

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW (PIR) 2000

UNDP/GEF PIR Report '00

Purpose: To determine the status of all GEF projects under implementation, assess their performance and derive lessons to improve design and implementation of GEF projects in the future

1 Basic Project Data

1.1 Identifiers

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

1.2 Brief Project Description

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

1.3 Executing Agency

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

1.4 Contacts

Res Rep: Ms. Sally Fegan-Wyles
Country Office Focal Point: Ms. Deborah Kahatano
Project Director:
Project Manager/Coordinator: Dr. Andrew Menz

1.5 Basic Financial Data

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

a) Project Performance**2.1 DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE****2.1.1 PROJECT IMPACT (Progress towards achievement of development objective)**

Please provide level of indicator achievement and kindly rate the PROJECT IMPACT by comparing actual level achieved as of end of June 2000 to target values and timeframes provided in the Indicators.

Development Objective	Indicator(s) (incl. Target Value & Time Frame)	Actual level achieved	Source of Verification	1998 Rating	1999 Rating	2000 Rating
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.	There are no formally established indicators for this Development Objective. The rating is based on discussions with the project management team and through those discussions the establishment of informal indicators. These indicators should be formalized.			U	S	S

2.1.2 Assumptions identified in relation to the Achievement of the Development Objective

- b) Please review the major Assumptions identified in **project design** and list any new ones identified **later during implementation**
c) Assess the probability that the Assumption will hold: high (H), substantial (S), modest (M), low (L).

Assumptions identified in project design	Probability that it WILL hold
Govt support continues and commitment demonstrated	S
Communities willing to participate communally	S
Lake Management Body in place before project ends	L
Appropriate staff maintained in place by implementing agencies	L
SAP actively supported by all stakeholders	M

Alternatives to damaging practices are found which are acceptable	S
Security situation improves substantially in DRC and Burundi	L
Early acceptance and signing of Convention	L
New assumptions identified during implementation:	
Donor interest maintained to support SAP management body	S

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

- d) In the light of: (i) the level of indicator achievement ; (ii) rating assigned; and (iii) assumptions listed in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, please provide a brief narrative assessment of the progress made towards the achievement of the development objective and more specifically, the contribution to the respective GEF operational programme (for example, conservation and sustainable use of mountain ecosystems, promoting the adoption of renewable energy, etc.).

In spite of early delays, constant security restrictions in a large part of the Lake shore and limited availability of suitable personnel in some locations the project has delivered 4 principal outputs, developed through a documented process of stakeholder participation and consultation and public involvement. These are:

- The Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika
- The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
- The Convention on the Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika
- Scientific and Technical Reports on the State of the Lake.

Although the development objective has not been fully achieved this project has taken a considerable step forward and laid a firm base that the countries and supporting agencies recognise and appreciate and are willing to build on. The potential impact on biodiversity conservation and pollution control of an international water body is thus high. Sustainability of direct actions that involve substantial resources will, however, depend to a large extent on external support for some time to come. Nevertheless, the potential for sustainability of country commitment has been greatly enhanced through the signing of the SAP and ongoing joint development of the Convention for the Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika. Moreover the collaborative and participatory development of these agreements has enhanced the capacity within the region for joint action.

Technical capacity has been substantially developed through a high level of participation of national institutions and individuals in carrying out the numerous technical studies on which the principal outputs are based. In addition capacity has been increased through substantial on-the-job and more formal training.

- e) If there has been a change in ratings since 1999 please briefly discuss the reasons.

2.2 IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES

2.2.1 Implementation Progress

Please provide level of indicator achievement and kindly rate the progress towards the achievement of the Immediate Objectives by comparing actual level achieved as of end of June 2000 to target values and timeframes provided in the Indicators.

	Immediate Objective	Indicator(s) (incl. Target value)	Actual level achieved	Source of Verification	1998 Rating	1999 Rating	2000 Rating
1.	Establish a regional long-term management program for pollution control, conservation and maintenance of biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika.	1.1 When a Management Plan (the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Action Programme) is accepted by all riparian states, is supported by appropriate legislation and a Regional Management Committee and supporting technical committees are formally constituted and supported by legislation;	1.1.1 A Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis has been formulated by Technical, Advisory and SAP planning Committees and endorsed by the four countries 1.1.2 Through a process of broad stakeholder consultation a SAP has been formulated and signed by all four countries. 1.1.3 A proposal for PDF funds is currently with GEF. This will support the formation of a	TDA and SAP documents. Minutes of 5 th , 6 th & 7 th Regional Steering Committee Meetings. Minutes of final TPR. Terminal Evaluation report	S	S	S

		1.2 When nationally defined action programs contained within the management plan are funded and operational.	regional planning support unit intended to formulate projects to implement the SAP including proposed regional committees. 1.2.1 Nationally defined action programmes are detailed in the SAP. To be funded under a second project.				
2.	Formulation of a regional legal framework for cooperative management of the lake environment.	2.1 When a draft regional agreement for the co-operative management of the Lake ("the Agreement") has been drafted and approved by representatives from each of the countries. 2.2 When the Agreement has been formally signed by all, or the majority, of the countries.	2.1.1. A detailed draft legal Convention was endorsed by the four countries at the final SCM with a strong recommendation to take the process forward asap. 2.2.1 Dependant on finalization of text of Convention. Internal consultation underway.	Draft Convention, Minutes of 7 th Regional Steering Committee Meeting. Minutes of final TPR. Terminal Evaluation report	S	S	S
3.	Establish a programme of environmental education and	3.1 When national environment education	3.1.1 Following an in depth	Report of training needs	U	U	U

	<p>training for Lake Tanganyika and its basin.</p>	<p>programmes involving NGOs and Government agencies are underway which address the specific issues related to the lake.</p> <p>3.2 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.</p> <p>3.3 When a cadre of trained environmental scientists and technicians are available to provide governmental institutions and the Regional Lake Basin Management Committee with the information and recommendations required to take rational management decisions.</p>	<p>training/EE needs assessment, National EE teams, including representatives from NGOs have been formed and these have planned and carried out a series of EE programmes. The programme is not as well established as originally planned.</p> <p>3.2.1 Implementation began late in project thus too early to evaluate impact.</p> <p>3.3.1 A large number of scientists and technicians have received training both on-the-job and through in-country and external courses. This</p>	<p>assessment. Progress reports. Terminal Evaluation report. Final EE/training reports.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	---

			has increased capacity to inform governments.				
4.	Establish tested mechanisms for regional coordination in conservation management of the Lake Tanganyika basin.	<p>4.1 When an operational Lake Tanganyika Basin Management Committee, as the principal body for regional co-ordination in policy management, exists that has demonstrated its ability to tackle the issues effectively by engendering appropriate action through a strategic planning process.</p> <p>4.2 When regular meetings of technical working groups take place within an overall monitoring and management structure with a clear mandate and the necessary resources to collect and analyse data from monitoring programs and formulate recommendations for mitigation of threats to the lake's biodiversity.</p> <p>4.3 When a regional information exchange network exists to support national activities.</p>	<p>4.1.1 Details for the formation of management bodies with necessary technical support groups are contained within the SAP and Convention and are expected to be implemented in a follow-on project.</p> <p>4.2.1 See above</p> <p>4.3.1 The project has developed a web-site</p>	SAP & draft Convention docs. TANGIS & project website. Ltbp.org	S	S	S
					S	S	S

			providing an online library of project reports other documents and databases and a GIS system for regional collation and dissemination of information.				
5.	In order to produce a full Strategic Plan for long-term application, some specific studies need to be undertaken. These special studies will also add to the understanding of the lake as a whole and in some cases provide the baseline and framework for long-term research and monitoring programmes.	<p>5.1 Successful completion of the various special studies with published results and recommendations. These will identify trends in current and potential threats to the lake, make recommendations for mitigation and cost effective monitoring.</p> <p>5.2 Successful integration of monitoring and scientific research programmes proposals into a strategic planning process supported by the necessary institutional mechanisms.</p>	<p>5.1.1 Special studies have been completed and reports published that fulfil project requirements .</p> <p>5.2.1 The SAP provides for the monitoring programmes based on recommendations from the special studies.</p>	Special study reports. Terminal evaluation report. SAP	S	S	S
6.	The implementation and sustainability of the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Action Plan and incorporated environmental management proposals.	6.1 When underwater conservation areas are established in all four countries with operational management plans;	6.1.1 Project indicators re conservation areas no longer valid owing to recommendation				S

		<p>6.2 When long term research and monitoring programs are operational with funding for the time horizon of the Strategic Plan and which include the participation of all stakeholder groups;</p> <p>6.3 When operational 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.</p>	<p>s from Biodiversity special study that more clearly define requirements.</p> <p>Both 6.2. & 6.3 are incorporated into the SAP. Funding for planning and preparation of proposals for management interventions.</p> <p>See above</p>				
Project as a whole:					S	S	S

2.2.2 Assumptions identified in relation to the Achievement of the Immediate Objectives

- f) Please list/ review the major Assumptions identified in project design or later during implementation
g) Assess the probability that the assumption will hold: high (H), substantial (S), modest (M), low (L).

Immediate Objective Number	Assumptions	Probability that it WILL hold
1 & 6	Improved security situation in DRC and Burundi	L

	Govt support and commitment continues	S
	Community support maintained	S
	Donor support maintained	S
	Regional acceptance of legal convention	S
2	Regional acceptance of legal convention	S
3	Govt support and commitment continues	S
	Community support maintained	S
	Donor support maintained	S
4	All governments agree and support	S
	Govt institutions implement effectively	M
	Donor support identified	S
5	Work programmes and trained staff maintained by implementing institution	M
	New assumptions identified during implementation:	

2.2.3 Descriptive Assessment of Implementation Progress and Achievement Ratings

- a) In the light of: (i) the level of indicator achievement; (ii) ratings assigned; and (iii) assumptions listed in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, please provide a brief narrative assessment of implementation progress since July 1999 and project risks.

During the last year of the project (July 1999 to end July 2000) it has been brought to a satisfactory conclusion as indicated in Section 2.1.3 of this report.

The Terminal Evaluation report states that, "In summary, the project successfully realized four immediate objectives; 1,2,4 & 5. Realization of two others (3 & 6) was delayed directly or indirectly by insecurity prevailing in the region. The project outputs are of very high quality and of great regional importance".

A worsening of the security situation in Burundi in October 1999 which lasted until May 2000 further disrupted progress in the Francophone region, and particularly activities 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 in this region. By the time of completion of the project, the security situation had not improved enough to result in a successful completion of these two activities.

The fact that all four countries accepted the draft Convention and signed up to the Strategic Action Programme indicates satisfaction with the process and principal outputs of the project.

The greatest current risk is that donor funding to implement the recommendations of the SAP will not be found or will be delayed thus losing the momentum gained during the current project. It is highly doubtful that any significant contribution to the management of the lake will be made by the riparian states without external support.

- b) If there has been a change in ratings since 1999 please briefly discuss the reasons.

2.3 Challenges

Please mention any significant policy, institutional, managerial, scientific and technical challenges/ issues that have arisen during project implementation, including changes in project assumptions.

The principal challenges that the project met may be summarized as follows:

1) Involvement of nationals in project design and subsequent tendering and choice of implementing agency was minimal. This coupled with the central government taking few steps to inform institutions of their likely role in the project resulted in most key agencies having very little knowledge of or commitment to the project in the initial stages of implementation. However, this was redressed during the rest of the implementation phase so that by the time of project completion most key agencies were fully committed to the project.

2) 1. above and the lack of an all party agreement on national contributions in terms of staff and other resources led to a very ad hoc process of informing institutions of the project and its aims and then soliciting the required support. This resulted in resources, especially of staff, being inadequate owing to lack of availability. In addition the lack of any clear statement of the obligations of the riparian state institutions led to reviews of project implementation being based almost entirely on the performance of the implementing sub-contractors rather than on that plus the level of participation and commitment of the riparian states.

3) There appeared to have been a gross overestimate of the number and calibre of staff that countries were able and willing to assign to the project.

This in turn led to a gross underestimate of the external staffing provision required. Given the emphasis in the project on capacity building it was unreasonable to expect that the numbers of high caliber staff required for the project would be readily available in national institutions. This was in large part responsible for the initial slow pace of project implementation. However, through the capacity building efforts of the project, this problem was partially overcome.

4) Project management structure was weak both from the point of view of efficiency of implementation and effectiveness of monitoring. This was caused primarily by the National Coordinators being government appointed civil servants, typically at director level, who were able to give only a limited time to the project. Thus National Coordinators were, for a variety of reasons, unable to fulfill their agreed TORs and much of their work thus fell to the PCU. In addition as National Coordinators were also key members of the Regional Steering Committee they were also involved in reviewing project progress. Hence they had dual and conflicting roles.

5) Weak institutional linkages between lead organisations based in capital cities distant from the lake and lake shore institutions responsible for implementing most of the actual activities.

6) The principal technical challenge not anticipated was the lack of security in, and access to, large stretches of the lake shore and hinterland for practically all of the project's duration.

2.4 Remedial Action

For all projects rated “unsatisfactory” on either measure (impact or implementation progress), for projects where ratings have declined since 1999 and for specific challenges identified in section 2.3, please include here a description of actions being taken to address implementation problems. Please specify who should be responsible for such actions and tentative time frame.

Under Section 2.2 Immediate Objective 3, parts 1 & 2 relating to the programme of environmental education have been classified as unsatisfactory. This relates largely to the fact that the initial approach to this programme was flawed first in that it was not sufficiently closely linked with overall training needs and the second was that efforts began before it was clear what the findings of the special studies were likely to be and thus message was that needed to be conveyed. In the early years of the project this led to a number of ad hoc initiatives that although of value individually did not result in a coherent programme. Once these shortcomings had been identified and a thorough review of training needs and environmental education requirements carried out, in the light of early results from the special studies, a well organised and directed process was initiated through national teams the initial results of which were, in three of the four countries, successful and most satisfactory. Unfortunately time ran out before these initiatives could be consolidated in the current phase of the project.

The challenges identified in Section 2.3 were addressed by the project as follows:

- 1) This was ameliorated to some extent through the project Inception Workshop held in early 1996 that brought together key stakeholders to examine project purpose assumptions and workplans. The results of the workshop were documented in the Inception Report which thus had a broader ownership.
- 2) The project's approach to unclear institutional responsibilities was to draw up Letters of Agreement with the various partner institutions for to carry out specific roles in the project. These detailed as far as possible contributions of both the project and the institution. It was more difficult to address the question of accountability so far into the project cycle although some success was achieved by the project coordinator drawing attention to the difficulties in meetings with government officials. In addition, where possible the issues were raised in the more formal setting of Regional Steering Committee meetings.
- 3) To address this critical challenge the project sought and finally received approval to appoint a small number of full time, low cost, Special Study regional facilitators through an international recruitment process. Once the facilitators were in post there was a marked increase in the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation and capacity building owing to their catalytic effect.
- 4) For the last 18 months of the project the Steering Committee approved the appointment of National Coordinators The appointment of NCs assistants. This was taken up by two of the four countries and alleviated the problem to some extent.
- 5) The project attempted to improve these linkages by using the Project Co-ordination Unit to enhance communications between institutional HQs and lake shore stations and draw the attention to the pressing issues.

6) There was little the project could do to address this problem except to ensure that techniques developed in the accessible areas of the lake are lake wide in their applicability such that once access is gained surveys can be completed expeditiously providing results directly comparable with results previously surveyed areas.

3. Lessons Learned/Good Practice

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

The principal lessons learned relate largely to means of meeting the challenges referred to in section 2.3 above.

Great care and consideration must be put into ensuring that the number and capacity level of human resources is adequate and identified prior to implementation. This applies especially to the choice, role and obligations of national implementing agencies and to the management/co-ordination structure of the project.

Following from the above training needs should also be identified at this stage or very early in the project and where capacity gaps occur arrangement agreed upon as to how these gaps will be filled, while training takes place, e.g. through consultants, long term facilitators/trainers etc.

An implementation manual or guidelines should be established and agreed by all parties at a high level of government covering all matters of payments, recruitment of staff, obligations of affiliated institutions etc. This should be done before implementation begins and be incorporated into the project document.

Links to communities should be established early in the project but these should be at a level and in a manner appropriate to the likely short to medium term benefits likely to accrue to the community from the project.

National co-ordinators should be full time staff appointed by the project. National “Directors” should be appointed by governments.

The process used for the development of the SAP including the highly participatory and extended nature of its development is a valuable example of good practice

4. Resources Leveraged & Demonstration and Catalytic Effects

4.1 Resources Leveraged

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

An additional 30,000 USD was obtained from UNICEF, Tanzania, for the purposes of assessing the extent of oil pollution caused by a lake shore oil fired power station in Tanzania. Recommendations for substantially reducing the level of pollution were made to government and essential ones have been implemented.

4.2 Demonstration and Catalytic Effects

4.2.1 How has the project contributed to bringing about policy or legislation changes in the country, changes in Implementing Agency or other donor strategies – or private business practices – to give stronger emphasis to global environmental issues? Please also assess the sustainability of project activities and results following the completion of GEF funding. Which other factors influence the project sustainability?

The principal change at the national level has been to initiate a regional view of the lake as a shared resources for which each state has transboundary responsibilities. This is manifested in the signing of the SAP and the endorsement of the draft Convention for the management of the lake.

Lake Tanganyika is not yet in crisis with regard to the levels of degradation of the environment and in three of the four riparian states the lake is remote from any major cities. It is thus low priority for allocation of resources for management in all countries. This coupled with the four countries being some of the poorest in the region severely limits the level of sustainability of project initiatives that are likely to be realised without further external support.

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

Project implementation overlapped with the FAO/FINNIDA lake Tanganyika fisheries management project. This has provided current information on the status of the major commercial fisheries important for the development of the SAP. The FAO project was also contracted under an interagency agreement to carry out part of the original scientific programme assigned to LTBP. Subsequently and parallel to the development of the SAP the FAO project has developed a fisheries management plan and steps have been taken to ensure that both programmes are merged under a single initiative for the future management of the lake and its basin.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures and Tools

Please provide dates, availability of reports, and any relevant comments for each of the following Monitoring and Evaluation tools.

	Date	Report available/comments
Field Visits	None	
Annual Project Report (APR)	Previous: PPER, October 1997 APR/PIR 1998 APR?PIR 1999 Next: PIR 2000 UNDP Terminal report July 2000	Reports available
Tripartite Review (TPR)	Previous: Feb 1998 May 1999 July 2000	Reports available
Mid-Term Evaluation	Nov 1998	Reports available
Final Evaluation	May 2000	Reports available

5.2 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.

Effective participation at the different stages of the project cycle is critical to the success of GEF-Financed projects. Within this framework, a thematic paper focused on participatory monitoring and evaluation will be prepared jointly by Capacity 21 and UNDP GEF based on the experiences of both programmes on this subject. Please provide your experiences/comments in relation to: (for additional information, please refer to the Instructions Sheet)

5.2.1 Experiences/examples of **effective** participatory M&E: what has worked well, how does it work and why does it work. Try to highlight wherever possible the lessons learned. (*)

5.2.2 Experiences/examples of **problems or barriers** which prevent or impede effective participatory M&E: what has not worked, why not, and how to make it work. (*)

(*) Please refer to the Instructions Sheet for examples provided to give you an idea of the sort of issues that may be relevant.

6. NGO Involvement

6.1 Basic Information

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

Full Name: Please list the full name of the NGO.
 Acronym: The official initials of the NGO's name.
 Type: Put the cursor over the highlighted word "Type" in the table below to access the different types.
 Project Stage: Please indicate where the NGO involvement took place, e.g. preparation (PDF A or PDF B), implementation or evaluation stage.
 Role: Put the cursor over the highlighted word "Role" in the table below to access the different roles.
 Activity: Brief description of services provided by NGO.
 \$ Value: \$ value of contracted project services assigned to NGO (if applicable).

Full Name (Do not give acronym only!)	Acronym	Type	Project Stage	Role	Activity	\$ Value of contracted services
Lake Tanganyika Fisheries Research Project. (FAO/FINNIDA)	LTR	IGO	IMPL	a. b.	Mutual logistic support, data re fisheries. Provision of research vessel and crew.	80,000
Organisation pour la Défense de l'Environnement au Burundi)	ODEB	NGO	IMPL	a.	Attendance at EE and SAP workshops	0
Nouvelles options de Pêche pour le lac Tanganyika	NOPTA	NGO	IMPL	A	Attendance at EE workshops; local advice.	0
Comite d'Action pour le Developpement Integral	CADIC		IMPL	A	Attendance at EE and SAP workshops.	0
lake Tanganyika Catchment Reforestation and Education	TACAR E		IMPL	A	Attendance at EE and SAP workshops.	0

					Support to World Environment activities	
Wildlife conservation society of Tanzania	WCST		IMPL	A	Attendance at SAP workshops.	0
Diocese of Western Tanganyika	CARITAS		IMPL	A	Attendance at SAP workshops.	0
Zambian Ornithological Society	ZOS		IMPL	A	Attendance at EE and SAP workshops.	0
World Wildlife Fund	WWF		IMPL	B	In Zambia, development of EE materials	5,000

Note where attendance to workshops is indicated, travel and DSAs would have been paid by project but total cost for these inputs does not exceed c. 5,000 US.

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

6.3 Please indicate factors that have constrained NGO involvement:

7. Financial Information

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

- Planned disbursements (\$millions) as of 6/30/00
\$9,400,000
- Actual disbursements (\$millions) as of 6/30/00
\$9,006,546
- Timing of disbursement (percentage of planned vs actual expenditures):
96%
- Date/Period of First Disbursement: 1993

7.2 Procurement Data (please refer to instruction sheet for details)

Note : For projects or project components executed by UNOPS this section ***must not*** be filled in - data will be provided by UNOPS headquarters-

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 June 30, 2000 into the matrix against the donor country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project.

Supplying Country (only donor countries)	Personnel (in US\$)	Sub-con Tracts (in US\$)	Equipment (in US\$)	Training (in US\$)	Total (in US\$)

Please calculate the following ratio:

Procurement from donor countries as a % of total project expenditure from project start up to June 30, 2000:

7.3 Audit Requirements for Government and NGO Executed Projects

The UN Board of Auditors has established that an annual audit is necessary for all Nationally Executed and NGO Executed GEF projects, whose expenditures for the calendar year (January - December) exceed \$20,000. Expenditures below that amount are subject to normal UNDP audit procedures, which is once in the project's lifetime.

According to the above regulations, please indicate:

- For which calendar year's expenditures, an audited financial statements have been issued;
- Which will be next calendar year for which an audit will next occur:
- Date of Submission to HQ UNDP Office of Audit and Performance Review, National Execution Audit Section:
- If the report has not been received from the Government or NGO, please comment on actions taken by the Country Office to ensure compliance.
- If the Audit Report contains negative comments, please indicate what actions have been taken by the Government or NGO.

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.