

ISSUES ARISING FROM MEETING OF GEF PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE
ON 2-3 OCTOBER 2001

A. GENERAL:

- 1) Desire to see on diagram the distribution of project tasks and implementation schedule.
- 2) Completion of work needed to satisfy GEF requirements.
- 3) Need to transform the existing project briefs to a project document.
- 4) There already existed in Member States National Committees on Wetlands.
- 5) Participants were encouraged to draft Terms of Reference for the project financial management to be discussed at next meeting of the Steering Committee to be held in November 2001.
- 6) On the issue of project risks, need was highlighted to avoid negative impressions about the security situation in Member States and to harmonize this in the English and French versions of the project briefs.
- 7) The role of LCBC being supervision, LCBC was expected to have a key role in determining how the project was to be implemented.
- 8) The GEF Project would not support project on inter basin water transfer but could increase national and regional capacity to identify and characterize issues that may arise later on.
- 9) Need for close co-ordination function between the demonstration projects and the non-demonstration projects.
- 10) Last Summit of Heads of State requested LCBC to convene a Donors Conference for all projects.
- 11) UNDP and World Bank could serve as catalysts to attract other Donors.
- 12) Big industries within the basin could be invited to the Donors Conference to assist LCBC.

B. SPECIFICS:

- 1) Presentation and discussions of project implementation and execution:
 - Need to replace “Inter-Ministerial Committees” by “National Steering Committees” and for LCBC to take the lead in organizing these National Steering Committees in the Member States.
 - In respect of executing agencies, international competitive bidding was recommended for choosing these, even though this is not a World Bank requirement. LCBC was required to take decision on this issue.
- 2) Project on the Komadougou-Yobe basin:
 - The title of the pilot project was to be re-worded.
 - Project area of intervention entirely national at present. Need therefore to keep the trans-boundary nature of the project involving Nigeria and Niger.

- Need for harmonizing project title in different documents.
- IUCN holding meeting with national authorities very soon to reactivate its relationship with the project.
- Need to re-formulate risks to make them positive and project attractive to donors.

3) Waza-Logone Pilot Project:

- The proposed institutional arrangement discussed at the Bangui meeting not yet reflected in the project brief.
- Document on the pilot project to be up-dated later.
- Institutions involved in the project not included in the English version of the project brief.
- There was also an organogram in the French version left out in the English version.
- Issue of how to involve LCBC in the Waza-Logone pilot project yet to be resolved.
- Risk indicated for the project pessimistic. One of the stated risks was even identified to be an expected result of the project, while a second risk was to enable reference to be made to institutional framework.
- The phrase “maître d’ouvrage ... (owner of works....)” was to be struck out.
- The Ministry in charge of Livestock was to be included.
- Need to highlight the trans-boundary nature of the project involving Cameroon and Chad, as well as the role of LCBC.
- To be co-financed by GEF and the Netherlands government.
- Project activity components were not yet well-defined.
- The Table on pilot project components not yet included in brief.

4) Pilot Project on the Northern Diagnostic Basin:

- Need to study the feasibility of an engineering approach to the project.

5) Pilot Project on C.A.R.:

- Project documents done so far with no financing from the PDF-C project budget.
- Need to fund the project document finalization from the balance left in PDF-C.
- Need for more data on the Chadian parts of the basin within the pilot project area.
- What was described as indicators in the project document were not indicators *per se*.
- Budget incompatibility also highlighted.
- Bossangoa was the site preferred to host the pilot project.
- C.A.R. was decentralizing and as such there were military bases in the hinterland to enhance the security of existing Prefectures.
- Conflict in the pilot project budget indicated as US\$260,000 in one document and US\$750,000 in another.
- US\$250,000 approved for the initial project activities. However, another project initiative at the World Bank (Land & Water Initiative) has agreed to provide an additional US\$250,000.

- Need to combine the 6th and 7th projects as one project for C.A.R. since the 6th project was not acceptable to GEF and the 7th project therefore meant to replace it.
- There was in existence an on-going WWF project to declare some wetlands in C.A.R. upstream of Chari river as RAMSAR sites of international importance.

6) Pilot Project on the Lake Chad Shorelines:

- Project title was to be re-worded to incorporate management of the Lake Chad and its shorelines.
- Need for the four LCBC Member States sharing the Lake Chad to get the portion of the Lake lying within their respective territories a RAMSAR site. Need also for Member States to subscribe to RAMSAR Convention.
- Activities of the pilot project must conform with RAMSAR Convention.
- How to associate the local communities to the pilot project not yet fully resolved.