

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW (PIR) 1998

UNDP/GEF PIR Report 98

For all regular UNDP/GEF projects (*excluding* enabling and pre-investment activities such as PPAs, PRIFs, and PDFs) that have been under implementation for over 1 (one) year, as of June 30, 1998

1 Basic Project Data (this section will be completed at headquarters based on the PIMS data)

1.1 Identifiers

Short Title: Lake Tanganyika

Project Number: RAF92G32

Bureau: RBA

Country/Host: BURUNDI, TANZANIA AND ZAIRE

Focal Area: BD CC OZ IW LD

Operational Program: BD: Coastal, marine & freshwater ecosystems

Date of entry in WP (MM/DD/YY): 01-dec-91

ProDoc Signature date (MM/DD/YY): 14-feb-95

1.2 Brief Project Description: The 5-year project aims to improve understanding of the ecosystem function and effects of stresses on the lake system; to take action on all other measures necessary to maintain the health and biodiversity of the ecosystem; and to co-ordinate the efforts of the four countries to control pollution and to prevent the loss of the exceptional diversity of Lake Tanganyika.

1.3 Executing Agency Type: UN Agency
Name: OPS

1.4 National Implementing Agencies:

1.5 Contacts

Res Rep: Mr. Simon Nhongo (a.i.)

Country Office Focal Point: Sylvester Sisila

Project Manager: Andrew Menz

1.6 Financial Data

GEF funding: 10,000,000

Co-financing: UNDP (TRAC):
Government:
National Implementing Agency:
World Bank:
Regional Dev. Bank:
Others:

Total Funding for Co-financing:	
Total Funding for project:	10,000,000
Associated Project Funding:	

1.6.1 Financial Status

Planned disbursements (\$millions) as of 6/30/98

Actual disbursements (\$millions) as of 6/30/98

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

2 Project Design (this section will be partly completed by headquarters (HQ))

2.1 Development Objective: (HQ) The ultimate objective of the project is to demonstrate an effective regional approach to control pollution and to prevent the loss of the exceptional diversity of Lake Tanganyika's international waters. For this purpose, the development objective which has to be met is the creation of the capacity in the four participating countries to manage the lake on a regional basis as a sound and sustainable environment. The means by which the project proposes to achieve this development objective are set out in the project document.

2.2 Immediate Objectives: (HQ)

Immediate objective 1

Establish a regional long-term management program for pollution control, conservation and maintenance of biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika.

Immediate objective 2

Formulation of a regional legal framework for co-operative management of the lake environment.

Immediate objective 3

Establish a programme of environmental education and training for Lake Tanganyika and its basin.

Immediate objective 4

Establish tested mechanisms for regional co-ordination in conservation management of the Lake Tanganyika basin.

Immediate objective 5

In order to produce a full Strategic Plan for long-term application, some specific studies need to be undertaken. These special studies will also add to the understanding of the lake as a whole and, in some cases, provide the baseline and framework for long-term research and monitoring programmes.

Immediate objective 6

The implementation and sustainability of the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Plan and

incorporated environmental management proposals.

2.3 Performance Indicators:

Note that the performance indicators listed are the original indicators pertaining to the six immediate objectives. As requested at the previous TPR others are being developed to measure performance against key outputs.

How can the achievement of Objective 1 be observed?

- When a Management Plan (the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Action Plan) is accepted by all riparian states, is supported by appropriate legislation and a Regional Management Committee and supporting technical committees are formally constituted and supported by legislation;
- When nationally defined action programmes contained within the management plan are funded and operational.

How can the achievement of Objective 2 be observed?

- When a draft regional agreement for the co-operative management of the Lake (“the Agreement”) has been drafted and approved by representatives from each of the countries.
- When the Agreement has been formally signed by all, or the majority, of the countries.

How can the achievement of Objective 3 be observed?

- When national environment education programmes involving NGOs and Government agencies are underway which address the specific issues related to the lake.
- When the effects of such programmes can be seen in terms of increased awareness at all levels, including policy level, and changes brought about in activities identified as deleterious to the well-being of the lake.
- When a cadre of trained environmental scientists and technicians are available to provide governmental institutions and the Regional Lake Basin Management Committee with the information and recommendations required to take rational management decisions.

How can the achievement of Objective 4 be observed?

- When an operational Lake Tanganyika Basin Management Committee, as the principal body for regional co-ordination in policy management, exists that has demonstrated its ability to tackle the issues effectively by engendering appropriate action through a strategic planning process.
- When regular meetings of technical working groups take place within an overall monitoring and management structure with a clear mandate and the necessary resources to collect and analyse data from monitoring programmes and formulate recommendations for mitigation of threats to the lake’s biodiversity.
- When a regional information exchange network exists to support national activities.

How can the achievement of Objective 5 be observed?

- Successful completion of the various special studies with published results and recommendations. These will identify trends in current and potential threats to the lake, make recommendations for mitigation and cost effective monitoring.
- Successful integration of monitoring and scientific research programmes proposals into a strategic planning process supported by the necessary institutional mechanisms.

How can the achievement of Objective 6 be observed?

- When underwater conservation areas are established in all four countries with operational management plans;
- When long term research and monitoring programmes are operational with funding for the time horizon of the Strategic Plan and which include the participation of all stakeholder groups;
- When operational management interventions are funded that are fully effective in identifying and responding to environmental threats to the lake and the needs of the communities affected.

2.4 Assumptions:

Note: to-date none of the project documents list explicit assumptions but talk of risks and constraints; the following assumptions are based on those.

Assumption 1.

That the security situation will improve all around the lake, and that expected short periods of insecurity will not impede the implementation on of the project.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **High**

The project has been and continues to be seriously affected by the current conflicts in DR Congo and Burundi, although the latter is currently less of a problem.

Assumption 2

That the 4 countries continue cooperation on the lake after the project.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Modest**

This assumes external funding is found to finance co-operative action. Without the risk of failure becomes high.

Assumption 3

That the project is given low priority by the recipient governments and diverts resources to other environmental projects.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Modest** to Substantial.

This varies across the region, Burundi gives this project a high priority whereas in Tanzania it competes with many others. In DRC particularly in the lake region it is

high but seems less so in Kinshasa. In Zambia it is also in competition with many other projects but they give it reasonable priority.

Assumption 4

That funding is forthcoming for recommended mitigating actions either from local governments or donors.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Modest**

It seems reasonable to suppose that funding will be obtained for action beyond the duration of the project provided they are seen to be part of a regional programme within the context of a Strategic Action Plan support by the four governments.

Assumption 5

That the legislatures of the Lake Tanganyika basin countries fail to move towards harmonising their natural resources legislation regarding the lake.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Currently High**

This depends largely on obtaining ratification of the legal agreement being drawn up by the project for the management of the lake. Current political relations are not generally good between the four countries. Nevertheless the impact of this assumption failing to materialise in the medium term would be somewhat mitigated if the Strategic Action Plan were signed and implemented.

Assumption 6

That the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) developed by the project is signed at high level in all four governments.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Currently Substantial**

Nevertheless a modest improvement in relations could enable the SAP to be signed as this would constitute a general agreement of principals and priorities for action to address transboundary concerns rather than a legally binding treaty.

Assumption 7.

That areas of conflict between the need for conservation and the expectations of local communities can be resolved in part through the generation of alternative livelihoods.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Modest.**

Assumption 8.

Level of local resources, especially staff, available to carry out special studies is of sufficient standard.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Modest.**

Varies across countries and disciplines but in some cases available staff of low standard.

Assumption 9.

That the project will leave in place a cadre of individuals in all four countries in all stakeholder institutions able to carry forward the Strategic Action Plan.

Probability that the assumption may fail to hold or materialise. **Modest.**

Probably the greater risk is that key individuals will cease to be available at critical times in the early stages of handing over full responsibility for the SAP to the region.

Assumption 10.

That two full time senior managerial staff in the field would be sufficient to implement the project.

This was an implicit assumption of the agreed project design was very risky and failed.

3 Project Performance

3.1 Procurement Data

Please report the US\$ value of UNDP/GEF Payments to Supplying Countries for Procurement in GEF Donor Countries. Please enter Project **expenditure** from project start up until December 31, 1997 into the matrix against the donor country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project.

Supplying Country	Personnel	Sub-contracts	Equipment	Training	Total
Argentina					
Australia					
Austria					
Belgium					
Brazil					
Canada					
China					
Côte d'Ivoire					
Czech Republic					
Denmark					
Egypt					
Finland					
France					

Supplying Country	Personnel	Sub-contracts	Equipment	Training	Total
Germany					
Greece					
India					
Ireland					
Italy					
Japan					
Korea					
Luxembourg					
Mexico					
Netherlands					
New Zealand					
Nigeria					
Norway					
Pakistan					
Portugal					
Russia					
Slovenia					
Spain					
Sweden					
Switzerland					
Turkey					
United Kingdom					
United States					

Please calculate the following ratio:

Procurement from donor countries as a % of total project expenditure from project start up to December 1997:

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Implementation Progress Rating

Immediate Objective, 1.

Satisfactory:

The development of the SAP under the currently approved process is going well although the full participation of Congo in the development of the first draft is now doubtful.

Immediate Objective, 2. Satisfactory:

The process agreed at the regional workshop held in February 1998 can still be expected to produce a document agreeable to all in good time. However, whether or not each country signs the Agreement is a matter of local foreign policy and cannot be guaranteed to occur within the lifetime of the current project.

Immediate Objective, 3. Unsatisfactory:

Progress within this very broad objective is patchy across the region being best in Zambia and currently non-existent in Congo and Burundi. Subsequent to the agreements made at the last TPR remedial actions, including the appointment of a full time Socio-Economic/Environmental Education field co-ordinator/facilitator are being implemented. In addition a training needs assessment has been carried out that will result in a more coherent approach to the achievement of this objective.

Immediate Objective, 4. Satisfactory:

This objective depends largely on the outcome of the legal component and the development of an agreed structure for the lake management body during the latter stages of the project.

Immediate Objective, 5. Unsatisfactory:

Due to general delays in physical implementation, some avoidable, but many unavoidable owing largely to large geographical and institutional scope of project coupled with the lack of full time field staff. These factors have been exacerbated by periods of limited or no access to large sections of the lake shore.

Immediate Objective, 6.

It is too early in the project to rate this in terms of implementation as it relates essentially to the implementation of Strategic Action Plan. Nevertheless it is likely that such implementation will fall short of the original project expectations as on the current schedule it was due to begin around August 1998 This is now not possible because of the status of other project components.

Project as a whole:

Unsatisfactory:

See below

3.2.2 Reasons for success or difficulties (such as delays, cost overruns) in implementation

Successes has been due to dedication of a small number of field staff both regional and external working under unexpectedly difficult conditions; augmented by high quality external and local consultants.

Difficulties have resulted from delays in choice and procurement of equipment, delays owing to lack of clarity regarding local reimbursement for services and other matters regarding administration in the field, wars, shortage of full time field staff and of quality part time staff.

3.3 Project Impact

3.3.1 Impact rating

Project as a whole

Currently unsatisfactory but cannot be judged accurately until project completed.

Note: The Lake Tanganyika Project must be considered as a multi-focal area project, containing elements of the Operational Programmes for Biodiversity and International Waters.

3.3.2 Verbal assessment of project impact

It is premature to try and judge project impact as it is at a stage where in spite of previous difficulties much could still be achieved through the ongoing strategic planning process and the activities that could lead from that. To say more with two years still to run would be speculative.

3.3.3 Basis for impact assessment:

3.3.3.1 What is the data or information base for your assessment?

3.3.3.2 What are your experiences with impact indicators?

3.3.3.3 Can the change in indicator values be measured against a baseline or a target?

3.3.3.4 What is the main obstacle to assess the impact of the project?

3.4 Project Relevance

Please assess adequacy of project design and validity of project purpose

Original project design was poor owing in particular to a lack of detailed consideration of project implementation logistics, including project expectations of national involvement support in kind expected and conditions under which that support would be provided.

Project purpose remains valid as without a raised awareness nationally coupled with a lake wide i.e. regional overview, and agreed planning process threats to the lake will almost certainly increase to the point where reversal is impossible.

3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

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

- a) Quarterly progress reports
- b) Progress review at National working group meetings
- c) Progress review at Regional Steering committee meetings
- d) Tripartite reviews
- e) Mid-term review - now due, expected in November 1998

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

First January 1998

Second due January 1999

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

None.

3.6 Sustainability and Replication

The process whereby the Strategic Action Plan for the lake is being developed provides good potential for sustainability as it emphasises the interactive and cyclical nature of the process rather than the plan as a one off output. It also provides a logical process for decision making and setting priorities for action that does not necessarily depend and on large inputs of resources.

Sustainability of lake health indicators will be almost entirely dependent on the ability to leverage additional funding before the end of the current project.

4 Stakeholder involvement

4.1 Type of stakeholder involved in which phase of the project cycle

Stakeholders Project phase	Government			NGOs			For Profit Org.	Academic /Research Institut.	Others
	national	regional	local	internati onal	national	commu nity org			
Design	<u>x</u>						<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	
Implement.	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>	
M&E	<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>		<u>x</u>	<u>x</u>				

4.2 All Stakeholder

4.2.1 Does the actual set of stakeholders reflect the real stakeholders?

Yes.

4.2.2 Estimation of time and cost for adequate stakeholder involvement

Through workshops, meetings, both nationally and regionally and on-the-job training a large proportion of the projects time and money is spent on trying to involve stakeholders at the different levels. Owing to the very broad stakeholder base of this project maintenance of continuity of involvement throughout the project is a major challenge and a heavy drain on resources. Eg the agreed basic SAP process (workshops meetings etc) is expected to cost \$400,000 over 15 months.

4.2.3 Which are the mechanisms set up by project management to assure participation of stakeholders in decision making?

Village environmental committees.

National working groups

National steering committees

National and local, NGO and private sector participation in SAP process.

Environmental Education awareness programmes and PRAs at village level.

4.2.4 Assessment of how stakeholder involvement has influenced (degree of ownership) project design, implementation and impact.

Most probably had little involvement in project design and involvement in certain sectors of project implementation has not been adequate. However the content of the SAP is largely being driven by local stakeholders as will be the design of proposals for mitigating actions.

4.2.5 Please describe efforts made to involve women in project design and implementation and the effect of this on the prospects for achieving global environmental objectives.

To date no specific efforts to involve women have been made other than to ensure as much participation as possible during participatory rural appraisals.

4.3 NGO Stakeholder

Please refer to attachment on Stakeholder Involvement.

4.3.1 Full names of each participating NGOs.

Burundi:

Advisory: (FAO/FINNIDA) Lake Tanganyika Fisheries Research Project.

Working Group: ODEB (Organisation pour la Défense de l'Environnement au Burundi)

Congo:

Advisory: RESE, MEB (Mouvement des Ecologistes de Bukavu), NOPTA (Nouvelles options de Pêche pour le lac Tanganyika), CEPAC (Centre d'Etude et de promotion pour les Actions de Dev. Communautaire), SOCODEFI

Working Group: CADIC (Comite d'Action pour le Developpement Integral),

Tanzania

Advisory: TACARE, (lake Tanganyika Catchment Reforestation and Education)

WCST, (Wildlife conservation society of Tanzania) CARITAS, Diocese of Western Tanganyika

Zambia

Advisory: ZOS (Zambian Ornithological Society), IUCN

Working group: WWF

4.3.3 Please indicate factors that limit NGO involvement

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

5 Cross-Cutting Issues

5.1 Leveraging additional resources and actions

5.1.1 Financial leveraging

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

No action to date.

5.1.2 Actions “leveraged”

5.1.2.1 How has the project contributed to bring about changes in Implementing Agency, other donor, or country strategies – or private business practices – to give stronger emphasis to global environmental issues?

No action to date.

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

No action to date.

5.2 Capacity development

5.2.1 How has the project contributed to human resource development? Briefly summarise training and education indicators such as a) number of degrees or certificates earned; b) number of managers introduced to environment impact assessment methodologies etc.

TRAINING UNDERTAKEN TO DATE ON LTBP

Date	Target Group/s	Participants	Title of training	Training Location
JAN-Feb '97	-local officials		PRA Training Workshop & Practice (extractive)	Mpulungu & villages
On the job	FPSS team and fishers	Tz x 6, Zam x 5	Fishing Practices	Mpulungu & Kigoma
6-8/5/97	Local stakeholders	80 local stakeholders	Local stakeholders workshop	Zambia: Mpulungu
05/06/97	EE practitioners	Nsongela	Awareness to Actions	ICCE, UK
		Tarimo (NEEC)	Environmental Education methods	
6/98-6/99		Ms Emma Msaky	Pollen analyses	University of Arizona
	Drama group		Drama group training	Mpulungu
09.'97	Wildlife fisheries CRH officials	Tz x 3, Bur x 4 DR Congo x 4 Zam x 4	Dive Training & Underwater survey	Kigoma
06-09/97	local officials and some pr.	ca. 20	PRA Workshops	Kigoma /Rukwa

	stakeholders			
09/97	Workshop attendees	11 Tz 7 Za	GIS intro	Kigoma
10/97	Anglophone Scientists	11 Tz 7 Za	Joint SS Technical Training Workshop	Kigoma
Nov 97	Nat Met training schools	5 Tanzanians instructors	NOAA satellite data capture & analysis	Kigoma
3 days, Jan '98	Village Headmen	Za		Mpulungu
April/May 98		Regional (4 countries)	SE/EE workshop	Mpulungu
June/July 1998	BIOSS	Francophone	BIOSS and follow-up to Dive training	Bujumbura
	BIOSS	Anglophone parks staff,	Dive and Underwater Survey training	Zambia, Tanzania
To be set, 1998/9	BIOSS teams	BIOSS dive Teams + terrestrial support	Taxonomic Training for Biodiversity Monitoring	Cruise of Congo Coast
ongoing	Pollution	Field teams ca 5	on-the-job	Burundi, Tanzania Zambia
ongoing	sedimentation	Field teams ca 4	on-the-job	Tanzania Zambia Burundi
ongoing	BIOSS	Field teams ca 6	on-the-job	Congo Burundi, Tanz Zambia.

5.2.2 How has the project contributed to institutional development?

Institution	Government			NGOs			For Profit Org	Academic /Research Institut.	Others
	national	regional	local	international	national	community org			
Number	<u>48</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>

Please estimate the level of capacity developed for each category of institution:
limited, moderate or substantial increase in capacity

Limited	<u>x</u>								
Moderate	<u>x</u>		<u>x</u>			<u>x</u>		<u>x</u>	
Substantial									

Briefly summarise institutional development indicators such as a) adoption of environmental management plans; b) inter institutional linkage and networks

The process for the development of the Strategic Action Plan for the management of the lake has been accepted by all countries and as all major stakeholders are involved it

may be expected that the final plan will be adopted. Inter institutional linkages and networks have been developed mainly through the National Working Groups and through the formation of multi-institutional teams to carry out research under the projects various technical special studies.

In addition to a) and b) appropriate indicators would be, implementation of relevant monitoring and research programmes; regional management body formed and functional; adoption of legal agreement for lake management; community based institutions for monitoring lake resource usage.

5.2.3 What factors constrain project efforts to increase the capacity of recipient countries/institutions?

The very broad range of institutions involved limits the resources that can be directed at any individual institution and thus limits the impact.

Limited number of full time staff dedicated to capacity building.

Lack of suitable staff for training in certain subject/institution combinations.

Until recently, lack of regional training strategy based on in-depth training needs assessment.

Low priority of Lake Tanganyika as a national concern.

6 Lessons Learned

Please describe briefly the “lessons learned”.

Regarding implementation the principal lesson is that in a project with such a broad remit, geographically and institutionally plus a number of fairly high risk assumptions more resources need to be committed to planning operational factors prior to project implementation. These include: careful consideration of the level of full time field staff required both international and regional. Identification of key institutions, their precise role and the resources they will receive and be required to commit. Remuneration/financial compensation payable to (government) staff/institutions.

In addition far more local consultation and involvement should have taken place in the early stages of the project in a more formal manner than actually occurred.

Ideally some regionally agreed partitioning of budgetary resources prior to implementation would have been of assistance in assuaging fears of unfair distribution of resources among the four countries.

Reports:

Please list any mid-term or final evaluation report, annual performance review report (APR), completion report, etc. available for further reference (HQ)

Project Performance Evaluation Report. October 1997

Report of Tripartite Review Meeting, Lusaka, Zambia, 19-20 January 1998

Your opinion:

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

From the project manager:

It would be useful to have clarification of the role of the implementing sub-contractor in this process which is ostensibly aimed at the UNDP project officers responsible.

Repeated reporting in different formats, PPER, PIR etc results in appear to be unnecessary repetition and distraction from implementation of the project.

Information on how precisely this information is used and feed-back on the outcome of the process would make it a more meaningful exercise.