

## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Albertine Rift Conservation Society Civil Society Alliance for Enhanced Implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments in Key Biodiversity Areas of the Albertine Rift Region
<b>Project Title:</b>	
<b>Grant Number:</b>	64760
<b>CEPF Region:</b>	Eastern Afromontane
<b>Strategic Direction:</b>	2 Improve the protection and management of the KBA network throughout the hotspot.
<b>Grant Amount:</b>	\$209,998.65
<b>Project Dates:</b>	June 01, 2014 - August 31, 2017
<b>Date of Report:</b>	April 06, 2018

### Implementation Partners

List each partner and explain how they were involved in the project

- **Rwanda Environmental Management Authority:** As Lead Agency, REMA helped in sharing EIA related information for Rwanda to be posted on ARCOS web-portal. Also, they co-hosted all events organised in Rwanda under this project.
- **Rwanda Development Board:** RDB leads the EIA process in Rwanda. They helped in sharing EIA reports for comments by AREALA members.
- **Office Burundais Pour la Protection de l'Environnement:** As Lead Agency, OBPE co-hosted the EIA trainings and other advocacy events. They also facilitated the development of the public participation decree in Burundi.
- **North and south Kivu Province, DRC:** Both provinces co-hosted the EIA training in Bukavu. They were involved in all events organised regionally by sharing different case studies from DRC side.
- **National Environmental NGOs:** The NGOs (see the attached list) were beneficiaries of the EIA trainings and later became part of AREALA. They participated actively in all advocacy events planned under this project.
- **National and Regional Organisations of EIA experts:** They provided technical support during EIA trainings and the development of other planned project materials (see the offline report for more details).

### Conservation Impacts

Summarize the overall impact of your project, describing how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

**This project has contributed to the Strategic Direction 2 and specifically to the investment Priority 2.2. Geographically, we have focused on a selected set of KBAs located in the Itombwe-Nyungwe Landscape and the associated Freshwater KBAS {Lake Kivu, Lake Tanganyika) in Burundi, DRC and Rwanda. However, given that development in the region is a dynamic process, we have constantly been updating our assessment as new risks emerge.**

**The project aimed to minimise adverse impacts of development projects to Key Biodiversity Areas in central Albertine Rift through enhanced civil society advocacy and information sharing for transparent EIA processes. The project initiated a strong advocacy alliance of civil society organisations named “Albertine Rift Environmental Assessment Leadership Alliance (AREALA) in the three countries (Burundi, DRC and Rwanda). Through this alliance, the civil society was and will be able to influence decisions on projects targeting KBAs through EIA processes and to make collaborative advocacy that lead to positive changes in EIA process for targeted countries. One example is the “cable car project” in Rwanda, which was proposed in Volcanoes National Park (VNP), a key habitat for Mountain Gorilla. Following comments collected from AREALA members (among others), the EIA was subjected to a total review. Also, the EIA for road project in Nyungwe National Park was rejected. In Burundi, such advocacy led to the development of a public participation ministerial decree, which is to enable the public, including the civil society organisations to give their views on the decisions made to the environment and natural resources management.**

**In relation to information sharing, the project provided channels through which CSOs and other partners will be able to access EIA information from the region. These include, a web-portal accommodating an online library that contains EIA information on policy, EIA reports, training materials, as well as case studies from the region and beyond. Also, there is a newsletter (AREALA News) initiated to share information within the network and beyond, on development projects and EIA from the region.**

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
By end of 2017, The adverse impacts of development activities affecting key biodiversity areas in the Central Albertine Rift will be minimized through enhanced civil society advocacy for transparent EIA processes.	Due to advocacy made by civil society organizations through AREALA, joining other advocacy processes, up to 4 development projects (see threats report) targeting Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) were either rejected before implementation, instructed to review the implementation or to redo the EIA process. The advocacy was rather not confrontational but based on facts in form of comments to the proposed or ongoing projects.
Experience and information sharing in the region and synergies in EIA development and implementation promoted.	Another challenge that the project came to address was a gap in information sharing, especially EIA related information. There was no existing platform, available to CSOs or other stakeholders to access EIA information. Through the established platforms (including the web-portal, newsletter and dialogues),

	<p>CSOs were efficiently updated regularly on EIA policy developments in the three countries and the ongoing projects (particularly those targeting KBAs) and the process of their EIAs. Also, the platform helped to enhance EIA knowledge beyond planned EIA trainings; The portal contains EIA training materials while the AREALA newsletter would provide one article that discusses specific EIA topics with the aim to better understand the EIA process. Also, the platforms helped the CSOs to work together to positively influence the EIA process. For example, collected comments on EIA reports for projects proposed in Rwanda (cable car in VNP and road in Nyungwe) included inputs from NGOs in Burundi and Eastern DRC. Finally, the dialogues brought together stakeholders from the 3 countries and resulted in joint positions were shared with decision makers from the three countries.</p>
--	---


Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<p>The national EIA reviews, assessments and case studies are used by at least 1 country in the Central Albertine Rift in the formulation of EIA policy, standards and guidelines by 2017</p>	<p>While other countries considered case studies and joint position papers (see the attached) for future reviews of EIA documents, Burundi went ahead and considered improving the public participation, an issue highlighted in one of our case studies. This has led to the development of the Public Participation Ministerial Decree by “Office Burundians Pour la Protection de l’Environnement” together with CSOs.</p>
<p>AREALA Network reach at least 100 members by 2017 actively engaged in EIA assessment and influencing</p>	<p>One of the project objectives was to build a strong voice of SCOs in the three countries advocating for and influencing transparent EIA while facilitating information sharing in the region. After EIA trainings, we started to interest members to join the platform as per the attached TORs. Facilitated by ARCOS as a secretariat, the CSOs have been continuously joining and we currently have 81 members as per the attached list segregated per country. As this platform was initiated in the presence of EIA lead agencies, they appreciated and recognised AREALA members and have been working with them to improve the EIA process. ARCOS has also been providing technical support to AREALA members in each country on advocacy for country specific issues. For example, AREALA and other partners participated in regular dialogues to discuss some emerging issues such as mining, oil and gas in relation to EIA and development. This was based on produced materials such as policy briefs and case studies where joint positions were developed and</p>

	addressed to governments and other key partners to take actions. More specifically, AREALA produced a case study on transboundary EIA which was highly discussed in our regional advocacy events.
At least 40 NGOs and CBOs (10 in Rwanda, 10 in Burundi, 10 in North Kivu and 10 in South Kivu) and 5 from wider Albertine Rift) have skills in EIA to influence EIA process by end 2017	Around 70 environmental non-governmental organisations from Rwanda, Burundi and Eastern DRC (North and South Kivu) were trained in the process of Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Advocacy. The acquired skills have enabled CSOs to influence transparent EIA processes. For example, with AREALA comments, 3 EIAs in Rwanda were returned to the developer and reviewed while one was rejected. Also, following a field visit organised on the project site, AREALA provided useful recommendations on the implementation of two projects: Mining in Kuzi Biega, and Hydropower development in Kibira National Park in DRC and Burundi respectively). Advocacy skills are now helping AREALA members in DRC to influence decisions (through joint position papers) regarding natural resources management in the Albertine Rift Lakes.
NGO advocacy action contribute to effective EIA implementation and site safeguard papers are available and support site-specific safeguard policy and NGO engagement in at least 2 sites in the region by end 2017	Papers developed by AREALA members were used by CSOs and ARCOS in different ways to advocate for specific Key Biodiversity Areas. These include the position papers for the cable car project proposed in the Volcanoes National Park, and road inside Nyungwe National Park. The latter pressed to influence the EIA for the proposed project of Pindura-Bweyeye road. In the end, the EIA report was rejected and the project couldn't continue as proposed. The papers were used to influence EIA process and resulted in a total review of the EIA report. Other endeavours consisted in general advocacy for public participation in EIA process and this led to the development of the public participation document in Burundi.

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives

**What we considered as a success in this project (Among other) is to see an EIA process transparently undertaken as a result AREALA intervention. As such, AREALA participated in at least 5 reviews of EIA reports and provided comprehensive comments. Three of them were subjected to reviews, one rejected and one given a green light. Also, the success would be seen when EIA documents legal documents are either developed or reviewed as a result of AREALA advocacy. In that line, for example AREALA advocacy resulted in the development of a public participation decree that will enable officially the whole public to participate in EIA process. However, there were some challenges as well. Those include**

- 
1. **The limited willingness by lead agencies to share EIA information especially EIA reports:** in all the 3 countries (Burundi, DRC and Rwanda,) EIA reports are not made public. Instead, they are supposed to be a property of the lead agencies only, which become a potential barrier to ensuring transparent EIA. Negotiations were made and we agreed to have MoUs with EIA lead agencies, but the project ended when the process was still on.
  2. **Security issues:** To some extent, the security issues in the region, particularly in Burundi and DRC, would limit us to access some places or effectively to interact with partners.
  3. **Language:** All the 3 countries don't speak same official languages; DRC and Burundi use French while Rwanda has just shifted to English. This forced us (as secretariat to the alliance) to prepare communications materials (including AREALA news) in both languages as well as using instant translation in our regional events which would surely cost more time and money.
  4. **Slow information sharing:** Information sharing among AREALA members was not as quick as expected. This delayed some project deliverables such as the newsletter to which members were supposed to contribute.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

We had not planned for the dialogues as one of advocacy option. However, this initiative was judged as the best approach to engage civil society and other stakeholders in the conservation of KBAs. Also, it turned out that the planned trainings benefited not only the CSO but also some government officials and private sector which appreciated and learned a lot about the EIA process.

## Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Describe the results from each product/deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Regional EIA knowledge and information management system established and functional to support EIA decision-making in the region	1.1	Two issues of AREALA Newsletter produced per year and disseminated to AREALA members and wider ARCOS Network and other stakeholders	<p>AREALA newsletter is bilingual newsletters and produced in collaboration with AREALA members to raise awareness on Environmental Impact Assessment in the Albertine Rift region. Containing approximately 5-6 articles, each issue included EIA related information for the Albertine Rift Region; EIA for proposed projects, EIA policy processes and civil society engagement in EIA. We have produced five (Attached) out of the expected six issues for the project period. This was due to long period needed to collect articles from contributors. However, since the newsletter is meant to go beyond the project lifespan, we hope to have the expected number and go beyond.</p> <p>The dissemination was primarily by email, posted online (website, social media) and shared in hard copy forms. The newsletters were submitted as PDF attachments to AREALA members and other ARCOS facilitated groups (Africa Great Lakes Conservation Network and the Africa Regional Mountain Forum). Each issue would reach up to 400 people. We measure this by counting of the number of individuals in ARCOS groups who downloaded the issues from the portal, and estimated the number of issues shared in person in both hard and soft copies.</p>
1	Regional EIA knowledge and information management system established and functional to support EIA decision-making in the region	1.2	Regional web portal finalised and populated with exiting materials on EIA (i.e. case studies, training and advocacy materials, etc.) with a target of 1000 users by 2017;	<p>The ARCOS web portal became active on in July 2014 and we formally launched it at the regional African mountain Forum in Arusha in October 2014. It can be reached with the following link and is active (<a href="http://arbmis.arcosnetwork.org/library-eia/out/out.Login.php?referuri=%2Flibrary-eia%2Fout%2Fout.Dashboard.php">http://arbmis.arcosnetwork.org/library-eia/out/out.Login.php?referuri=%2Flibrary-eia%2Fout%2Fout.Dashboard.php</a>).</p> <p>The portal is organized under the “library” section of the ARCOS website. It has capabilities of both registered users and guest access, registered users being able to upload documents. It is organized in four libraries one of which is dedicated to “Albertine Rift Development and EIA”. Using google track we have been monitoring the number of visitors to the library, and as of November 2017 the page had 5,389 views, of which 4,075 were unique visitors. These figures suggest the helpfulness of the</p>

				documents uploaded to the library, given that we have maintained a base of 1,314 repeated visitors, and continue to draw in new visitors with the information we are publishing. ARCOS has permanent staff with technical database experience who manage the portal, track its usage, and update documentation. Given the ongoing programs using the libraries in the portal, we foresee that ARCOS will easily continue managing the web portal. The EIA section will be continuously updated
1	Regional EIA knowledge and information management system established and functional to support EIA decision-making in the region	1.3	At least one EIA case study per year produced and shared amongst AREALA and posted on the web portal	3 Case studies have been produced on topics that included public participation (attached) in the Albertine Rift with focus on civil society organisation, this was shared specifically with government EIA lead agencies and shared in all our events to support public participation in EIA process. Other topics included cumulative impacts or roads development in Nyungwe and Oil/ gas exploitation in Albertine Rift lakes. These were shared to different stakeholders through AREALA news which is also available on our portal.
2	AREALA Network is functioning effectively and civil society organisations work together in advocating for effective EIA at local, national and regional level.	2.1	AREALA Network reaches at least 100 members by 2017 under the facilitation of an effective regional Secretariat.	AREALA has been growing as the project went on (2014: 32,2015: 58,2016: 81 ,2017: 81 and it included mainly Civil Society Organisations but also EIA practitioners from the Albertine Rift Region (see attached list). The Secretariat (ARCOS) facilitated information exchange among the members and mobilised them for eventual discussion on different issues pertaining EIA process in particular, and natural resources management in general.
2	AREALA Network is functioning effectively and civil society organisations work together in advocating for effective EIA at local, national and regional level.	2.2	AREALA Branches in Rwanda, South Kivu, North Kivu and Burundi supported to pilot site specific safeguard measures in selected KBAs.	Similar to Rwanda and Burundi, we have organised and facilitated EIA trainings for 38 Civil Society Organisations in Eastern DRC, including 17 from north Kivu and 21 from south Kivu. For this training, we had to combine both North Kivu and South Kivu and all identified stakeholders met in Bukavu due to security issues in Goma. The attached training report gives more detailed information.
2	AREALA Network is functioning	2.3	At least one national	After EIA trainings in each country, we organised advocacy meetings that were preceded by field visits

	effectively and civil society organisations work together in advocating for effective EIA at local, national and regional level.		advocacy activity facilitated in each country.	where we took advantage of the presence of government authorities and private sector representatives (see training reports). The meetings served to discuss specific issues pertaining EIA process in each country, emerging threats to KBAs and proposed sustainable solutions. For example, mining was the biggest issue in DRC, infrastructure development in Rwanda's KBAs and urban development around Lake Tanganyika in Burundi. In all countries, the public participation in EIA process was highly discussed and recommendations drawn. After these, the advocacy meetings were taken to a regional level through dialogues. The ideas were to come up with a stronger CSO voice with harmonised recommendations on issues covering the whole region and targeting transboundary ecosystems such as oil and gas exploration. These meetings resulted into joint positions which were shared with government lead agencies and other stakeholders. In addition to stakeholder meetings which took place at the end of EIA trainings in every country, ARCOS organised two regional dialogues covering the three countries( after discussion with CEPF during the mid-term review). This helped to connect local stakeholders with
3	Civil society capacity (NGOs and community groups) enhanced for effective participation in the EIA Process joint advocacy in EIA issues across the region.	3.1	Training Plan for Local NGOs/CBOs developed	A training plan was developed in accordance with the training needs assessment (TNA) conducted prior to the training. The plan highlighted the purpose, which was to increase EIA skills and advocacy capacity of civil society organizations and ensure their active participation in EIA process, especially for projects taking place in Key Biodiversity Areas. As per the TNA, the training focused on general EIA/SEA process, EIA review, public participation and advocacy strategies. Trainings were undertaken between 2014 and 2015 through the partnership with specialised institutions in EIA including national and regional EIA associations (ABEIE, APEIER, SEEAC) who provided trainers.
3	Civil society capacity (NGOs and community groups) enhanced for effective participation in the EIA Process joint advocacy in EIA issues across	3.2	At least 10 NGOs/CBOs in Burundi trained in EIA/SEA and Cumulative Impact Assessment and advocacy.	Similar to Rwanda we have organised and facilitated EIA trainings for 18 Civil Society Organisations in Burundi. This involved translation of all EIA materials into French versions. Also, the training involved field visits around Lake Tanganyika to observe the impacts of urbanisation to the lake. See attached the training report.



	the region.			
3	Civil society capacity (NGOs and community groups) enhanced for effective participation in the EIA Process joint advocacy in EIA issues across the region.	3.3	At least 10 NGOs/CBOs in South Kivu trained in EIA/SEA and Cumulative Impact Assessment and advocacy.	We have facilitated EIA trainings for 20 Civil Society Organisations in Rwanda (see training report). Participants have been trained on different topics including EIA steps as highlighted in the training plan. However, more focus was given to critical steps which involve the public participation such as scoping and reporting. The training was also marked by the reviews of ongoing EIAs where CSOs got the opportunity to comment on water abstraction project in Nyungwe National Park proposed by the Water and Sanitation Corporation (WASAC) in Rwanda.
3	Civil society capacity (NGOs and community groups) enhanced for effective participation in the EIA Process joint advocacy in EIA issues across the region.	3.4	At least 10 NGOs/CBOs in North Kivu trained in EIA/SEA and Cumulative Impact Assessment and advocacy.	Similar to Rwanda and Burundi, we have organised and facilitated EIA trainings to 38 Civil Society Organisations in Eastern DRC, including 17 from north Kivu and 21 from south Kivu. For this training, we had to combine both North Kivu and South Kivu and all identified stakeholders met in Bukavu due to security issues in Goma. The attached training report gives more detailed information.
4	Evidence-based and collaborative advocacy by civil society organisations contribute to improved EIA policy and site safeguard and practices for Albertine Rift KBAs	4.1	Advocacy materials for Rwanda, DRC and Burundi (incl. site specific concerns and legislation goals), produced and disseminated to members and publish on web portal.	Advocacy materials were developed, some of which were general to all KBAs in the region others were targeting specific KBAs. As mentioned above, 3 policy briefs were produced on mountain EIA and mountain ecosystems, transboundary ecosystems, and one on mining targeting Kauzi Biega. Case studies included one on public participation in the Albertine Rift, one on cumulative impacts of roads in Nyungwe and one on oil and gas in the region. We have also produced threats maps and finally AREALA Newsletter (in all issues) was highly used to communicate EIA issues in the regions
4	Evidence-based and collaborative advocacy by civil society organisations contribute to improved EIA	4.2	Policy briefs on the threats affecting key KBAs using selected case studies and information from AREALA	Three policy briefs were produced covering topics of mining in and around Kauzi Biega advocating for sustainable mining, mountain ecosystems including Nyungwe National Park, Volcanoes National Park and others highlighting that once a project is targeting such areas, EIA should carefully be done. Finally, we produced one policy brief on transboundary ecosystems in the Albertine advocating for consultation beyond one country

	policy and site safeguard and practices for Albertine Rift KBAs		members	when a project is targeting a transboundary ecosystem. All policy briefs were used in different meetings and fora, and shared with AREALA members and made available at ARCOS web-portal.
4	Evidence-based and collaborative advocacy by civil society organisations contribute to improved EIA policy and site safeguard and practices for Albertine Rift KBAs	4.3	Advocacy event organised in Rwanda, targeting governments, donors, private sector and AREALA members	We have supported AREALA members in each country for site specific EIA advocacy. Plans were made after EIA training highlighting KBAs and specific issues of focus. Based on that we have facilitated advocacy sessions depending on emerging issues. In Rwanda, we helped to compile all inputs to EIAs made by different NGOs members of AREALA and submitted to RDB. In Burundi, we facilitated field visits to the hydropower development in Kibira national park, and supported financially and technically the development of public participation ministerial decree. This also included technical assistance to the Horizon Nature project in Kahuzi-Biega National Park where we were part of the project advisory committee and were involved technically in the project activities including trainings and information sharing and joint development of the policy brief on mining.
4	Evidence-based and collaborative advocacy by civil society organisations contribute to improved EIA policy and site safeguard and practices for Albertine Rift KBAs	4.4	Face to face advocacy consultations (involving governments, major donors, private sector, local governments, communities and NGOs) conducted with regulators and officials in Kigali, Bujumbura, Bukavu and Goma.	The advocacy event was organised in form of “Environment and Development Dialogue” that took place in Kigali, Rwanda. This brought together a wide range of stakeholders from Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania (No Burundi unfortunately! They couldn’t travel to Rwanda). The dialogue focused on EIA issues and emerging projects in the Albertine Rift including oil and gas, mining, intensive agriculture, etc. As discussed during the mid-term review, this dialogue was made regional instead of country based, in order to promote exchange between three countries, to benefit from experience of other countries such as Uganda and Tanzania and to ensure a meaningful discussion around these emerging issues some of which affects all the countries. See the dialogue reports.
4	Evidence-based and collaborative advocacy by civil society	4.5	Priority sites reviewed annually ; changes in threat levels	A baseline of projects targeting KBAs in the project sites was produced at the beginning of the project. This included the type of projects, the promoter and whether or not the EIA was undertaken before project implementation. Updated every year, and presented into

	organisations contribute to improved EIA policy and site safeguard and practices for Albertine Rift KBAs		recorded and reported on, as a contribution to CEPF's monitoring framework	maps, these reports have been also used in advocacy, shared with stakeholders but especially referred to in our dialogues. Table with priority sites and maps are attached.
4	Evidence-based and collaborative advocacy by civil society organisations contribute to improved EIA policy and site safeguard and practices for Albertine Rift KBAs	4.6	Annual report on number of policies influenced	For this phase, we didn't have many policies developed or reviewed by our advocacy. However, we did have one important development in Burundi where the government (under the office Burundais pour la Protection de l'Environnement) embraced the development of a ministerial decree for the public participation. Nevertheless, we have advocated for the enforcement of existing EIA legal document. In Rwanda for instance, the public consultation at scoping level was in EIA guidelines but poorly enforced, but it has now improved partly due to the recommendations made in our advocacy events. In DRC, Civil Society Organisations were allowed to access EIA reports in hard copies at province offices when they are interested

Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

1. 5 issues of AREALA Newsletter;
2. ARCOS Portal and Library;
3. 3 Case Studies [(a) Public participation in EIA in the Albertine Rift, b) Cumulative impacts of roads in Nyungwe, and c) Oil and gas exploitation in the Albertine Rift Lakes( published in the AREALA news issue 4)];
4. 3 Policy Briefs [a) Why and how to halt unsustainable mining in mountain forests of the Albertine Rift, b) Environmental impact Assessment and transboundary ecosystems of the Albertine Rift, and c) EIA in mountain ecosystems];
5. List of AREALA members segregated by country in DRC, Rwanda and Burundi;
6. Dialogue Report; Regional Environment and Development dialogue;
7. Dialogue resolutions
8. EIA training reports in Rwanda, Burundi and North/South Kivu;
9. Threat maps showing development projects targeting KBAs in the Albertine Rift;
10. List of projects affecting selected KBAs of Albertine Rift
11. Comments from AREALA members on EIA reports for proposed projects in and around KBAs
12. Ministerial Decree for public participation in Burundi.

## Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Consider lessons that would inform:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

One of the lessons learned during the design of the project was the increasing pressure of development projects to Key Biodiversity Areas in the Albertine Rift region and a subsequent lack of public participation (for interested and affected parties) in the design and implementation of those projects. In the implementation, we learned that the the lack of capacity in the EIA processes for various stakeholders (not only the civil society organisations) but as one of the biggest obstacle to the participatory process of the EIA. It was also clear that for some cases where CSOs were given an opportunity to give their comments to the EIA process, the result was much improved (some of the EIA reports were rejected because the projects were too damaging).

Finally, we realised that in the Albertine Rift reparation countries, the EIA process can highly be influenced by governments especially when a project falls into specific development agenda or individual interests. In that case therefre, the project will continue however environomentaly damaging, the project can be .e.g Oil and Gaz, Pit extraction, Hydropower,roads construction,etc.

## Sustainability / Replication

Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

The project managed to train around 70 NGOs from the project sites on the EIA process. Subsequently, an informal network (AREALA) was set up, which will serve as a platform for civil society organisation to advocate for transparant EIA processes for project affecting the KBAs in their areas and sustanable natural resources management in general. An online information system and a newsletter (AREALA news) were created for sharing EIA information from the albertine Rift Region. We managed to influence the establishement of a legal document (Public Participation Decree in Burundi) in one country of the project sites which will then allow the public to be involved in the EIA process in particular and in Natural resources management in General. The challenge faced included; the limited time and resources to train CSO leaders given the need, the insecurity in the region (especially in Burundi and DRC) and for some countries, the difficulties to access EIA information regarding planned and ongoing projects. One important activity which was not planned for (initially) but which brought promissing results is the stakeholder dialogues on environment and Development. With this, we even managed to put on board the private sector e.g. Total Limited, BANRO, Kivuwatt ContourGlobal.

## Safeguards

If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

**This was Listed a separate project component.**

## Additional Comments/Recommendations

Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF

**We would like to commend CEPF efforts to the conservation of the Key Biodiversity Areas in the East Afromont (Where the albertine Rift is found) in regards to the emmerging issue of development projects targeting these ecosystems. Also, the need for capacity building (in different ways) of civil society organisations working in natural resources management. However, the needs for this efforts are still many and are increasing. Therefore, dispite the continuous political instability in the region, it is important that CEPF need to keep considering the Albertine rift as a priolity and a region of focus among others.**

## Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment

**Total additional funding (US\$)**

*\$5,000.00*

### **Type of funding**

*Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:*

- A Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*
- C Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*



This project was supported by other programs implemented by ARCOS to develop a web portal

1. Development of the web-portal (ARBMIS): Category A. This project required \$25,000 and CEPF contributed \$ 5000

### **Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

1. Please include your full contact details (Name, Organization, Mailing address, Telephone number, E-mail address) below

**Name: Philbert Nsengiyumva, Organization: Albertine Rift Conservation Society(ARCOS), Mailing address: Po Box 9146, Telephone number: +256788180857/+250788466541, Email address: [pnsengiyumva@arcosnetwork.org](mailto:pnsengiyumva@arcosnetwork.org)**