

NILE BASIN INITIATIVE

NILE TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION PROJECT

**Report on the Regional Capacity
Building Workshop for NGOs, NGO
Networks and Government Stakeholders**

April'2005: Nairobi, Kenya

NILE BASIN INITIATIVE

Initiative du Bassin du Nil

Acronyms

CBOs:	Community Based Organizations
CAP:	Community Action Plan
DRC:	Democratic Republic of Congo
EE&A:	Environmental Education and Awareness
FBOs:	Faith Based Organizations
GEF:	Global Environmental Facility
GEAP:	Governorate Environmental Action Plan
GTZ:	German Technical Cooperation
HIPC:	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
IUCB:	World Conservation Union
LFA:	Logical Framework Analysis
MDGs:	Millennium Development Goals
NAT:	Nile Applied Training
NGOs:	Non Governmental Organizations
NBD:	Nile Basin Discourse
NBI:	Nile Basin Initiative
NEAP:	National Environmental Action Plan
NRPT:	Nile River Power Trade
NTEAP:	Nile Transboundary Environment Action Project
NEWUP:	Nile Efficient Water Use for Agriculture Production
PEP:	Participatory Environmental Planning
PPM:	Participatory Planning Methodology
PRA:	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRS:	Poverty Reduction Strategy
QQT:	Quality Quantity and Time
RRA:	Rapid Rural Appraisal
SHA:	Stakeholder Analysis

SGP: Small Grants Programme
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme
UNOPS: United Nations Office Project Services
US\$: United States Dollars
VIP: UNICEF Invented Latrine
WQM: Water Quality Monitoring

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	4
Introduction.....	5
2.0 Opening Remarks.....	5
3.0 Objectives of the Workshop.....	6
4.0 Participant Expectations.....	7
5.0 Methodology	7
6.0 Session 1: Introduction and Update on Nile Basin Initiative with a specific Focus on the Nile Transboundary Environment Project (NTEAP).....	8
7.0 Session 2: Environment of the Nile river Basin: Threats and Opportunities.....	9
8.0 Session 3: Basin Wide Water quality Monitoring and its linkage with the Micro-grants and Environment Education and Awareness	12
9.0 Session 4: Participatory Planning Methodology (PPM): a Critical Process for effective and appropriate micro grants project designs	16
10.0 Session 5: Community Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation	22
11.0 Session 6: Micro-grants Monitoring and Evaluation	26
12.0 Session 7: Establishing Transboundary Networks.....	29
13.0 Session 8: Seeing is Believing:.....	32
Conclusion	33
Annex 1: Workshop Evaluation Results	34
Annex 2: List of Participants	36
Annex 3: Workshop Agenda.....	38

Introduction

- 1.0 This workshop was organized under the auspices of the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI). The NBI covers 10 countries thus, Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt and Eritrea which holds an observer status. NBI has eight programmatic strands each of them managed from different member countries where this has been possible. Uganda hosts the Secretariat at Entebbe. It also hosts two programme strands thus; Confidence Building and Stakeholder Involvement and Socio-Economic Development and Benefit Sharing. The Shared Vision Programme which provides the regional/basin wide overarching strategic focus is also coordinated from the Secretariat. The management of other programmes is spread out in the region as follows; Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP) in Sudan, Regional Power Trade(NRPT)in Tanzania, Efficient Water Use for Agricultural Production(NEWUAP)- Kenya and Applied Training (APT) in Egypt. These programmes are at varying degrees of implementation.
- 1.1 The NTEAP under whose remit this workshop was organized is one of the first NBI programmes off the starting blocks. Led by the Regional Project Manager it has a full complement of senior professional and administrative staff covering the institutional strengthening, community level land, forests and water conservation, environmental education and awareness, (wetlands and biodiversity) and basin wide water quality monitoring. Each of the countries have in place national project coordinators who coordinate implementation of all NTEAP activities at this level and provide an administrative link between national steering committees and the NTEAP headquarters in Khartoum.
- 1.2 This workshop was conducted at the Nairobi Safari Club (Lillian Towers) and lasted 4 days starting from 5th –8th April 2005.

2.0 Opening Remarks

- 2.1 This covered largely the official opening of the workshop conducted by Alan Rogers of UNDP/GEF, Mr. Mbegera, member of the NTEAP steering Committee and Mr. Gedion Asfaw the Regional Project Manager and Amir Baker the Workshop Coordinator and Lead Specialist Community Level, Land, Forests and Water Conservation Component of the NTEAP. In all the opening remarks the workshop theme was reinforced and norms established which included ground rules thus:
- All participants to be informal.
 - Active participation from all participants.

- Punctuality to be observed by all.
- All cell phones to be switched off.
- Share and exchange information freely.
- Eat well to maintain high energy levels.

2.2 Key messages included active participation, sharing and learning, contribution and dialogue and enjoy to ensure that the workshop was not a series of top down lectures by presenters, rather an exchange of views and learning.

3.0 Objectives of the Workshop

3.1 The overall objective of the workshop was to continue deepening the understanding of the importance of the Nile Basin to the people living and deriving their livelihoods out of this Nile River Basin on the first count and to appreciate its contribution to an overall healthy global environment on the second count. Of all global water resources, fresh water accounts for 3% of which only 1% is accessible. The Nile Basin is a significant contributor to this water. The Nile basin is also covered by a large proportion of the only remaining rain forests in the world that bear the brand of being the ‘earth’s lungs’ that provide oxygen for human and other animal life. It is also the food basket of over 300 million people (50% of Africa’s population). In this regard, the workshop aimed to increase public awareness of the issues affecting the basin with a view of mobilizing support for conservation activities and sharing of new ideas, practices and models using micro-grants as catalyst.

3.2 Specifically the workshop focused on mitigation efforts of immediate nature which can be used to assist communities in the basin to enhance their conservation activities without losing their livelihoods derived out of the basin. One of the ways of supporting communities’ conservation efforts is the use of micro-grants. Consequently, the workshop was used to introduce the micro-grants component to participants, its procedures and management and steps through which beneficiaries may follow to access the grants. The workshop also sought from participants new ideas that could be incorporated in the implementation of micro-grants to ensure that it achieved maximum

contribution to the overall objective of the NTEA project and ultimately to the NBI's goal.

4.0 Participant Expectations

4.1 By way of leveling expectations, participants were asked to record their expectations before the workshop started. Only one expectation was requested from each participant. Below is a summary of the expectations:

- to understand mechanisms and operational guidelines in the micro grant projects
- expose and understand threats and probable solutions to unforeseen challenges.
- to acquire skills that will improve the performance of micro grants' projects implementation.
- share and exchange past experiences in micro grants' initiatives and explore new capacity building methodologies.
- gain experience of government vs NGO's collaboration in combating environmental threats.
- to get a better understanding of the transboundary concept and successful transboundary projects.
- acquire knowledge on enhancing NGO's networks and linkages.

5.0 Methodology

5.1 A participatory approach was adopted during the workshop, where the national consultant worked with workshop presenters who were largely drawn from NTEAP Lead Specialists of various programme components. These included; the Introduction to NBI, the environment of the Nile Basin, the micro-grants and small grants, water quality monitoring, environment education and awareness through networking, monitoring and evaluation. These were underpinned by the participatory planning methodologies module which was delivered by the national consultant/workshop facilitator.

5.2 This workshop was attended by 34 participants representing a range of NGOs and CBOs from the Nile basin region and were of diverse backgrounds and specialization. In order to ensure the workshop

- served the interests of all participants, the facilitator asked each of them to list their most important expectation. These were then synthesized as shown in section 4.0 above.
- They were then harmonized with the workshop objectives and circulated to participants as their daily checklist which they used as a participatory monitoring tool.
- 5.3 Together with this the facilitator sought to know whether some of the participants had experiences to share so that they could be accommodated in the programme. Two participants, from Egypt, Dr. Atwa and Ms Irene Makumbi of Uganda asked to be allowed to present on participatory methodologies and networking. In order to ensure that these presentations were harmonized within the themes in the programme, the facilitator catered for them in the relevant sessions alongside the main presenters.
- 5.4 For maximum participation, the workshop was delivered using three strategies thus, lecture for introduction, theoretical underpinnings and practical exemplification. This was done using psycho social pull and push techniques that allowed participants to interact with presenters continuously. On every presentation except the introductory sessions, participants worked in groups to delve deeper into the issues raised, practice some of the tools and techniques and share their experiences.
- 6.0 Session 1: Introduction and Update on Nile Basin Initiative with a specific Focus on the Nile Transboundary Environment Project (NTEAP)**
- 6.1 Mr. Asfaw made a brief introduction to the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) and the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP). He pointed out that the NBI is a mechanism that includes 9 riparian countries (Burundi, DRC, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) as equal members in a regional partnership to promote economic development and fight poverty. Although, rightly a riparian country Eritrea, maintains an observatory status only. Mr. Asfaw pointed out that;
- 6.2 The NBI is composed of two main programs:
- The Shared Vision Program: the objective is to build the basis for cooperation in the Nile Basin, to build the capacity and to create enabling environment.

- The Subsidiary Action Program: the objective is to implement investment and development projects on the ground.
- 6.3 The NBI Shared Vision Program is composed of 7 Projects (the NTEAP is one of them). The NBI Secretariat is located in Entebbe-Uganda. NBI is funded by a consortium of international of donors lead by the World Bank. As regards the Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project (NTEAP), Mr. Asfaw said the objectives were: (1) to provide a forum to discuss development paths for the Nile with national/local stakeholders, (2) to improve understanding of the relationship between water resources development and the environment and, (3) enhance basin-wide cooperation.
- 6.4 The NTEAP has five components:
1. Institutional Strengthening to facilitate regional cooperation
 2. Community-Level Land, Forest and Water Conservation
 3. Environmental Education & Awareness
 4. Wetland and Biodiversity Conservation
 5. Water Quality Monitoring
- 6.5 The NTEAP total budget is US\$ 43.6 million out which the riparian states contribute \$4.3million.

7.0 Session 2: Environment of the Nile river Basin: Threats and Opportunities

- 7.1 Presented by Gedion Asfaw the NTEAP Project Manager, he outlined the overview of the Nile Basin environment, threats and opportunities. The NTEAP objective is to provide a strategic environmental framework for the management of trans-boundary waters and environmental challenges existing in the Nile Basin. This is aimed to contribute significantly to the overarching objective of the Nile Basin Initiative which is to achieve sustainable socio-economic development through equitable utilization of, and benefit from the common Nile Basin water resources. The riparian countries through a cooperative arrangement have agreed to ensure that the wellbeing of communities in the basin is not compromised through unsustainable exploitation that may lead to adverse environmental degradation and conflicts.

7.2 **The Nile Basin Fact Sheet:** In order to place the workshop in the context of the NBI the NTEAP Regional Project Manager painted an overall picture of the important facts and features of the Nile Basin as stated below: (based on data from the World Resources Institute, Watersheds of Africa, 2001):

i. socio-economic facts are:

- NBI involves 10 countries as stated earlier;
- Covers Area 3.2million sq.km which is 35% of the total area occupied by the 10 riparian states and 46% of the population of these countries live in the basin,
- Population density by 1990 was 41.6 people per sq km and is estimated to reach 91 people per sq km by 2025;
- River Nile traverses over a distance of 6,800km from the farthest source in Uganda to the delta in Egypt-Alexandria;

ii. Drainage:

- Of all the countries Egypt has the highest dependency ration of 97% followed by Sudan 77% and Eritrea 68%;
- 91% of irrigated land in the basin is in Egypt and Sudan while only 9 % is spread out in the rest of the countries;
- The potential of hydro electric energy along the Nile is about 134,000 MW and yet only 5% is being utilized.

iii. Biodiversity:

- The NBI is very rich in biodiversity with about 129 species of fish;
- 129 fish endemics;
- 137 species of amphibians;
- 3 ramsar sites;
- 69 wetland dependent IBAs
- 5 endemic bird areas;
- Only 4.5% of protected area.

iv. Rainfall:

- 3000 bcm water falls over the basin and only 2-4% reaches the Aswan in Egypt. Lots and lots of water is lost through evaporation, siltation and poor water resource management;
- In 1994, four countries in the basin experienced water scarcity and stress and this number is estimated to increase to 9 by 2025.

7.3 Environmental Threats facing the Nile Basin include deforestation which is affecting the wetlands and exposing the water sources that feed the Nile river, soil erosion causing serious levels of siltation which negatively affects the river flow and may, if it persists, negatively impact on the quantity of water available especially in the down stream countries such as Egypt and Sudan. Other threats include invasive water weeds infestation which impact on the river ecosystem causing loss of some fish species such as tilapia. floods, droughts, wetlands degradation. Pollution are also among the key threats that face the Basin.

7.4 Most of these threats except for droughts and floods are human related and can be controlled through proper management of the environmental protection initiatives.

7.5 Opportunities that need to be considered include:

- intensifying soil conservation and forestry activities in upstream countries;
- practicing efficient water use in downstream countries (drip irrigation, recycling, etc)
- promoting sustainable livelihood activities (improved water supply and sanitation, alternative sources of energy, income generating activities)
- establishing Peace Parks;
- water quality monitoring and compliance;

7.6 To take advantage of the opportunities that exist for curbing the environmental destruction in the basin, stakeholders should:

- on the basis of the TEA, prioritize the environmental threats at sub-basin level and at district level in consultations with the affected communities;
- for each identified threat develop options/ alternatives for addressing the threats;

- explore possibilities of attaining thematic and geographical focus for impact;
- build on what has already worked and have gained acceptability at the community level;
- establish linkage with ongoing SGP Projects for experience sharing;
- Record the process of planning and implementation of all micro grant projects (written, pictures, videos...);
- Promote and follow-up on up-scaling of successful projects;

8.0 Session 3: Basin Wide Water quality Monitoring and its linkage with the Micro-grants and Environment Education and Awareness

8.1 Presented by Mr. John Omwenga, the Lead Specialist on Water Quality Monitoring. His presentation gave a synopsis on water as follows: There is 1.4 cu km of water in the world out of which 97% is saline largely covered by oceans and seas, 3 % is fresh out of which 2% is in accessible and only 1% is accessible. The accessible water is provided by rivers and lakes(57%) and the rest is atmospheric like rain, biological and underground. This global water is faced by a myriad of threats which include increasing pollution caused mostly by industrial chemical effluents that are disposed into seas, rivers and oceans, siltation, eutrophication, destruction of wetlands and water sources, degradation of catchments especially due to encroachment by cultivators, chemical spills, sedimentation, invading weeds, floods, droughts, hurricanes and decomposition of organic matter. These threats affect the water supply and are increasingly causing the deterioration of water quality in the Nile Basin and the rest of the water World.

8.2 As knock on effects, the threats are increasingly causing poor health through infections of water borne diseases amongst humans, loss of biodiversity which is impacting on marine life such as fish and other marine food sources and floral life. Studies have shown that the main pollutants of water sources include domestic waste, where water is easily polluted in the process of use, and may be combined with

chemicals and pathogens. Irrigation may also cause salinity through increased use of pesticides and fertilizers. Food processing effluents may be washed away into water sources, while textile industries, pulping, sugar industries and mining may add toxic chemicals to the river. Where there are no effective legislative frameworks and frequent monitoring of pollution especially in developing countries (where resources are limited), there is very strong evidence showing that water quality is deteriorating tremendously.

8.3 The objectives of the Basin wide Water Quality Monitoring Component of the NTEAP are to:

- Identify and detect the current status of the Nile river system and signs of deterioration in water quality
- identify sections of the river system that do not meet the desired water quality standards and any contamination and black spots along the river system and further estimate pollution load carried by the main river streams and tributaries
- generate data for general research on water and provide information to advice on the effectiveness of pollution control measures in place, and for decision making at operational and policy levels

8.4 Implementation of these objective have began and ultimately this will lead to an increase and improvement of dialogue on water quality monitoring and understanding of trans boundary water management issues. Specifically these will manifest themselves in improvements of capacities in water quality management in the basin, transboundary water quality assessments, exchange and dissemination of information regarding key parameters of water quality. The intention is to move towards the establishment of the Nile Basin Water Quality Monitoring Network in the long term.

8.5 These objectives link directly to the wider objective of the NBI which include the provision of strategic environmental framework for the management of the transboundary waters and the environmental challenges within the basin. Globally this component, will contribute directly to assisting countries to meet the Millennium Development Goals on water which proposes that *by 2015 the world community should reduce the number of people living without sanitation by 50% and reduce waterborne diseases by 50%*, by ensuring that national

- integrated water resource management practices are in place and operational.
- 8.6 This is an ambitious goal especially in the Nile Basin where challenges such as legal and institutional frameworks are still very weak, budgets on water are minimal and external funding is limited, poor implementation of programmes is rampant, the laboratories are poorly equipped, and the guidelines on quality and standards are largely not agreed on, data management systems is poor and there is increasing poverty and insecurity.
- 8.7 The NTEAP project's focus is to make a significant contribution to the management of the of the 1% of fresh water mainly to ensure that it is being conserved, protected and renewed through improvement of ground water recharge, recycling, controlling evaporation, silting, pollution and wastage. This is important because over 80% of common diseases are environmental and many human diseases are waterborne hence ensuring water quality will contribute to the reduction of these diseases. Fresh water is also very important for agriculture which uses about 73%. It is similarly, important for industries that consume about 21% and for humans and animals that use 6%.
- 8.8 To do this, the Basin wide Water Quality Monitoring Component of the NTEAP will collaborate with the Micro-grants Component in a number of areas. Some of these areas include community projects like:
- enhancement of capacity at schools and communities for testing quality of water. This may entail purchase of water testing equipment for schools and communities which they will use to test the quality, training of the schools and communities on how to use these equipment and what are accepted standards of water for consumption. A widespread of this knowledge will have a significant impact on the reduction of water borne diseases;
 - improvement of environmental sanitation in communities and schools. This may entail introduction of VIP latrines, increase availability of portable water, safe disposal of effluents and solid waste;
 - reduce cases of eutrophication and invasive weeds infestation like water hyacinth around water sources. This may be done using

mechanical or manual processes or biological and other advanced technologies if infested or practice proper farm husbandry and wise fertilizer usage;

- promote wise use of wetlands: this may entail protection of wetlands using conservation methodologies such as agro-forestry and terracing and conservation farming;
- forestall catchments degradation: Through terracing and agro-forestry to hold the soil and help in its regeneration along river banks, road sides, slopes etc;
- promote wise use of farm inputs: promotion of conservation and organic farming technologies and limited use of fertilizers and pesticides;
- support household water treatment: through improved water handling and management information, use of appropriate technologies like boiling, filtration, and treatment at house hold level.

8.9 The Micro grants form an important input to accelerate the generation and dissemination of knowledge on the technologies and also to complement the efforts of national governments and communities. It will be useful in providing funds for training and also to purchase equipment to enhance the environmental protection and management of water sources in the Nile Basin.

8.10 The Basin wide Water Quality Monitoring Component also works in conjunction with the Environment, Education and Awareness Component. As the EE&A deals mostly with creation of awareness, strengthening the knowledge base, establishing networks and increasing understanding on issues around the environment in the basin the WQM Component collaborates in the following areas:

- i. Influencing policy formulation and legislation on water resources and water quality management;
- ii. Create Awareness on:
 - water laws and regulations
 - water quality strategies and standards,
 - water borne diseases

- effect of water quality on health of humans and biodiversity;
- iii. Create awareness on the impacts of water quality on:
- increase in Poverty;
 - greed by investors;
 - anthropogenic activities in catchments areas.

The Basin wide Water Quality Monitoring Component intends to work closely with the Micro grants and the EE&A Components of the NTEAP.

9.0 Session 4: Participatory Planning Methodology (PPM): a Critical Process for effective and appropriate micro grants project designs

9.1 Presented by James Atema from the Eastern Africa Rural Reconstruction Association, who was the facilitator of the workshop. This module aimed to enhance and deepen the skills of participants in participatory approaches in design, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. The Nile Basin Trans-boundary Project was designed to enhance the understanding of communities and indeed countries within the River Nile Basin on a range of aspects covering environmental conservation and management socio-economics and political economy. Supporting a large population of over 300 million people in more than 10 countries, the Nile Basin is undisputedly one of the largest ecosystems in the world. This makes it important to ensure that the interests of all stakeholders are taken care of. Participatory planning approach is one of the most important strategies that need to be applied on regular basis to ensure the views of those who are directly affected and those who are involved at fore. More importantly, PPM helps to unveil hidden agendas that are critical for sustainable utilization of this ecosystem, develop greater understanding, minimize conflict and ensure that countries apply the rule of symbiosis for the benefit of all. This module was used in this training to equip participants with a menu of tools and techniques in participatory planning so that all the projects implemented in this programme are a direct response to the felt needs of the primary stakeholders.

9.2 Objectives of the module: The underpinning objectives of the workshop were to determine ways of means of how micro-grants

could leverage the work of other components of the NTEAP project. PPM as a planning tool aimed at helping participants to equip themselves with skills and knowledge to help them in developing proposals for MG consideration. As the MG manual stipulates, all projects for MG must be developed with the participation of all stakeholders.

9.3 Concepts of Participatory Planning: Where did PPM come from?

During Keynesian neoclassical economic days and the post Keynesian era after the Second World War, central planning was advocated where planning was viewed as highly technical exercise that needed only highly skilled economists to do it. The first generation of central planning in the developing world were initiated in the 1950s with countries like India and the Philippines. This era witnessed the introduction of 5 year development planning, fully developed and published by ministries of planning and national development. Non professional planners were simply to read and implement even if they didn't understand the underlying premises upon which plans were developed. In Africa the intensification of central planning was witnessed in 1970s when a range of planning and development models including integrated development planning were introduced. Millions and millions of dollars were spent with a view of lifting the continent from its poor state of economy. After over 50 years, Africa and indeed the rest of the third world has continued to deteriorate on almost all the critical indicators e.g. child mortality and maternal mortality, household incomes, life expectancy, general poverty etc.

9.4 This has raised the question to all policy makers from the rich northern countries and the poor southern countries of 'what was going wrong and why were programmes not improving the well being of the people?' A deeper interrogation of these policies revealed that, the missing link was the participation of the stakeholders in planning and implementation of programmes. Most of the programmes during this period were found to be driven by either central/headquarter interests including donor country interests which have not addressed the felt needs of the people for whom they were intended.

9.5 The World Social Summit of 1995 in Copenhagen, Denmark underpinned this problem more elaborately and a decision was made to change the development approach that had dominated programmes for a long time. This change proposed strongly, the integration of

participatory methods in planning, implementation and evaluation. Although, participatory methods had been agitated mostly by NGOs, it was not until after 1995 that, they came to the centre stage and were made a pre-requisite for project/programme funding. PPM simply means being part of, owning both the process and the outcome, valuing the effort and being able to defend outcomes.

9.6 Participatory planning entails seven key stages:

- Stakeholder analysis
- Problems analysis
- Objective analysis
- Design
- Implementation,
- Monitoring and evaluation

9.7 Types of participatory methods in planning: There are many participatory planning methods many which have gained currency only in the late 20th and 21st century. These include:

- Stakeholder Analysis
- Rapid Rural Appraisal/Participatory rural appraisal(RRA/PRA)
- Appreciative Enquiry
- Zoop
- Logical framework Analysis(LFA) and,
- Poverty Reduction Strategies(PRS)
- Community Action Planning(CAP)

9.8 Stakeholder Analysis (SHA): As the term states, it about knowing who are holding onto the stake and what their relation is with the stake. Usually they are divided into three or four categories thus primary, secondary and key. Primary stakeholders are usually the most important but not necessarily the most influential. They are the reason for the project or programme but usually don't control resources.

9.9 SHA is used for identification of the various types, interests, roles and influence of project or programme participants. It is very important in planning as it helps to determine what should be made part of the

programme or what should be managed as a risk. To conduct an SHA you must assess the role of each stakeholder in the context of their importance and influence. Identify those who are the most important but not influential stakeholders, those who are most important and also influential, those who are influential and not important and those who are not important and not influential See the figure below.

1. Most Important	2. Most important and influential
3. Least Important and Least Influential	4. Most influential but not Important

9.10 What should you do with these categories in a programme?

1. Involve/participate
2. Involve and manage
3. Consult
4. Inform

9.11 PRA: Introduced in the era of sustainable development in the mid 1980s. It was preceded by RRA. PRA was a response to frustration planners and policy makers had experienced in getting current information to inform planning. Traditional methods like surveys, censuses take a long time to be analysed such that by the time, results come out, they are usually out of date and hence require being adjusted using forecasts based on established trends and approximation. PRA produces what is referred to as rough and dirty information that provides current information which is used immediately. It also involves the primary stakeholders for whom programmes are intended. This ensures that their views are the ones that dominate plans and avoids technical interpretations that may be irrelevant to the actual solutions of a problem. It is cheap, unscientific, quick and responsive. It does not require evaluation experts to conduct it.

9.12 In PRA there are four important functions: mapping where social mapping and social analysis tools are used, analysis where Zoop and LFA are used, ranking where preference ranking or pair wise ranking are used and designing where community action planning or LFA are used.

- 9.13 Appreciative Enquiry: Similar to PRA introduced by Americans but takes a more investigative approach. It is called appreciative enquiry because it involves both parties the enquirer and the enquiree. It is a dialogue and has no fixed time frame. The enquiry is allowed to take as long as the participants need until they both become exhausted with their discussions.
- 9.14 Zoop: Introduced by the Germans/GTZ, this is a way of generating information in a spontaneous way using non evaluators who are usually primary stakeholders but not exclusively. Zoop starts from a clean sheet and builds up information as it gets generated. It depends on causal effect analysis
- 9.15 Logical Framework: A tool for critical thinking, analysis and planning. It started from the military and it is in the family of methods such as critical path analysis and gantt charts. It combines both PRA and Zoop during collection and analysis of data. Very strong for design and monitoring and evaluation. Like Zoop it depends on causal effect linkages based on the 'if and..... then logic' and the how and why interrogation. Thus as you move from a wider objective to a more specific one you use the question 'how' while the vice versa requires you to use the question 'why'.
- 9.16 Poverty Reduction Strategy: Introduced in the late in 2000 as a response to the declaration of the World Social Summit in 1995 in Copenhagen-Denmark and is largely seen as the vehicle to operationalise the MDGs. It combines PRA, Zoop, CAP and LFA at different stages. It is used at a much broader level, mostly country level but can be applied at any level. At the moment it serves as an incentive to reform planning in poor countries especially the so called heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC).

9.17 **Community Action Planning:** Is a way of translating qualitative analysis into quantitative analysis to be able to interpret results and use them for planning. It is localised and is most effective at village level. It uses PRA /Zoop techniques to generate information. It insists on timeframe, responsibility and costing of the plan. The table below shows a matrix commonly used in community Action Planning

Activity	cost	Funding Source	Time frame	By whom	Remarks
Terracing	\$3000	Micro grants	April-September'2005	CARD-Kenya	Funds must be procured before the rains come.

9.18 **Participatory Planning in Action-the Egyptian experience-** Presented by **Atwa Hussein Atwa**, he demonstrated the importance of this process in environmental conservation and management. This has been used in Egypt to monitor issues such as climate change, ozone layer depletion, biodiversity loss, desertification, natural resource depletion and environmental degradation in the context of poverty reduction, enhancement of community participation and sustainability and overall economic growth of the country. The model of PPM engaged in this case study was participatory environmental planning(PEP), and has resulted in three key plans, National Environmental Action Plan(NEAP) where national priorities and actions are enlisted, Governorate Environmental Action plans(GEAPs) where regional priorities and actions are enlisted and local Environmental Action Plans(LEAPs).

9.19 To delve deeper into the ‘raison detre’ Mr Atwa explained the GEAP planning. GEAP is used as a strategic planning framework in environmental management. It makes clear linkages between poverty reduction and environmental management, ensuring that tensions are reduced. GEAP focuses on the following:

- Minimizing environmental damage;
- Protecting natural resources;
- Supporting economic growth through environmental friendly initiatives;

- Improving environmental infrastructure;
- Building capacities ensuring efficiency in delivering and managing environmental services and;
- Improving planning and management of natural resources.

9.20 Through GEAP it is possible to identify community environmental priorities, such as sanitation, solid waste, water shortage, pollution, environmental awareness, canal covering, industrial pollution etc. these are then costed based on the community action planning model which uses unit cost approach based on current prices or constant prices.

10.0 Session 5: Community Level Land, Forests and Water Conservation

10.1 This session was delivered by Amir Baker the Lead Specialist who was also the workshop convener. This is component II of the NTEA project and is responsible for micro-grants (MG). This presentation explained what micro-grants were, why they were important, how to access them and provided some lessons and best practices. This component has three sub components which include enhancement of basin wide capabilities and cooperation at regional and national level(capacity building); priority actions for addressing soil erosion which could be funded through micro-grants; transboundary micro-grants programme policy and operational procedures which includes the strategy, operational and planning instruments and the MG manual.

10.2 The Micro-grants procedures were developed based on the GEF small grants programming model which provides seed capital to NGOs and CBOs. The modus operandi of the MGs require that genuine community participation be employed in the project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership. Experience from the existing MGs and SGPs mentioned above shows that communities have always been more interested in projects that address their immediate needs which provide them with viable alternative livelihoods to focus them away from destroying the environment. The challenge here is that community needs do not always equal to transboundary environmental initiatives and may easily be things that are un related to the NTEAP agenda. In this

- regard, it requires extensive and intensive participatory skills and knowledge to be able to help refocus them towards environmental management. Experience by project implementers in participatory planning is therefore important to help in identification of appropriate projects.
- 10.3 Tools and techniques like stakeholders analysis that help to identify the beneficiaries, problem tree analysis that help identify the core problems, root causes and effects in the context of the NTEA project, objective tree analysis that help to identify the most important interventions, logical framework analysis that helps in project design and community action planning that helps to translate qualitative data into quantitative data to help in interpretation and design of projects at community level are critical in MGs projects' design. All proposals must demonstrate that this due process was followed otherwise they risk being rejected by the NSC. The overall grant envelope available for MGs is \$ 1.0 million in the first year and the size of each grant per project is \$25,000.
- 10.4 The first round which is supposed to begin in June this year (2005). Kenya, Uganda, Egypt and Tanzania are expected to mobilise their project proposals faster than other countries since they already are SGP countries and have experience and institutional framework to manage MGs.
- 10.5 There are three types of micro-grants projects. These include:
- Type I, these include projects that take place within a country. These projects' typology resemble the existing GEF SGP projects however must address transboundary issues. They are single country focused projects; however, their purposes must address issues affecting the Nile basin countries sharing the same transboundary issues.
 - Type II, these are projects that are implemented in more than one country at cross border location and financed by separate MGs of each of the countries. These are examples of a multi-country projects which neighboring countries can implement together or in close collaboration. Due to their nature of traversing across borders they are likely to be challenging. Design of such projects must show the transboundary issues at stake which are being addressed.

- Type III- are single or joint projects and can be implemented in two or more countries but not at the cross border locations, and are financed separately or through joint MGs in each of the participating countries. These projects are implemented in different locations although addressing similar issues. The participants may have different culture and languages although they share a common problem.
 - As a rule of thumb, it is envisaged that 50% of MGs projects should be either type II or III thus projects supporting transboundary initiatives. Single country projects must demonstrate their contribution and relationship with achieving transboundary objectives otherwise they may not be approved.
- 10.6 Micro-grants aim to enhance capacity and increase knowledge through sharing of lessons and experience across the basin. Through transboundary projects that work across countries, MGs aim to foster linkages and strong partnerships. MGs focus on working with vulnerable groups at community level especially women, to help them implement conservation activities such as forestation, agro forestry, soil and water conservation, terracing, building of gabions, development of woodlots at family and household level and promoting dialogue on contentious environmental issues such sharing of water resource, grazing, wood fuel etc.
- 10.7 MGs can also provide the glue that keeps communities together for a common purpose for example activities in environment, education and awareness component such as supporting schools, universities, media in their network activities. Such activities could range from tree planting which in turn may stimulate the culture of tree planting amongst young people and in the whole community. MGs can also be used to support initiatives like protection of shallow wells and springs for clean drinking water, provision of simple tools like sand filtration units for villagers and providing villagers with kits to monitor water quality.
- 10.8 The overall aim of MGs is to provide a facility for NGOs and CBOs to pilot and experiment on new ideas that support conservation efforts. They can also be used to promote ownership hence are supposed to play a key part in ensuring sustainability. They are like fuel provided to kick-start the running of social environmental laboratories through generation of information to foster learning of the intricacies involved

- in conserving the Nile basin environment and create level grounds for communities to engage in more broader issues for their own benefit. Through regular interactions, MGs will provide a platform for positive ventilation therapy thereby pre-empting any tensions and or conflicts that may be simmering or underlying between countries or communities.
- 10.9 The overall guidance and strategic direction of MGs programming is provided by the project management unit in Khartoum while at national level, the National Micro-grants Coordinators are charged with the management of the MGS including ensuring that all beneficiary NGOs/CBOs are properly supported when preparing proposals. Approval of proposals is the sole responsibility of the National Steering Committee (NSC), however at the local level there may be a local steering committee whose role is advisory and supportive to the host institution and the applying NGOs and CBOs to ensure that their projects are of high quality to meet the standards established and stipulated in the procedures in order to be approved by NSC. Details of MGs are encapsulated in the NTEAP Micro-grants Strategy of January 2005.
- 10.10 **Small Grants Programme: A Global Perspective and Challenges the Tanzania case study.** To provide practical experience to participants, Mr. Victor Kamagenge, the NTEAP LMGC of Tanzania delivered a presentation on behalf of the GEF/SGP Coordinator from Tanzania on the Small Grants Program. The SGP is a product of the Rio Earth Summit of 1992. It is premised on the fact that global environment problems are best addressed only if local communities are involved. The goal of the GEF/SGP is to support community level initiatives in order to secure community and global benefits in the GEF strategic areas of global significance.
- 10.11 Since inception GEF/SGP is operational in 73 countries covering countries in Africa, Asia Pacific, Arab States, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean. To-date GEF/SGP has supported 5000 projects. Unlike MGs whose maximum grant per project is \$25,000, GEF/SGP provides \$ 50,000 per project. GEF/SGP funding programme is now in its 3rd phase. The current budget is \$172 million having risen from pilot phase \$18million, first phase \$24 million and second phase \$133million.

10.12 Like MGs the target of SGP are the marginalized communities and assistance goes through the NGOs, CBOs, FBOs and TBOs. Other beneficiary organizations include training and research institutions, village councils, national level NGOs and CSOs. GEF/SGP management flows from New York where a Central Programme Management Team which is responsible for overall direction of the programme. At the country level, UNDP provides administrative support and in most cases office space in the case of SGP.MG offices are not situated in the UNDP offices rather in the offices of the host NGO. At the national level programme management for both programmes are managed by National Steering Committees. Both programmes have a country strategy and country monitoring and evaluation framework.

10.13 The Tanzania SGP has adopted a landscape or geographical approach in its implementation. This is based on establishing a strategic cluster of complementary community based projects which focus on a specific problem. Examples of these include the COMPACT which is in six countries, Niokolo Koba Park in Senegal, Lake Victoria Irrigation in Tanzania and Lake Jipe restoration initiative in Kenya. Some of the projects supported by SGP in Tanzania include:

- Biogas for institutions and households to provide an alternative source of energy
- Fuel Efficient cook stoves to reduce consumption of charcoal
- Wind and solar powered irrigation systems to mitigate the vagaries of weather to name but just a few.

10.14 The GEF/ SGP provides some important lessons to be learnt by the MGs. These include landscape/ecosystem or geographical approach which creates a site wide impact; it promotes inter community sharing hence reduces potential conflicts in conservation practices; it captures and documents implementation processes both horizontally and vertically for dissemination and lastly it receives important visits from national and international stakeholders thereby increasing visibility.

11.0 Session 6: Micro-grants Monitoring and Evaluation

11.1 This session was delivered by the Micro-grants M&E Lead Specialist Ms Intisar Salih. As part of the micro-grants component, the presenter stressed the importance of M&E forming an integral part of any

- project design. A good M&E system must be based on sound baseline data for all project components. Monitoring is a process of measuring progress of performance in a project on a continuous basis. Monitoring is usually undertaken by project staff or management and is mostly activity based. Monitoring helps to measure 'effort' thus:
- 11.2 Inputs(materials+money+time+activities+personnel=Effort).Monitoring helps to show whether the milestones in the project are being reached i.e. on expenditure, procurements, implementation etc. it is through monitoring that project management and stakeholders can tell whether they the project is on course, or whether strategies must be changed to ensure progress.
 - 11.3 Evaluation on the hand is used to measure results usually at output, purpose and goal level. Evaluation measures effectiveness thus the quality of the services being delivered including coverage and targets. Evaluation is about determining improvements in peoples well being as far as it can be attributed to the project inputs. Evaluation helps to generate replicable lessons and also helps identify capacity gaps which can then be improved through training interventions.
 - 11.4 The MG Monitoring Framework is based on the GEF/Small Grants Programme which has been adopted by NTEAP. The MG, M&E has three levels thus local and project. The first is the grassroots level and management of this level are implementers which in the case of NTEAP are NGOs, CBOs and project beneficiaries. The second level is national and this is implemented by the national micro-grants coordinators, lead monitoring coordinator and steering committee members. This also involves technical departments and environmental authorities. At regional level, this is undertaken by NTEAP, Nile Secretariat, UNOPS and relevant funding donors.
 - 11.5 The MG M&E framework is based on logical framework matrix where indicators are based on the SMART principle thus;
 - S-specific
 - M-measurable
 - A-achievable
 - R-realistic
 - T-timebound

These could also be referred to as QQT meaning quality, quantity and time bound.

11.6 All indicators should be derived out of solid baseline data and the MG component of the NTEAP. These could be grants disbursement tables, reports and qualitative information from grantees. Other data could be derived from semi annual and annual reviews. Baselines are important in M&E framework as they help to explain the situation, help identify and set indicator bench marks and are therefore necessary for setting targets to be achieved at every level. The matrix below shows an M&E framework based on logical frameworks analysis.

Level of indicator	Description of Indicator	Qualitative and quantitative description of an indicator	Time boundness	Measure	Means of verification
Activity	Disburse grants to members	Disburse 40 grants to 40 groups	Disburse 40 grants to 40 groups by April 2005	EFFORT	Project reports
Output	Grants disbursed	X no. of grants disbursed to y no of groups	X no. of grants disbursed to y no of groups by end of first year of project implementation2005	RESULTS	Output to purpose reviews
Purpose	Grants utilized to conserve the biodiversity purpose effectively	No. and % of grants utilized to conserve biodiversity effectively	No. and % of grants utilized to conserve biodiversity effectively by 2007	EFFECTIVENESS	End of project reviews
Impact	Acreage conserved	No. of acres conserved	No of acres conserved by 2007	CHANGE	Impact assessment reports

11.7 MG component uses both qualitative and quantitative methods for their monitoring and evaluation. The qualitative method ensures that the views of stakeholders are captured at all levels of the programme. This involves consultations with stakeholders from design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Participatory M&E employs tools and techniques such as direct observation, focus group discussions, social analysis and mapping, while quantitative methods use, surveys, document reviews, cost benefit analysis etc.

12.0 Session 7: Establishing Transboundary Networks

- 12.1 Presented by Mr. Maushe Kidundo the Lead Specialist in Environment, Education and Awareness component, he defined the meaning of networks using both conventional and contemporary theory based on Thesaurus Dictionary where networking is defined as a set of connections, arrangement or association which facilitates meetings or exchanging of ideas or making contacts or interacting. Quoting from Taylor (1997) and Goldstick (1993), Mr. Kidundo explained that networking is a net like arrangement involving a group of people to exchange or share information about something or a range of things. In contemporary terms networking implies a structure whether formal or informal that enables people to share information. This invokes the characteristic of active participation and interaction between suppliers and consumers of information.
- 12.2 Examples of networks include information, technical, global integrated, professional, world city and learning networks. Networks depict characteristics such as: line or chain links with many nodes spread out in a linear fashion or star or hub where relationships have a central control or channels where communication flows from all directions. Key elements of networks may include collaboration, cooperation where objective of the network and roles are clearly defined or communication where information sharing is crucial and coordination where a structure is required to create cohesion and to establish realistic levels of participation.
- 12.3 Like in any activity, networking must have stakeholders or those for whom networking serves. These may include any person or group or institution that is affected positively or negatively by the networks' activities. Networks can be formed at any level such as community, projects, district, provincial, national, regional or global depending on the issue, theme or agenda at hand. Networks are necessary especially so when an issue is quite complex requiring more than one stakeholder to deal with. They create an environment for people to open up, share views and knowledge and also ventilate on contentious issues. Networks can save time and money by helping people, organizations and institutions to learn from others and not to re-invent wheels.
- 12.4 Formation or establishment of networks requires a conscious process. This may start with identifying who the stakeholders are and understanding the interest of each one of them. This then leads to a

process of designing the network which includes the development of a shared agenda, constituency building before moving to implement network activities. In the case of NBI, the stakeholders identified within the Transboundary Environment Action (TEA) include the environment education and awareness practitioners, schools and teachers, national working groups, lecturers, students’ media and development partners. Institutionalization of networks provides a facility for sustainability, establishment of networks in the NBI has largely been driven by individuals who act as champions. Virtual information exchange is being enabled by E-flash news, newsletters and regular meetings. The matrix below shows the typologies of current EE&A networks, their objectives, composition, coordination and status.

12.5 Although institutional support or institutionalization of networks perse is necessary it is not sufficient without a reliance on individuals who must champion the cause. In this regard, the selection of individuals for a particular network is critical and must be carefully handled. In EE&A survival of networks has always reflected the process of establishment and maintenance of functions which includes a strong coordination.

12.6 Net works are not cheap and require substantial resources which include time and money to conduct regular activities that act as the glue that cements relationship and develops deeper understand of the purpose and synergy amongst members. One of the golden rules in establishing networks is the early and continuous involvement of members in setting the agenda. This entails ensuring that due process is followed thus: bringing people together, to share information to avoid duplicity, need for a common activity around which to coalesce. This must demonstrate clear benefits for all members.

Type of Network	
1. EE practitioners	<p>Objectives/ Terms of reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deals with and organizes EE activities within country <p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes practitioners as committee members but not exclusively. Other stakeholders are also involved

	<p>Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Project Coordinators play a lead role in establishment and are supported by the Lead Specialist EE&A <p>Work Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings are taking place at national level and regional was held
<p>2. Schools</p>	<p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote collaborative projects and discussions with peers <p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently 10 schools per country engaged <p>Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At Project Management Unit in collaboration with National Project Coordinators <p>Work Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90 schools selected and making connections with each other through environmental projects
<p>3. Media</p>	<p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing of information, validation creating public awareness and sensitization of communities <p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Media houses per country <p>Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Lead Specialist <p>Work Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings have been planned at regional level Proposals for micro grants under development.
<p>4. Universities</p>	<p>Objectives</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates students exchange and module development <p>Composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Universities and two lectures per country <p>Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At The Project Management Unit in collaboration with National Project Coordinators <p>Work Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection at national level completed • Regional meeting planned
--	---

13.0 Session 8: Seeing is Believing:

The Nile Basin Discourse (NBD) demonstrates how networking is done practically.....Presented by Irene Makumbi from Uganda, she highlighted the fact that the NBD provides a voice to the voiceless. This is an independent initiative of civil society organizations concerned with the development of the Nile Basin. NBD main objective is to promote abroad based and open dialogue discussion and sharing of views on the developments in the Nile River Basin. It works through a range of stakeholders including the NBI, community members, academia, civil society, private sector, and governments, regional and international organisations.

13.1 Institutionally the NBD has a discourse desk responsible for providing secretariat services, facilitation and coordination, it has a General Assembly comprised of three representatives from NBI Countries, international NGOs and donors, a steering committee which is the policy making body comprised of 8 representatives from 8 out of the 10 NBI countries. The countries not yet included are Democratic Republic of Congo and Eritrea. Ethiopia is represented by the Inter Africa Group. At the national level, NBD has national discourse forums comprising civil society organisations, individuals. National Forums have been formed in 8 of the 10 countries.

13.2 Although extremely successful NBD, as a network is faced with the challenge of not holding legal status. This makes it difficult to receive funds from donors. Current donors funds are held by IUCN on NBD's behalf. This has made it very difficult to acquire funds for National Discourse which frustrates most of the stakeholders who are most of

the time providing their services through voluntarism. The experience of NBD demonstrates how it is difficult to form and sustain networks.

Conclusion

This report has captured the critical tenets of the proceedings of the Regional Micro-Grants workshop providing a broader understanding of the MGs but more importantly the relations, linkages and synergy that needs to be developed amongst NTEAP components in order to achieve its purpose. Each session has represented the various components of the project, the broader linkage with the Nile Basin Initiative and how Micro-grants can be used to enhance implementation of the NTEAP.

Although NTEAP has been running for just under two years, the project is showing considerable accomplishments towards strengthening the regional or basin wide responses to the management and conservation of the environment of the Nile River for the benefit of all stakeholders. Particular achievements include; creation of awareness on the importance of conserving the Nile River environment, creation of networks between and among stakeholders of different categories, development of the Micro grants strategy and manual, development of a monitoring and evaluation framework including a monitoring and evaluation framework for micro-grants and increasing knowledge in water quality monitoring.

Most of the NTEAP activities implemented could be regarded as preparatory but critical for laying the foundation upon which the whole project will depend for full scale implementation. The ground work has been done and it can only be expected that real work will begin to generate tangible benefits for the Nile Basin population and indeed the riparian countries. The success of the NTEAP project will be fundamental for the success of all the other NBI programme strands. The positive signals demonstrated and the professional delivery of the workshop by the Lead Specialists under the Leadership of the Project Manager during the workshop provides an assurance that the project is on the right trajectory.

Annex 1: Workshop Evaluation Results

At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to complete evaluation forms based on the following questions:

- i. Did the workshop meet your overall expectations?
- ii. Which of the sessions did you find most useful?
- iii. What would you like to see improved?
- iv. Please rate the workshop venue and organization
- v. To what extent do you consider the workshop met its objectives?
- vi. Comments

1. Did the workshop meet your overall expectations?

	V.Good	Good	Satisfactory	Below Expectations	Total
Content	15	11	3	0	29
Duration of sessions	9	16	3	1	29
Relevance	10	13	5	1	29
Duration of workshop	4	16	8	1	29
Resource Persons	11	15	3	0	29
% Responses	34%	49%	15%	2%	100%

Assessment: 83% of participants rated the workshop expectations as very good and good.

2. Which Session did you find most useful?

Session 1: Introduction to NBI & NTEAP	4	9.5%
Session 2: Nile Basin Threats and Opportunities	3	7.1%
Session 3: Basin Wide Water Quality Monitoring	2	4.7%
Session 4: Participatory Planning Methodologies	11	26.2%
Session 5: Microgrants- Mitigation Strategies to the Threats and Opportunities	12	28.6%
Session 6: Monitoring and Evaluation of Micro grants	6	14.2%
Session 7: EE&A Networks	4	9.5%

Total Responses	42	100%
-----------------	----	------

Assessment : 54.8% of participants found Micro-grants and mitigation strategies and participatory methods most useful sessions.

3. What would you like to see improved?

- More time to be given to Networking, Participatory methodologies and Monitoring and evaluation
- Field visit to be planned for
- NPCs to be allowed room to share their experiences/perspectives
- Workshop time should be 5 days not 4 days and time for sight seeing to be budgeted in future.

4. Please rate the workshop venue and organisation

	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Below Expectations	Total
Venue(Meeting Hall, Facilities)	20	6	3	0	29
Organisation(Programme & materials	19	9	1	0	29
Logistics(Transport, Accommodation, Catering)	18	9	2	0	29
%	65.5%	27.5%	6.9%	0%	100%

Assessment: Over 90% of participants rated workshop organisation and venue as good to very good.

5. To what extent to you consider the workshop met its objectives?

Exceeded	Very much all	Most	Some	Not at all	Total responses
1	12	16	0	0	29
3.5%	41.4%	55.1%	0%	0%	100%

Assessment: Over 90% of participants considered to the workshop to have met its objectives.

Annex 2: List of Participants
Regional Capacity Building Workshop – 05- 08 April 2005
Nairobi – Kenya

No.	Name	Address	Country
1.	Mr. Anatole Kanyenkiko	General manager of UCODE (NMGC host NGO); email: kanyenkikoa@yahoo.fr	Burundi
2.	Ms. Consolate Kamangaza	email: kamangazac@yahoo.fr Department of environmental education INECN	Burundi
3.	Mr. Fabien Kibungere	In charge of communication in the Department of Environment, Ministry of Land management, environment and tourism; email: ndikumugisha@yahoo.fr	Burundi
4.	Mr. Crispin Sedeke Okwul Okam	Environment Agency	DRC
5.	Mr. Stephane Amani	Micro-Credit Specialist, Goma	DRC
6.	Ms. KATUNGU MUVUNGA	kipaska@yahoo.fr	DRC
7.	Dr. Atwa Hussien	e-mail: Dr_atwaatwa@yahoo.com	Egypt
8.	Ms. Amal Abdel Wahed	Email: nouraw@hotmail.com and anouraw@yahoo.com	Egypt
9.	Dr. Sohier Malak	Fax: 002 02 4619901	Egypt
10	Mr. Ato Yigzaw Ayalew	Head Planning and Programming Service EPA, Tel. no. 464880, Fax: 464876 e mail: yigzawa2001@yahoo.com P.O. Box 127 60, Addis Ababa	Ethiopia
11	Mr. Gebre-Kidan Nerie,	Lem –Ethiopia, NGO Specialized in Environment email: che@telecom.net.et Addis Ababa	Ethiopia
12	Mr. Million Alemayehu	ORDA (endogenous), Head Liaison Office Tel:504455, Fax: 517244 email: orda.liaison@telecom.net.et Addis Ababa	Ethiopia
13.	Ms. Jane Nyandika	NEMA	Kenya
14.	Mr. Michael Congo	Busia	Kenya
15.	Mr. Moses Kabeyi		Kenya
16.	Ms. Kemilembe Salome Mutasa	Department of Environment P. O. Box 5380 Dar es Salam, Tanzania Tel: + 255 744 541 763 e-mail: kemmymutasa@hotmail.com	Tanzania
17.	Mr. Petro Ahham	Program Coordinator, MESO P. O. Box 1304, Arusha, Tanzania Tel: +255 0744 467 472 e-mail: mesotz@hotmail.com	Tanzania
18.	Mr. Lucas Wambura	General Secretary, LANESO P.O. Box 10016 Mwanza, Tanzania TelEL: +255 748 366 866	Tanzania

		e-mail: lucaswambura@yahoo.com	
19.	Mr. Theobald Mashinga	mashingatheo@yahoo.com	Rwanda
20.	Mrs. Dancilla Mukakamari	arecorwa@yahoo.fr	Rwanda
21.	Mr. Johnson Nkusi	Tel. 250-530007/08449738	Rwanda
22.	Irene Makumbi	e-mail: makumbi@uws.or.ug	Uganda
23.	Ms. Samia Meki Abo	Sudan Development Association	Sudan
24.	Ms. Nadia Hassan Omer	HCENR	Sudan
25.	Mr. Ali El Khalifa El Hassan	Sudanese Environmental Conservation Society	Sudan
26.	Mr. Martin Madara	Local Micro Grants Coordinator	Kenya
27.	Ms. Jane Kisakye	Local Micro Grants Coordinator	Uganda
28.	Mr. Victor Kamagenge	Local Micro Grants Coordinator,	Tanzania
29.	Mr. Khaled Bayoumi	Local Micro Grants Coordinator,	Egypt
30.	Mrs. Ishrag Dirar	National Micro-Grants Coordinator	Sudan
31.	Ms. Françoise Kayigamba	GEF/SGP NC	Rwanda
32.	Mr. Mohamed Yesuf	NTEAP National Project Coordinator	Ethiopia
33.	Mr. Audace Ndayizeye	NTEAP National Project Coordinator	Burundi
34.	Mr. Joseph L. Afata	NTEAP National Project Coordinator,	D.R.C.
35.	Mr. Gedion Asfaw	NTEAP Regional Project Manager	Sudan
36.	Ms. Intisar Salih	NTEAP M&E Lead Specialist	Sudan
37.	Mr. Amir Baker	NTEAP MG Lead Specialist	Sudan
38.	Mr. John Omwenga	NTEAP WQ Lead Specialist	Sudan
39.	Mr. Mausche Kidundo	NTEAP EE&A Lead Specialist	Sudan
40.	Ms. Lily Kisake	NTEAP National Project Coordinator	Kenya

Annex 3: Workshop Agenda

Regional Capacity Building Workshop for NGOs, NGO Networks, and Government Staff

Nairobi, Kenya: 05-08 April 2005

Monday, 04 April 2005

Arrival of participants to Nairobi. Hotel check-in at the Nairobi Safari Club Hotel (Lillian Towers) off University Way, on Koinang Road in Nairobi .

Time	Activity	Comments
Flight Schedule	Arrival and registration	Participants will arrange their own Airport – Hotel transport. Terminal costs will be paid by the Project.

Tuesday, 05 April 2005: DAY 1 Introduction to NBI, NTEAP and its components; environmental threats and opportunities

		Objectives	Comments
Opening Session : Chaired by Mr. Gedion Asfaw, RPM			
09:00 – 10:00	Welcoming remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Gedion Asfaw: RPM • Mr. Alan Rodgers, UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator • Mr. Amir Baker: MGLS Introduction of Workshop participants • Facilitator: Overview of Workshop Program and objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcoming of participants 	<i>Rapporteur: Ms. Lily Kisaka, NPC Kenya</i>
10:00-10:30	Coffee Break		
Session 2: Introduction to the NBI, NTEAP its components: Chair: Workshop Facilitator			
10:30-11:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Introduction to the NBI and NTEAP and its components : Presentation by Mr. Gedion Asfaw, RPM - Presentation on the Micro-Grants Component by Mr. Amir Baker (MG LS) - Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction to the objectives of the Workshop and expectations of the discussions ▪ Improve awareness, develop understanding of the NTEAP and its components 	<i>Rapporteur: Ms. Lily Kisaka, NPC Kenya</i> Presentations (20 minutes each) Discussions (20 minutes)

Tuesday 05 April 2005 DAY 1 Introduction to NBI, NTEAP and its components; Environmental threats and opportunities

Time	Activity	Objectives	Process
11:30 –	The Environment of the Nile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build understanding 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Audace</i>

13:00	Basin: Threats and Opportunities by Mr. Gedion Asfaw	and knowledge on the different environmental threats affecting the Basin (causes and effects) and the opportunities that exist to address those threats and transform them into valuable assets.	<i>Ndayizeye, NPC, Burundi</i> Presentation (45 minutes) Discussions, Q&As (45 minutes)
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch Break		
	Session 3: Introduction to the NBI, NTEAP and its components; Environmental threats and opportunities, (continued).		
14:00 - 15:30	The Small Grants Program: A Global Perspective and challenges of SGP in Tanzania: Presentation by Mr. Nehemiah Murusuri National Coordinator of SGP and MG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction to the SGP ▪ Understanding the role of NGOs in project implementation 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Audace Ndayizeye, NPC, Burundi</i> Presentation (45 minutes) Discussion (45 minutes)
15:30 - 17:00	Introduction to the WQ and understanding issues of Land and Water Conservation including Eutrophication and Water Weeds problems in the Nile Basin by: Mr. John Omwenga, Water Quality Lead Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build understanding and knowledge on issues land and water conservation including Eutrophication and Water Weeds 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Audace Ndayizeye, NPC, Burundi</i> Présentation (45 minutes) Discussion (Q&A): (45 minutes)
17:00	Coffee Break and end of day One		

Wednesday, 06 April 2005

DAY 2 Participatory Planning Methodologies

Time	Activity	Objectives	Process
Session 4: Participatory Planning Methodologies, Chair: Workshop Facilitator/MG LS			
09:00 - 09:30	Recap of day one (Facilitator)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review issues discussed and identify common challenges ▪ Share experiences 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Joseph L. Afata, NPC, D.R.C.</i>
09:30 - 11:00	Participatory Planning methodologies: PRA, theories and concepts. Tools and techniques for participation (Presentation by Workshop Facilitator)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understanding the concepts behind participatory planning ▪ Defining different techniques for participation ▪ Identifying 	<i>Rapporteur Mr. Joseph L. Afata, NPC, D.R.C.</i> Overview presentation (50 minutes each) Discussions (40 minutes)

		opportunities for the NB countries	
11:00 11:30	Coffee Break		
11:30 13:00	<p>Group Discussion on Participatory Planning: Applying the concepts into identification of opportunities to overcome the threats.</p> <p>Groups A, B, C and D will discuss issue(s) that will be provided before the session.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overcoming the Transboundary environmental challenges and promoting the opportunities ▪ Understanding the concepts and using them to develop sound planning tools. 	<p><i>Participants will be divided into four groups. Each group will select a facilitator, timekeeper and rapporteur</i></p>
13:00 14:00	Lunch Break		
14:00- 16:00	<p>Reporting back to the Plenary (presentation of group findings by rapporteurs) followed by Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exchange of knowledge and sharing of experiences 	<p><i>Rapporteur: Mr. Martin Madara, LMGC, Kenya</i></p> <p>Presentations made by each Group</p>
16:00 – 16:30	Coffee Break		
16:30 – 17:00	Video Presentation on the Nile Basin and end of day two		

Thursday, 07 April 2005

DAY 3 Mitigation Techniques and implementation of projects

Time	Activity	Objectives	Process
Session 5: Mitigation Techniques and implementation of projects, Chair: Workshop Facilitator			
09:00 09:30	<p>Recap of day two (Facilitator)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Answer any questions and review concepts 	<p><i>Rapporteur: Mr. Mohamed Yesuf, NPC, Ethiopia</i></p>
09:30 11:00	<p>Mitigation efforts through project implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - using the micro-grants to address transboundary challenges - generating lessons learned and best practices <p>Presentation by Amir Baker, MG LS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand the main elements of the project cycle ▪ Understanding the uses of the Micro-grants in the riparian countries 	<p><i>Rapporteur: Mr. Mohamed Yesuf, NPC, Ethiopia</i></p> <p>Presentation (50 minutes)</p> <p>Discussions (40 minutes)</p>
11:00 11:30	Coffee Break		

11:30 13:00	Introduction to the M&E, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Micro-Grants Projects -developing indicators -monitoring tools - evaluating the activities Presentation by Ms. Intisar Salih, M&E LS Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understanding the key M&E concepts ▪ Applying the concepts to project activities 	<i>Rapporteur: Ms Ishrag Dirar, NMGC, Sudan</i> Présentation : (45 minutes) Discussion : (45 minutes)
13:00 14:00	Lunch Break		
14:00 16:00	Group Discussion on designing mitigation related project proposals and incorporating M&E framework. Groups A, B, C and D will be given a transboundary problem and asked to develop project proposal responding to the issue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applying concepts ▪ Understanding and fostering transboundary linkages 	<i>Participants will be divided into four groups. Each group will select a facilitator, timekeeper and rapporteur</i>
16:00- 17:30	Reporting back to the Plenary (presentation of group findings by rapporteurs) followed by Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exchange of knowledge and sharing of experiences 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr.Khaled Bayoumi , LMGC, Egypt</i> Presentations made by each Group
17:30	Coffee Break and end of Day three		

Friday 08 April 2005

DAY 4 Networking and Transboundary linkages

Time	Activity	Objectives	Process
Session 6: Networking and Tran boundary linkages, Chair: Workshop Facilitator			
09:00 - 09:30	Recap of day three (Facilitator)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Answer any questions and review concepts 	<i>Rapporteur: Ms. Jane Kisakye. LMGC Uganda</i>
09:30 11:00	Introduction to the E E & A, NGO networking and establishing transboundary linkages Presentation by Mr. Mausche Kidundo, EE&A LS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understanding the importance of networking ▪ Techniques to establish good networking and transboundary linkages 	<i>Rapporteur: Ms. Jane Kisakye. LMGC Uganda</i> Presentation (45 minutes) Discussion (45 minutes)
11:00- 11:30	Coffee Break		
11:30 13:00	Group Discussion on networking and transboundary linkages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improving networking and establishing viable 	<i>Participants will be divided into four groups. Each group will select a facilitator, timekeeper and</i>

	Groups A, B, C and D will discuss issue(s) that will be provided before the session.	tools to maintain them	<i>rappporteur</i>
13:00 14:00	Lunch		
14:00- 15:30	Reporting back to the Plenary (presentation of group findings by rapportueres) followed by Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exchange of knowledge and sharing of experiences 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Victor K LMGC, Tanzania</i> Presentations made by each Group
15:30 16:30	The way forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capitalizing on the information and knowledge acquired ▪ Building partnerships and alliances ▪ Becoming agents for change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building a knowledge base and using it effectively 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Victor K LMGC, Tanzania</i>
Time	Activity	Objectives	Comments
Session 7: Closing Session Chaired by Mr. Gedion Asfaw, RPM			
16:30 – 17:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Workshop evaluation by participants - Remarks by representative of participants - Remarks by Amir Baker, MG LS - Closing remarks by Mr. Gedion Asfaw, RPM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feedback and new ideas ▪ Farewell & conclusions 	<i>Rapporteur: Mr. Victor K LMGC, Tanzania</i>
17:30	Coffee Break – End of Workshop Departure of some participants		

Saturday, 09 April 2005

Time	Activity	Comments
Flight Schedule	Departure of rest of participants	Participants will arrange their own Hotel -Airport transport