unep.org</p>
	<p><b>Dr. Johnson U. KITHEKA</b>  Project Officer/Environmental Scientist  UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project Management Unit  P.O Box 47074  Nairobi, Kenya  Tel: (+254) 20 7624612  Mobile: (+254) 733777293  Fax: (+254) 20 7623928  Email: johnson.kitheka@unep.org</p>
	<p><b>Ms. Angelina MUSERA</b>  Project Assistant  UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project Management Unit  P.O Box 47074  Nairobi, Kenya  Tel: (+254) 20 7621206  Fax: (+254) 20 7623928  Email: Angelina.musera@unep.org</p>
<b>Observers:</b>	
<b>SOMALIA:</b>	<p><b>Mr. Abdi Salad DAHIR</b>  TFG-Liaison Officer for FAO  Transitional Federal Government of the Somali Republic  Embassy of the Somali Republic  P.O. Box 623 - 00606  Nairobi, Kenya  Tel: (+254) 20 2736618  Fax: (+254) 20 2736619  E-mail: adahir@yahoo.com</p>
<b>LOCAL NGOs -SEYCHELLES</b>	<p><b>Dr. Nirmal Jivan SHAH</b>  Nature Seychelles,  P.O Box 1301 Victoria Mahe  Rep of Seychelles  www.natureseychelles.org  E-mail: nirmalshah@natureseychelles.org  Tel: 248 601100/248 / 601101  Fax: 248 601102</p>
	<p><b>Mr. John NEVILL</b>  Green Island Foundation,  P.O Box 246 Victoria Mahe  Rep of Seychelles  E-mail: jnevill@seychelles.net  Tel: (+248) 717301</p>
	<p><b>Mr. Herve BAROIS</b>  Island Conservation Society</p>

	<p>P.O. Box 775 Victoria Mahe,  Fax: 248324157  Rep of Seychelles  E-mail: Icsoordi@seychelles.sc  Tel: (+248) 714488</p>
	<p><b>Mr.David ROWAT</b>  Marine Conservation Society  P.O Box 1299 Victoria Mahe  Rep of Seychelles  www.mscc.sc  Tel: (+248) 345445  Fax: (+248) 344223</p>
	<p><b>Mr. Lindsay Chong SENG</b>  Seychelles Island Foundation  P.O Box 853 Victoria Mahe,  Rep of Seychelles,  E-mail: I.chengseng@.sc  Tel: (+248) 321735  Fax: (+248) 324884</p>

**Annex 4 OVERVIEW OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE IN THE YEAR 2006**

			Planned expenditures			Status 31 December 2006			Balance for 2006		
			GEF	NOR	Total	GEF	NOR	Total	GEF	NOR	Total
<b>10</b>	<b>PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>										
	1100	Project Personnel	194,000	90,000	284,000	188,114	54,888	243,003	5,886	35,112	40,997
	1200	Consultants	74,395	88,000	162,395	42,203	60,000	102,203	32,192	28,000	60,192
	1600	Travel on official business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>1999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>294,895</b>	<b>208,000</b>	<b>502,895</b>	<b>237,150</b>	<b>123,555</b>	<b>360,705</b>	<b>57,745</b>	<b>84,445</b>	<b>142,190</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>SUBCONTRACT COMPONENT</b>										
	2100	Sub-contract (for cooperating agencies)	77,500	0	77,500	40,040	0	40,040	37,460	0	37,460
	2200	Sub-contracts (for supporting organizations)	592,000	1,031,000	1,623,000	101,666	516,427	618,093	490,334	514,573	1,004,907
	2300	Sub-contracts (for Commercial purposes)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>669,500</b>	<b>1,031,000</b>	<b>1,700,500</b>	<b>141,706</b>	<b>516,427</b>	<b>658,133</b>	<b>527,794</b>	<b>514,573</b>	<b>1,042,367</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>TRAINING COMPONENT</b>										
	3200	Group training	150,000	0	150,000	138,073	0	138,073	11,927	0	11,927
	3300	Meetings/conferences	152,300	40,000	192,300	140,687	34,729	175,415	11,613	5,271	16,885
<b>3999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>302,300</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>342,300</b>	<b>278,760</b>	<b>34,729</b>	<b>313,488</b>	<b>23,540</b>	<b>5,271</b>	<b>28,812</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT</b>										
	4100	Expendable equipment (items under \$1500 each)	11,000	0	11,000	5,183	0	5,183	5,817	0	5,817
	4200	Non-expendable equipment	100,700	0	100,700	22,460	0	22,460	78,240	0	78,240
	4300	Premises (rent)	12,000	0	12,000	0	0	0	12,000	0	12,000
<b>4999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>123,700</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>123,700</b>	<b>27,643</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,643</b>	<b>96,057</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>96,057</b>
<b>50</b>	<b>MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>										
	5100	Operation and maintenance of equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5200	Reporting cost	12,500	122,000	134,500	4,805	0	4,805	7,695	122,000	129,695
	5300	Sundry	10,500	0	10,500	712	0	712	9,788	0	9,788
	5400	Hospitality and entertainment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5500	Evaluation	7,500	0	7,500	0	0	0	7,500	0	7,500
<b>5999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>30,500</b>	<b>122,000</b>	<b>152,500</b>	<b>5,517</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,517</b>	<b>24,983</b>	<b>122,000</b>	<b>146,983</b>
<b>99</b>	<b>PROJECT GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>1,420,895</b>	<b>1,401,000</b>	<b>2,821,895</b>	<b>690,775</b>	<b>674,710</b>	<b>1,365,486</b>	<b>730,120</b>	<b>726,290</b>	<b>1,456,409</b>
	5304	NB: (*) Pproject management fee)	99,463	182,130	281,593	48,354	87,712	136,067	51,108	94,418	145,526
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>1,520,358</b>	<b>1,583,130</b>	<b>3,103,488</b>	<b>739,129</b>	<b>762,423</b>	<b>1,501,552</b>	<b>781,228</b>	<b>820,707</b>	<b>1,601,936</b>



**Annex 5**

**WORK PLAN FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007**





**United Nations  
Environment Programme**



**Global Environment  
Facility**

## **UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB PROJECT**

### ***ADDRESSING LAND BASED ACTIVITIES IN THE WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN***

## **ANNUAL WORKPLAN 2007**

**UNEP-GEF WIO-LAB Project Management Unit  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
P.O Box 30552  
Gigiri, Nairobi 00100, Kenya  
Tel: +254-020-7621206/1270  
Fax: +254-020-7623203  
E-mail: [wiolab@unep.org](mailto:wiolab@unep.org)  
<http://www.wiolab.org>**

---

## Table of Contents

### Summary

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Assessing water and sediment quality**
- 3. Managing Municipal Wastewater (MWW)**
- 4. Managing Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats (PADH)**
- 5. Strengthening of the legal framework**
- 6. Environmental Impact Assessment**
- 7. National Programmes of Action**
- 8. Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management**
- 9. Regional coordination**
- 10. Training and education**
- 11. Stakeholder participation**
- 12. TDA/SAP**

## Acronyms

CHM	Clearinghouse Mechanism
COP	Conference of Parties
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EQO	Environmental Quality Objective
EQS	Environmental Quality Standard
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPA	UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities
ICARM	Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management
IW	International Waters
LBA	Land-based Activity
LBSA	Land-based Sources and Activities
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MWW	Municipal Wastewater
NFP	National Focal Point
NFPI	National Focal Point Institution
NPA	National Programme of Action
PADH	Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats
PMU	WIO-LaB Project Management Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SAP	Strategic Action Plan
SGP	Small Grants Programme
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
WIO	Western Indian Ocean
WIOMSA	Western Indian Ocean Marine Sciences Association

## 1. Introduction

By December 2006, the WIO-LaB Project had completed its second year of implementation, and has therefore reached its halfway mark. As will be noted in this report, the implementation of the Project is still on course, despite delays in the initiation of certain activities. The main bottleneck in the implementation of the project activities has been the limited capacity (both in terms of human and financial resources) of the National Focal Point Institutions (NFPIs). This problem has now been partly resolved through the provision of financial support to those institutions. Nevertheless, much effort is required in order to ensure that project activities that initially had a relatively slow start are timely completed within the context of the overall project workplan.

The project workplan presented in the following sections has undergone a number of revisions in order to address changes required in order to keep it abreast with ongoing processes. A schematic representation of the detailed overall workplan is presented in Annex 1.

## 2. Assessing water and sediment quality

The 2007 workplan for this project component concentrates on a number of ongoing and new activities. It is anticipated that this component of the project will be largely completed by the end of 2007, in order to ensure timely inputs of findings into the development of the updated Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the WIO region (component 11). The outputs of the monitoring programme will also be applied to develop a long-term Monitoring Protocol as well as tangible Environmental Quality Objectives and Standards (EQO/EQS). Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Implementation of the regional monitoring programme	1 Jan – 31 Oct 2007
Assessment of ecotone carrying capacity	1 Jan – 31 Oct 2007
Assessment of hot spots (largely on the basis of the results of monitoring programme)	1 Jan – 31 Oct 2007
Establishment of EQOs and EQSs	1 Jan – 30 Nov 2007
The development of a long-term Monitoring Protocol	1 June – 30 Nov 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Regional workshop on ecotones and hot spots assessment	June 2007
Regional workshop on Environmental Quality Objectives and Standards	Dec 2007

Furthermore, in conjunction with project component 8, activities towards the establishment of a regional information management system under the auspices of the Nairobi Convention will be continued during the year.

## 3. Managing Municipal Wastewater (MWW)

The 2007 workplan for this project component focuses to a large extent on the implementation and the extraction of lessons learnt from the demonstration projects. Apart from this, the ongoing regional assessment of the status of municipal wastewater management and the review of the applicability of the global GPA guidelines will be finalized and training and education activities will be developed and undertaken. Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Implementation of demonstration projects	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Tracking of lessons learnt from demonstration projects	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Preparation of bankable project documents	1 Jan – 30 Apr 2007
Fundraising for bankable project proposals	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Development and implementation of MWW training programmes (in cooperation with GPA)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Development and implementation of educational /awareness raising programmes (partly in conjunction with the demonstration projects)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Review of the status of MWW management in the WIO region	1 Jan – 31 May 2007
Development of a regional annex to the GPA guidelines	1 Jan – 31 May 2007
Support to TDA/SAP development (component 11)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Third meeting of the Regional MWW Task Force	April 2007

#### **4. Managing Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats (PADH)**

The 2007 workplan for this project component focuses to a large extent on the implementation of, and the extraction of lessons learnt from the demonstration projects. Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Implementation of demonstration projects	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Tracking of lessons learnt from demonstration projects	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Preparation of bankable project documents	1 Jan – 30 Apr 2007
Fundraising for bankable project proposals	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Development and implementation of PADH training programmes	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Development and implementation of educational /awareness raising programmes (partly in conjunction with the demonstration projects)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Support to TDA/SAP development (component 11)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Third meeting of the Regional PADH Task Force	April 2007

#### **5. Strengthening of the legal framework**

The 2007 workplan for this project component focuses first of all on the completion of ongoing national policy, legal and institutional review processes as well as the finalization of the LBA/S Protocol. Furthermore, the focus of this component will be on the development of national implementation strategies with regard to the recommendations from the review processes including the new Protocol. On the basis of these implementation strategies, selected priority activities will be defined in order to assist countries in strengthening their policy, legal and institutional frameworks to deal with LBA/S. Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Finalization of national review reports and regional synthesis reports	1 Jan – 31 May 2007
Preparation of national implementation plans	1 Jan – 31 March 2007
Support to the implementation of national priority activities to strengthen national policy, legal and institutional frameworks	31 March – 31 Dec 2007
National consultations on second draft LBA Protocol	1 Jan – 28 Feb 2007
Finalization of third draft LBA Protocol	28 Feb - 15 March 2007

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
National consultations and awareness raising on (third) draft LBA Protocol	15 March – 15 Aug 2007
Preparation of final draft LBA Protocol	15 March - 15 May 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Third meeting of the Regional Legal and Technical Review Task Force	31 Jan – 2 Feb 2007
Submission of draft Protocol to NC/COP	31 May 2007

## 6. Environmental Impact Assessment

The 2007 workplan for this project component focuses on the completion of the current draft outputs, which are the Regional Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment and the regional overview of existing EIA frameworks. Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Preparation of draft Regional EIA Guidelines	1-28 Jan 2007
Preparation of draft NC Clauses on EIA	1-28 Jan 2007
Finalisation of draft EIA guidelines	1-28 Feb 2007
National-level review of draft EIA Guidelines	1 March – 30 June 2007
Finalisation of Regional Report on EIA	1 March – 30 June 2007
Finalisation of Regional EIA Guidelines	1 March – 30 June 2007
Finalisation of NC Clauses on EIA	1 March – 30 June 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Regional workshop on EIA processes	29-30 Jan 2007
Workshop to endorse regional EIA guidelines and NC Clauses on EIA	July 2007

## 7. National Programmes of Action

So far only Kenya and Tanzania have embarked on the preparation of a National Programme of Action. In 2007, further emphasis shall be given to this activity, in order to ensure that countries will establish appropriate national action plans for addressing the impacts of LBA/S. The effort will be linked as much as possible to strengthening existing national policy frameworks, such as existing ICZM Plans, National Environment Management Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategies and the like, rather than producing stand-alone strategies and policies, in order to ensure sustainability. Key activities as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Awareness raising on the benefits of NPAs	1 Jan – 30 June 2007
Development of a capacity building plan for NPA development	1 Jan – 30 June 2007
Assist countries in the development of NPAs	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007

## 8. Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management

The implementation of an Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM) demonstration project on the Incomati River Basin in Mozambique is ongoing, following the signing of an MOU with the Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA) in Mozambique.

The first phase of this demonstration project involves the preparation of a comprehensive environmental profile of the Incomati basin. In 2007, this activity shall be continued. Key activities as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Development of an environmental and socio-economic profile of the Incomati River basin	1 Jan – 30 June 2007
Development of an ICARM strategy for the Incomati River Basin	1 June – 31 Dec 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Regional workshop on ICARM to present interim results and to exchange lessons learnt	June 2007

The above represents the baseline scenario. However, in view of the major contribution of river basins in terms of LBA/S impacts on the coastal environment, it is felt that there is a need for a basic assessment of other main river basins. This assessment would focus on the inventory of LBA/S such as land-use changes, changes in demographic patterns (e.g. urbanization), damming of rivers, etc. in such river basins, as well as the collection of available data on water quality from those river basins. It is noted that such inventory was originally not foreseen, but it now proposed to be included in the revised project workplan.

## 9. Regional coordination

The project will continue to support the Nairobi Convention secretariat in ensuring regional coordination in the management of the coastal and marine waters of the WIO region. A key activity in this regard is the development of a regional Clearinghouse Mechanism. Also, several regional stakeholder forums will be taking place in the year 2007, most important of which the COP of the Nairobi Convention. Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Regional Project Coordination (continuous)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Development and operation of a Regional Clearinghouse Mechanism	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Monitoring and evaluation of project activities and achievements (continuous)	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
<b>Events</b>	
Fifth Conference of Parties of the Nairobi Convention	Aug 2007
Second Informal International Waters Forum	Oct 2007

## 10. Training and education

The regional assessment of training and educational needs (by WIOMSA) has nearly been completed. Several training activities have already been taken place. The focus of the project in 2007 will be on implementing the identified training and educational activities. Key activities as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Development of training programmes	1 Jan – 31 Aug 2007
Develop educational material for schools and institutes	1 Apr – 31 Aug 2007
Implementation of the training programme	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Implement educational and awareness activities	1 Sept – 31 Dec 2007

## 11. Stakeholder participation

The stakeholder participation plan will focus on the engagement of national stakeholders in project activities, such as the demonstration projects, through the mechanism of national Task Forces, Working Groups and Committees established by the project and through the implementation of the small-grants programme. Other specific stakeholder awareness activities (e.g. news broadcasts, townhall meetings, newsletters, etc.) have been integrated into the demonstration projects, as well as as part of MOUs established with the National Focal Point Institutions. Some awareness material has already been prepared by the project. However, more targeted awareness material will be prepared in conjunction with the education programme (component 9). Key activities as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Stakeholder (including private sector) engagement in demonstration projects	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
National stakeholder involvement meetings (Task Forces, Committees, Working Groups) related to project activities	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Implementation of the small grants programme	1 Jan – 31 Dec 2007
Development of targeted awareness raising material	1 Apr – 31 Aug 2007
Targeted stakeholder awareness raising activities	1 Sept – 31 Dec 2007

## 12. TDA/SAP

The recruitment process for the TDA Drafting Team is currently ongoing and a preliminary workplan for the TDA and SAP development has been developed. Key activities and events as part of this project component are listed below:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>
Establishment of TDA Drafting Team	1 Jan – 28 Feb 2007
Fact finding and initial review of transboundary problems	1 March – 31 Apr 2007
Causal Chain and governance analysis	1 May – 30 June 2007
Submission of draft TDA by Drafting Team	30 June 2007
Review and validation of the TDA	1 July – 30 Sept 2007
Finalisation of the TDA	1 Oct – 31 Dec 2007
<b>Events</b>	
First regional TDA/SAP workshop	April 2007





**UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project**  
Addressing Land Based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean



UNEP/GEF/WIO-LAB/PSC.3/8

**Annex 6 PROPOSED BUDGETARY ALLOCATIONS FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2007**

			2007 original planned			2007 new proposal		
			GEF	NOR	Total	GEF	NOR	Total
<b>10</b>	<b>PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>							
	1100	Project Personnel Grade	199,820	350,000	549,820	199,820	0	199,820
	1200	Consultants (Description of activity/service) w/m	87,000	135,000	222,000	114,000	201,750	315,750
	1600	Travel on official business	26,500	30,899	57,399	20,000	20,000	40,000
<b>1999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>313,320</b>	<b>515,899</b>	<b>829,219</b>	<b>333,820</b>	<b>221,750</b>	<b>555,570</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>SUBCONTRACT COMPONENT</b>							
	2100	Sub-contract (MOUs/Las for cooperating agencies)	37,500	0	37,500	53,100	0	53,100
	2200	Sub-contracts (MOUs/Las for supporting organizations)	468,000	895,000	1,363,000	555,500	1,502,275	2,057,775
	2300	Sub-contracts (for Commercial purposes)	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0
<b>2999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>525,500</b>	<b>895,000</b>	<b>1,420,500</b>	<b>608,600</b>	<b>1,502,275</b>	<b>2,110,875</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>TRAINING COMPONENT</b>							
	3200	Group training (Title)	151,200	0	151,200	150,000	35,000	185,000
	3300	Meetings/conferences	174,500	133,307	307,807	284,000	101,250	385,250
<b>3999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>325,700</b>	<b>133,307</b>	<b>459,007</b>	<b>434,000</b>	<b>136,250</b>	<b>570,250</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT</b>							
	4100	Expendable equipment (items under \$1500 each)	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	0	6,000
	4200	Non-expendable equipment (see items listed on budget worksheet)	3,000	0	3,000	20,000	0	20,000
	4300	Premises (rent)	12,000	0	12,000	0	0	0
<b>4999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>21,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,000</b>	<b>26,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26,000</b>
<b>50</b>	<b>MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>							
	5200	Reporting cost	24,000	85,000	109,000	30,000	0	30,000
	5300	Sundry	10,500	0	10,500	10,000	0	10,000
	5500	Evaluation	15,000	0	15,000	0	0	0
<b>5999</b>	<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>49,500</b>	<b>85,000</b>	<b>134,500</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40,000</b>
<b>99</b>	<b>PROJECT GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>1,235,020</b>	<b>1,629,206</b>	<b>2,864,226</b>	<b>1,442,420</b>	<b>1,860,275</b>	<b>3,302,695</b>
	5304	Other (UNOPS/UNON project management fee)	86,451	211,797	298,248	100,969	241,836	342,805
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>1,321,471</b>	<b>1,841,003</b>	<b>3,162,474</b>	<b>1,543,389</b>	<b>2,102,111</b>	<b>3,645,500</b>