

IBLAC

Independent Biodiversity and Livelihoods Advisory Committee

for Oil and Gas Developments in Albertine Graben

(Blocks: Contract Area 1, Licence Area 2, Kingfisher Development Area)
(Uganda)

and

East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP) from Kabaale in Hoima District (Uganda)
to Tanga (Tanzania)

Annual Report 2023

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
IBLAC Operations	1
IBLAC meetings	2
Technical Assistance and Support to the Tilenga and EACAOP Programs	5
In-Country Visit to Uganda and Tanzania	7
Summary	8
Annex 1: In-country visit report	1
Acronyms	2
1. Introduction	1
2. Positive highlights	2
3. Ten areas for further attention and follow-up	3
4. Current monitoring and evaluation (M&E), particularly for biodiversity (Tilenga and Kingfisher) is primarily focused on compliance and implementation performance (outputs), rather than on biodiversity and livelihood impacts	3
5. Funding models for long-term offset financing are still uncertain	4
6. More needs to be understood on whether or how net gain initiatives can make a difference to ecological connectivity	4
3.4 Livelihood successes are visible at household level of project-affected people and less at community level in those areas where impacts are concentrated (Tilenga landscape and Chongoleani Peninsula and need to be upscaled.	5
7. Efforts for achieving landscape level livelihoods and net gain goals don't seem to be synergistic at landscape level	6
7.6 Land-based livelihoods programs are vulnerable to water stress/climate change effects	7
8. Sustainability of B&L initiatives is at risk wherever local government is not embedded	7
9. Community-based conservation programs design need both social and ecological science	7
10. Supporting law enforcement of protected areas without simultaneously addressing the root causes of illegal activities, presents risks to livelihoods and to the Projects	8
11. Community wage-based livelihoods are at risk from gaps in contractor management of working conditions	8
12. Uganda	9
13. Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement	9
14. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement	9
15. Specific recommendations - Tilenga	10
16. Specific recommendations - Kingfisher	11
17. Specific recommendations – EACOP Uganda	12
18. Tanzania	12
19. Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement	12
20. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement	13
21. Specific recommendations – EACOP Tanzania	13
22. IBLAC Administration	14

Acknowledgements	15
Annex 2 . Schedule of Meetings and Visits	16
Annex 3. List of Paris Meeting Participants at TotalEnergies Headquarters November 17, 2023.	20

Introduction

IBLAC is the Independent Biodiversity and Livelihoods Advisory Committee for Oil and Gas Development in Albertine Graben (Blocks: Contract Area 1, Licence Area 2, Kingfisher Development Area) (Uganda) and for the East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP) from Kabaale in Hoima District (Uganda) to Tanga (Tanzania). These developments are together referred to below as ‘the Projects’.

IBLAC was formed in 2013 with the objective of advising the Parties (TotalEnergies Exploration Production Uganda BV (TEPU), Chinese National Offshore Oil Company Uganda Limited (CUL) and the East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP)) on how best to conserve and enhance biodiversity, and to improve and enhance community livelihoods within their areas of operation and the wider Projects’ areas of influence within the affected landscapes before, during, and after the Projects.

The role of the IBLAC is to be involved throughout all phases of the Projects to guide and support the implementation of impact avoidance and minimisation (preventative measures) and then implementing restoration and offsetting measures that are in line with best practices and available environmental and social management options, techniques, and practices and in accordance with ‘net gain’ and ‘no net loss’ commitments and legal requirements. IBLAC operates as an independent body and provides an independent, transparent assessment / perspective on biodiversity and community livelihood aspects of the Projects.

IBLAC provides its advice in accordance with the agreed terms of reference (TOR). These TORs were revised and drafted based on the results of meetings convened at TotalEnergies headquarters in November 2021. The revisions to the original TOR recognized the need for modifications in the scope and activities of IBLAC, as well as the need for greater stakeholder engagement and transparency regarding IBLAC recommendations and company responses. The new TOR was finalized in early 2022, formally agreed by TEPU and EACOP, and now forms the basis for the operations of IBLAC.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the creation of IBLAC. Over that time, the role of IBLAC has evolved from the provision of guidance and advice on avoiding impacts on biodiversity as part of the exploratory phase of activities in Uganda to now focusing on addressing both biodiversity and social issues (and their interlinkages), related to construction and project operations in both Uganda and Tanzania, involving the Tilenga, Kingfisher, and EACOP projects. IBLAC is now guiding both upstream and downstream operations regarding the mitigation of biodiversity and social impacts, the integration of biodiversity and social programs to both improve biodiversity management and achieve sustainable economic benefits. Another priority focus is the analysis of mechanisms to finance and secure the long-term biodiversity and social outcomes desired as part of the companies’ net gain ambitions.

IBLAC Operations

The new TOR established revised approaches for IBLAC operations, to improve information sharing among the parties, retain IBLAC independence, and ensure that IBLAC recommendations would be registered, responded to, and shared with relevant stakeholders. These approaches have been

operational for two years and have proven effective in maintaining communication between the Parties and IBLAC and ensuring an active role for IBLAC.

There were important changes to IBLAC operations in 2023. At the first IBLAC meeting of the year in February 2023, we introduced Dr. Yunus Mgaya as the newest IBLAC member. Dr. Mgaya is a Tanzanian national and a leading marine expert with a long and established track record in science and with Tanzanian institutions. He fills a position that IBLAC had identified as important given the project activities proposed in the coastal areas around Tanga and the Chongoleani Peninsula and the need to address marine and coastal critical habitat issues resulting from the development of the Marine Storage Terminal (MST), and the jetty built into the sea to provision tankers. Incorporating Dr. Mgaya into IBLAC adds important expertise that was missing from IBLAC, allowing it to fulfil its mandate more effectively.

Another important addition in 2023 was the designation by the Parties of Tiffanie Billey as the person in charge of the IBLAC Secretariat. Tiffanie plays an important role in the organization of the IBLAC program. She organizes the meetings, works with the Chair to establish the meeting agendas, assists in organizing in-country IBLAC visits and provides documentation and information to the Committee to allow it to carry out its mandate. She takes meeting minutes to ensure an accurate record of the discussions and deliberations during IBLAC meetings. She also posts documents and other materials for IBLAC review on the IBLAC MS-Teams environment and advises members on actions that need attention. Her arrival has contributed very positively to the improved operations of IBLAC.

IBLAC meetings.

IBLAC meets regularly throughout the year. These include regularly scheduled monthly meetings that allow for updates from the Parties on project progress, in-country visits and meetings when the team can review the various programs being implemented in the field, and an annual team meeting in Paris with the leadership of Total Energies. Table 1 shows the official meetings held by IBLAC in 2023. The list does not include the various ad hoc meetings organized to discuss specific issues or provide targeted guidance and advice.

Table 1. IBLAC 2023 meetings.

Date	Meeting Type	Notes
January 2023	Virtual Internal IBLAC meeting	Internal discussions
February 2023	Virtual Regular Monthly meeting: IBLAC and the Parties	First meeting of year IBLAC and Parties
March 2023	Virtual Annual General Meeting with Parties	First AGM for IBLAC with attendance from all parties and representatives from TotalEnergies HQ.
April 2023	Virtual Regular Monthly Meeting	EACOP focused meeting
May 2023	Virtual Quarterly Meeting	Planning meeting for the field trip schedule for July
June 2023	Virtual Internal IBLAC meeting	Discussions and final trip preparation

July & August 2023	In Country Visit to Uganda and Tanzania Also served as the Quarterly meeting	Three-week field trip with debriefing of findings and recommendations
September 2023	IBLAC Virtual Internal Meeting	Preparation of the field trip report
October 2023	Virtual regular IBLAC meeting	Project update
November 2023	Meeting in Paris with TotalEnergies headquarters to discuss project activities, issues and recommendations	Meetings with various departments to apprise leadership on progress of project vis-à-vis biodiversity and social issues and discuss recommendations from time in the field. Also undertake initial planning for 2024. Serves as quarterly meeting
December 2023	Regular IBLAC Quarterly Meeting	Final meeting of year, outline work plan for 2024

Monthly Meetings

The monthly meetings take place virtually over two hours and generally involve project updates, discussions of key issues that need to be addressed, and points related to the work plan. Often, the discussions have focused either on biodiversity or social issues to ensure that IBLAC gives adequate attention to both social and biodiversity concerns. Over the past year, as resettlement issues have taken on less prominence, and efforts have grown to better integrate social and biodiversity objectives as part of project implementation, IBLAC meetings include both the biodiversity and social teams so that discussions around impacts and mitigation are understood in a more integrated fashion. Some monthly meetings would focus activities of only one country or program (e.g. EACOP versus Tilenga), depending on the agenda and what issues need to be covered.

Quarterly Meetings

Quarterly meetings are more expansive, with greater participation from the Parties. Representatives from the biodiversity and social teams of Tilenga, EACAOP and Kingfisher normally attend quarterly meetings, which often include the participation of TotalEnergies headquarters' staff. In addition to receiving project updates, these meetings also discuss the status of recommendations and progress toward meeting planned objectives. The meetings normally last between two and two and one-half hours and provide an update on project activities across the entire landscape.

Annual Headquarters Meeting in Paris November 16 and 17, 2023

The work plan establishes that IBLAC hold an annual meeting to ensure that company leadership receives a direct briefing from IBLAC and has the opportunity to exchange information with Committee members. This year, IBLAC held a two-day meeting at the TotalEnergies headquarters

in Paris in November. Meetings on November 16th allowed the IBLAC team to review its recommendations from the in-country visit and to prepare for the meeting with TotalEnergies leadership planned for the following day. IBLAC also received briefing from Pauline Macronald and David Ochanda, Tilenga, on the current plans to implement a co-management plan for Murchison Falls National Park, that will bring in additional park management expertise to work with UWA to implement activities that will deliver a biodiversity net gain.

The meetings also allowed IBLAC to address some internal issues regarding operations. IBLAC members agreed that some revisions of the ToR will be necessary to improve overall operations. One item identified for clarification and discussed during the meetings, was the conflict of interest policy for IBLAC members. This will be reviewed and suggested modifications provided. Other modifications may also be proposed.

On November 18th, IBLAC made a presentation to TotalEnergies leadership physically present in Paris, along with virtual participation of the General Managers from EACOP and Tilenga, and the environmental managers from both companies. IBLAC highlighted the positive response to its recommendations to date and the positive social and biodiversity achievements in both Uganda and Tanzania. Effective systems have been put in place to achieve positive results and progress is positive. At the same time IBLAC, as a result of its visit to both countries in July and August, observed some challenges that need to be addressed and which led to a series of recommendations. The several points discussed during the presentation included the following:

- **Measurement of positive outcomes** – a robust monitoring system needs to be in place and managed to demonstrate results.
- **Efforts for achieving landscape level livelihoods and net gain goals don't always seem to be synergistic yet** - there is a greater need for integration of social and biodiversity objectives and outcomes given the significant community reliance on natural resources.
- **Discretionary social investment needs to support the net gain strategy** to the extent possible to build community conditions for successful net gain investments.
- **Long-term funding models for offset financing** need to be in place with adequate resources assured.
- **Be aware of the business and human rights risks** associated with supporting government initiatives that may lead to evictions from protected areas.
- **Buffers around well-pads/infrastructure need to be reviewed**, with adequate buffers developed and maintained to avoid impacts on people.

The meeting ended with a question and answer session to clarify the various observations and to allow participants to obtain more information.

Although two days were available for meetings and discussions, some of the work still needed to be finalized. There was insufficient time to review the recommendations register during these Paris sessions, and such a review needs to be carried out in early 2024 to ensure it reflects current conditions. New recommendations have been added, while older recommendations that have been addressed or are no longer relevant need to be archived. In the future, adding day for these meetings may need to be considered.

The list of attendees at the Paris meeting appears in Appendix X.

Adhoc Meetings

Throughout the year IBLAC members held adhoc meetings with the companies to follow-up on specific issues or recommendations that required IBLAC support, but which did not need the convening of the entire IBLAC. The Parties normally requested these meetings, but IBLAC members would also request meetings to address specific issues. The Chair holds ad hoc meetings that help form the agenda for the regular meetings.

Meetings with EACOP Lenders, Environmental and Social Consultant (LESC) Team

IBLAC held two meetings with the LESL – the group representing the project lenders. During those meetings, IBLAC provided information on the biodiversity and social performance of the companies and answered specific questions regarding the progress of the mitigation program. The LESL appreciated the input from IBLAC as part of its assessment.

Virtual Meeting with IUCN Great Ape Specialist Group ARCC Task Force

The Chair organized a virtual meeting with Genevieve Campbell of the ARCC Task Force to get an update on the work of ARCC related to project activities. This was organized to get an update on chimp issues, given that the in-country meeting would not coincide with the meeting with ARCC and that, due to medical issues, the Chair could not travel to the field. Two key issues were discussed: i) the need to work out the mechanism to ensure the flow of funds to the implementing organizations; ii) concerns that the new roads through forested areas are a threat, given their width and limited speed controls. In the meeting, the need for crossings of some kind was highlighted, but also it was noted that there is limited experience in putting in place either overpasses or underpasses for chimpanzees, and therefore, some research, or a pilot effort, may be required to test the feasibility. This information was taken into consideration by IBLAC and reflected in its recommendations.

Technical Assistance and Support to the Tilenga and EACAOP Programs

During 2023, IBLAC members supported the Parties on specific issues related to recommendations made in 2022 and as a result of the in-country visit in July and August. The support from IBLAC supported the following programs:

- **Tanzania Biodiversity Fund.** IBLAC supported developing and establishing a new conservation trust fund (CTF) in Tanzania. The IBLAC chair worked with EACOP to develop terms of reference and assist in identifying an expert consultant who could shepherd the process of the CTF creation. Then, Chair participated in launch of the process, and meetings with various stakeholders, including donors, to determine the feasibility of creating such a fund, as well as assessing the potential to bring in other companies and donors to establish an adequate long-term fund that would support conservation and sustainable development in the country. The new Fund will play an important role in funding mitigation/offset activities, as well as the sustainable development projects identified as part of the long-term funding plans. Moreover, the new Fund will provide the

institutional structure that can allow for the long-term funding of activities within the country. Launch of the new Fund is expected in 2024.

- **Uganda Biodiversity Fund.** IBLAC worked with both the EACOP/Tilenga and the Uganda Biodiversity Fund (UBF) to promote the development of a Memorandum of Understanding that would allow the UBF to play a role similar to that of the Tanzania Fund. The objective was to initiate work through funding activities related to the Chimpanzee Action Plan. Those discussions have continued for several months as the UBF board works to address some internal concerns and reach an agreement on an MoU. Recent decisions by the UBF Board indicate progress with the hope that an agreement can be signed with UBF in early 2024.
- **Tanga Wader Study.** IBLAC worked on enhancing the knowledge of the importance of the Tanga seascape for migratory waders in the context of the West Asian-East African Flyway by tracking waders in their daily patterns using the local habitats and during their long-distance migration. The coast around Tanga is known to harbour internationally important numbers of waders, e.g. Greater Sand Plovers (*Anarhynchus leschenaultii*) and other plovers and sandpipers. The limited knowledge about the habitat use, the migration and the important sites in this flyway are a limitation to conserving these biodiversity resources. Through the Tanga Wader project, EACOP contributes to generating new knowledge – e.g. for the better management of habitats in the Tanga Coelacanth Marine Park – and awareness about this importance as a facilitator for further investments by other donors in conservation and management of the habitats and the flyway.
- **Ecological Corridors.** During the field mission, the issue of ecological connectivity and its disruption by the project was raised and identified as a priority for mitigation. A series of technical meetings were held remotely between September and December 2023 with experts from CIRAD, Tilenga and EACOP. The aim of these meetings was to present the methodological approach required to analyse the state of structural and functional connectivity. The next step is to address this issue on a case-by-case basis in both countries. It was agreed to organise workshops involving government agencies and a wide audience to lay the groundwork for the restoration of wildlife corridors such as around Burigi Chato National Park and Wembere Game Reserve.
- **Impact monitoring:** On the issue of monitoring the impact of the project, virtual meetings were organised with experts from CIRARD and those from the Tilenga project. The discussions enabled a better understanding of the methods used to collect environmental monitoring data in Murchison Falls NP and to present digital tools that could improve the current system. The idea of a workshop detailing the range of tools to be tested is under consideration.
- **Livelihood Studies and Programs.** For Tilenga Project, IBLAC provided feedback on three draft Scopes of Work: two rapid assessments of potential interventions to support a) cattle herding activities in the savannah belt of Buliisa District and b) fishing-based livelihoods; and a call for an Implementation Partner to plan, manage and deliver a 3-year agricultural program targeting landowner and land user households practicing annual cropping in the agricultural belt of Buliisa, Hoima and Nwoya Districts.

In-Country Visit to Uganda and Tanzania

The IBLAC team visited both Uganda and Tanzania from July 23rd to August 5th in 2023 to review the progress of project activities in both countries, engage with stakeholders in the landscape and with government stakeholders and provided specific recommendations out of the visit. A copy of the detailed trip report, including recommendations arising from the visits and meetings held in the two countries, appears in Annex 1.

This trip occurred when activities in the field had ramped up due to construction and the start of drilling in Tilenga, spudding of wells in Kingfisher and finalising the MST camp on Chongoleani peninsular. It was also a time when mitigation action in form of , biodiversity, and social investments have moved forward, including a demonstration of responses to the recommendations made by IBLAC in previous visits.

Although the trip report includes specific recommendations and provides the relevant background information, there are several findings in addition to those mentioned earlier that IBLAC felt warranted attention. For instance, the team identified some very positive outcomes including:

Tilenga

- Tilenga continues to explore options to avoid and minimize impacts. IBLAC learned of on-going discussions to further reduce the project footprint in the Murchison Falls National Park, thereby lessening the total area disturbed by the Project in the Park. In addition, the project introduced technology that almost eliminates noise from drilling. This silent drilling is expected to reduce impact on species that may be the most susceptible to noise, reducing their stress and movement to other areas of the park. This approach addresses an earlier concern regarding the impact of noise on wildlife.
- Tilenga is engaged in supporting the new UWA management plan for Murchison Falls. The earlier plan did not adequately address the potential impacts of oil development. Now that the construction and operational plans are more clearly established, the management plan can identify interventions and management activities to address those impacts.
- Tilenga is moving forward with facilitating negotiation of community resource use agreements with the NFA and with UWA. These will be important to address the demand for resources and ecosystem services when land access is constrained by development and population pressures. Such actions can help to create a broader constituency that appreciates the value of the protected areas and helps to reduce pressures to degazette some areas that are now protected.
- Tilenga has also laid the foundation to work with UWA to put in place a co-management arrangement for Murchison Falls National Park. This effort can potentially improve the overall management of the protected area and ensure the planning and resources required to support the biodiversity net gain program, including work with local communities.
- IBLAC was happy to see that some of their recommendations were taken up from the earlier visits, including the development of the new tourist road and the levelling of road edges to increase visibility for wildlife when crossing roads. Addressing tourism issues more broadly will need to be included in the revised management plan.

EACOP

- In Uganda, household level agreements for livelihood restoration have been completed and will be implemented.

- Also, in Uganda, EACOP has committed to implementing aspects of the Chimpanzee Action Plan and is now working to develop the most effective funding mechanism to undertake projects in the region.
- EACOP has expanded its institutional connections in Tanzania by developing MoUs with TAWA and TANAPA.
- As mentioned, work is underway to establish the Tanzanian CTF that can become a national-level funding mechanism for conservation in the future, while also channelling offset funds to implementing groups.
- Offset efforts are now underway to protect the Pancake Tortoise and to support the Mkungunero Game Reserve.
- Support for livelihoods through improved agricultural practices is also showing success and provides a good model for introducing regenerative and sustainable approaches.

Kingfisher

At Kingfisher, it was evident that CNOOC had acted on recommendations from previous visits that include hiring more local community members. ,

During the visit, the IBLAC team also had a chance to observe areas where more attention is required to meet the established positive and social objectives. More detail around these points, including recommendations arising from them, are available in the attached trip report (Annex 1)

1. Current monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is primarily focused on compliance and implementation performance (outputs), rather than on biodiversity and livelihood impacts, especially related to biodiversity.
2. Funding models for offset financing are not yet confirmed.
3. More needs to be understood on whether or how net gain initiatives can make a difference to ecological connectivity.
4. Livelihood successes are primarily visible at the household level of project-affected people and less so at the relevant community level and need to be upscaled. This is particularly apparent in those areas where project impacts are concentrated (Tilenga landscape and Chongoleani Peninsula).
5. Efforts for achieving landscape level livelihoods and net gain goals don't seem to be synergistic at the landscape level.
6. Land-based livelihoods programs are vulnerable to water stress/climate change effects.
7. Sustainability of biodiversity and livelihoods (B&L) initiatives is at risk wherever local government is not embedded.
8. Community-based conservation programs design need both social and ecological science.
9. Supporting law enforcement of protected areas without simultaneously addressing the root causes of illegal activities presents risks to livelihoods and the Projects.
10. Community wage-based livelihoods are at risk from working conditions caused by gaps in compliance with an effective industrial relations system.

Summary

In 2023, IBLAC had the opportunity to observe significant improvements in the operation of the project in terms of addressing biodiversity and social issues. Funding has begun to flow to

programs in the field, and the various efforts undertaken to ensure greater coordination at the landscape level are starting to bear fruit. With the development of the co-management agreement for Murchison Falls National Park, which will be financed to a large degree by Tilenga, UWA will be able to deploy resources to address some of the most significant challenges facing park management and will be able to bolster the management capacity of the Park's team. This management will be able to work from a newly approved management plan that will also focus on meeting some of the net gain targets identified for the Murchison Conservation Area.

Achieving net gain is a challenging and ambitious goal requiring dedication, commitment, and resources over a long period. This year, the companies have made great strides in building the teams and mechanisms to implement programs that meet the established objectives, but much work remains to achieve the desired success. For example, there still needs to be buy-in from stakeholders in the net gain vision, including the understanding that net gain success will require long-term investments in programs that deliver both biodiversity and social benefits. However, the efforts underway by the projects can serve as a model for other projects and companies, especially in demonstrating how companies can work effectively to apply the environmental law requirements to avoid, reduce and then compensate for residual impacts effectively. The IBLAC team is committed to supporting that process and providing input and support toward meeting those net gain objectives.

At a time when climate issues are paramount in the minds of many governments and environmental constituencies and activist organizations, these projects operate under intense international scrutiny and are likely to face continued criticism and attacks from different interest groups. The development of a new project to deliver oil to the international market will continue to raise concerns and protests. As a consequence, any negative environmental and social impacts will be amplified in the press to draw attention to the negative aspects of what the companies are doing. By ensuring a commitment to the net gain ambition and investing in positive change that benefits both the environment and affected communities, the Parties can demonstrate that impacts can be mitigated and positive outcomes for both nature and people can be achieved; that there can be a balance between development and beneficial biodiversity and social outcomes. This can be at least a positive response to the detractors, and it should be a long-term priority for the companies and governments.

Annex 1: In-country visit report

Trip Report of the
Independent Biodiversity and Livelihoods Advisory Committee
(IBLAC) visit to Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP Projects
in Uganda and Tanzania

July 24 - August 5, 2023



Table of Contents

Acronyms	ii
1. Introduction	1
2. Positive highlights	2
3. Ten areas for further attention and follow-up	3
3.1 Current monitoring and evaluation (M&E), particularly for biodiversity (Tilenga and Kingfisher) is primarily focused on compliance and implementation performance (outputs), rather than on biodiversity and livelihood impacts	3
3.2 Funding models for long-term offset financing are still uncertain	4
3.3 More needs to be understood on whether or how net gain initiatives can make a difference to ecological connectivity	4
3.4 Livelihood successes are visible at household level of project-affected people and less at community level in those areas where impacts are concentrated (Tilenga landscape and Chongoleani Peninsula and need to be upscaled.	5
3.4 Efforts for achieving landscape level livelihoods and net gain goals don't seem to be synergistic at landscape level.....	6
3.6 Land-based livelihoods programs are vulnerable to water stress/climate change effects	7
3.7 Sustainability of B&L initiatives is at risk wherever local government is not embedded	7
3.8 Community-based conservation programs design need both social and ecological science	7
3.9 Supporting law enforcement of protected areas without simultaneously addressing the root causes of illegal activities, presents risks to livelihoods and to the Projects	8
3.10 Community wage-based livelihoods are at risk from gaps in contractor management of working conditions.....	8
4. Uganda	9
4.1 Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement	9
4.2 Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement.....	9
4.3 Specific recommendations - Tilenga	10
4.4 Specific recommendations - Kingfisher.....	11
4.5 Specific recommendations – EACOP Uganda	12
5. Tanzania	12
5.1 Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement	12
5.2 Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement.....	13
5.3 Specific recommendations – EACOP Tanzania.....	13
6. IBLAC Administration	14
Acknowledgements	15
Annex. Schedule of Meetings and Visit	16

1. Introduction

The Independent Biodiversity and Livelihoods Committee (IBLAC) was established in 2013 to advise the Tilenga (TotalEnergies Exploration Production Uganda (TEPU)), Kingfisher (Chinese National Offshore Oil Company Uganda Limited (CUL)) and East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP) Projects. IBLAC advice is aimed at supporting Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP to achieve biodiversity net gain and enhanced livelihoods in landscapes and communities affected by their Projects.

The IBLAC remit calls for an annual field visit to the operations in both countries¹, as well as offsite advice and support provided both online and face-to-face, and reviews and inputs into Project documentation. The field visits allow us to engage with communities; Ugandan and Tanzanian government institutions; civil society; relevant third-party institutions, such as the IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group ARRC Task Force, the Northern Albertine Rift Conservation Group (NARCG), the Eastern Arc Mountain Conservation Endowment Fund (EAMCEF); and other stakeholders. This engagement allows us to observe and learn about conditions on the ground and make informed recommendations.

This report presents the findings and recommendations from our 2023 visit. From July 24th until August 5th 2023, IBLAC, comprising Ward Hagemeyer, Ana Maria Esteves, Sébastien Le Bel, Alex Muhweezi, Charles Meshack and Prof. Yunus Mgaya, visited the Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP projects in Uganda and travelled to Tanzania to visit critical areas for biodiversity and livelihoods as part of the EACOP pipeline development. IBLAC chair, Ray Victorine, could not participate due to medical reasons and his role on the trip was substituted by Vice-Chair Ward Hagemeyer. This will form part of the Annual Report that will be published in December 2023.

The report starts by highlighting positive changes since our previous visit and observations on issues relevant across all Projects. Recommendations are made to address these issues (Section 2). Section 3 deals with Uganda specifically, and section 4 with Tanzania. Findings for EACOP appear under both chapters. Country chapters follow the same outline: landscape wide issues, supporting conditions, constraints, biodiversity findings, livelihood findings, and Project-specific recommendations.



¹ As per the IBLAC TOR dd 1 January 2022

2. Positive highlights

We observed good progress on addressing biodiversity and livelihood impacts. Some highlights are mentioned here and will be elaborated further under the respective country sections that follow. For instance, IBLAC learned of on-going discussions to further reduce the project footprint in the Murchison Falls National Park, thereby lessening the total area disturbed by the Project in the Park. In addition, the introduction of silent drilling technology appears to have limited disturbance to animal populations. We also recognized uptake of earlier IBLAC recommendations, including the construction of a new tourist road to facilitate continued visitation to the important wildlife areas in the Park, introduction of speed control measures (speed humps) on existing roads, and leveling of road edges to permit easy animal crossovers.

Tilenga's commitment to contribute to the management plan for Murchison National Park will help ensure that oil development issues are effectively addressed. While earlier versions of the UWA MFNP Management Plan did not refer to the consequences of oil exploration and production in the park, we noted that UWA is now adapting its management, and Tilenga is supporting UWA in the review of the Protected Area General Management Plan.

Positive actions were also observed outside the protected areas. In Buliisa, we observed a school conservation education program run by the Chimpanzee Trust and noted that an NGO has been engaged to facilitate resource use agreements between local communities and NFA/UWA.

At Kingfisher, it was evident that CNOOC had acted on recommendations from previous visits. These include hiring more local community members, and implementation of flood response practices at site.

EACOP also showed good practices on several topics. In Uganda, household level agreements were put in place as part of the livelihood restoration program. Implementation is supported by sound monitoring and evaluation procedures. In Tanzania, progress includes finalization of an MoU with TANAPA and launching of baseline studies in Burigi Chato. An MoU was also signed with TAWA covering management of the Wembere, and Swagaswaga Game Reserves and the Game Controlled Areas of Kitwai and Handeni.

Offset efforts have been identified for the Pancake Tortoise as well as for Mkungunero Game Reserve (with TAWA outside the national park) and with TANAPA for activities inside. In addition to noting the positive interactions with TAWA and TANAPA, we observed that EACOP has a good working relationship with NEMC. This allowed us to effectively engage with these entities.

Also in Tanzania, progress on agricultural livelihood restoration programs is demonstrably contributing to higher yields. The success of improved farming practices has spurred their adoption by the broader community. In addition to these practices there have been positive discussions regarding minimising livelihood impacts by allowing communities to use the right of way (ROW) of the pipeline for agricultural production.

3. Ten areas for further attention and follow-up

This section outlines ten areas where we noted issues cutting across Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP that require attention and further action. Where we have not named a specific Project, it should be inferred that the issue and/or recommendation applies to all Projects.

The ten areas are listed as follows:

11. Current monitoring and evaluation (M&E), particularly for biodiversity (Tilenga and Kingfisher) is primarily focused on compliance and implementation performance (outputs), rather than on biodiversity and livelihood impacts.
 12. Funding models for offset financing are not yet confirmed.
 13. More needs to be understood on whether or how net gain initiatives can make a difference to ecological connectivity.
 14. Livelihood successes are primarily visible at household level of project-affected people and less so at relevant community level and need to be upscaled. This is particularly apparent in those areas where project impacts are concentrated (Tilenga landscape and Chongoleani Peninsula).
 15. Efforts for achieving landscape level livelihoods and net gain goals don't seem to be synergistic at landscape level.
 16. Land-based livelihoods programs are vulnerable to water stress/climate change effects.
 17. Sustainability of biodiversity and livelihoods (B&L) initiatives is at risk wherever local government is not embedded.
 18. Community-based conservation programs design need both social and ecological science.
 19. Supporting law enforcement of protected areas without simultaneously addressing the root causes of illegal activities, presents risks to livelihoods and to the Projects.
 20. Community wage-based livelihoods are at risk from gaps in contractor management of working conditions.
4. Current monitoring and evaluation (M&E), particularly for biodiversity (Tilenga and Kingfisher) is primarily focused on compliance and implementation performance (outputs), rather than on biodiversity and livelihood impacts

Observations

- Approaches to M&E vary widely across Projects, and between biodiversity and livelihoods functions.
- B&L impact indicators are not developed and applied.
- In interaction with stakeholders, some expressed not having clarity or understanding of the logic of the desired impact of Biodiversity programs or LRP programs, the progress made to date, as well as how to get access to such information.
- LRP Monitoring may not be effectively addressing social cohesion issues between program participants and non-participants. These issues could result in theft, exclusion, and vulnerability.

Recommendations

- Continue development of the biodiversity monitoring, moving from determining compliance and implementation performance to measuring impact of the

interventions. As part of development efforts, design and apply a monitoring and reporting system that is based on data and indicators (KPIs) that would measure or assess impacts for both biodiversity and livelihoods in an integrated way.

- Explore the development of a Theory of Change concept/approach, or other appropriate analysis and planning tools in the coming year to better show the link between the program activities, outcomes, and impacts. This effort will allow for preparation of materials (e.g. visual schematic/infographic/map) related to the intended biodiversity and livelihood (B&L) positive impact pathways, that could be used in stakeholder engagement.
- Expand the discretionary Social Investment strategy to align with the proposed positive impact theory of change described above and do so with a long-term planning horizon.
- Use the opportunity of supporting UWA with the update of the Murchison Falls Protected Area Management plan, to strengthen monitoring by UWA to encompass compliance and impact monitoring of both ecological and community livelihoods impacts.

5. Funding models for long-term offset financing are still uncertain

Observations

- Discussion for engaging/selecting a fund manager in Uganda to manage the Biodiversity Offset program funds are still ongoing,
- The funding model or mechanism for biodiversity offsets financing in Tanzania is not yet ready.

Recommendations

- Expedite decisions on fund managers in both countries.
- Commit adequate long-term financing to meet B&L impact goals and advocate for similar commitments from other stakeholders.

6. More needs to be understood on whether or how net gain initiatives can make a difference to ecological connectivity

Observations in Uganda

- Landscape targeted for connectivity for Chimps, in several cases, involves public and privately-owned land that is subject to owner decisions on land use (for example Kasokwa forest, where there is a chimp habitat with approximately 25 individuals).
- Developing connectivity for Chimps in the landscape requires scaling up forest restoration.
- Roads and power lines pose threats to connectivity. In construction of the so-called oil roads these connectivity issues were not considered nor were impacts avoided or mitigated. Addressing the associated risks requires a stronger role from UNRA.
- IBLAC recommendations for improving signage along the road in the park, vehicle speed control infrastructure, monitoring animal behaviours towards project activities, etc. have received little attention.

Observations in Tanzania

- TFS, TAWA, TANAPA have limited capacity to deal with the social aspects of seeking to establish ecological landscape connectivity.
- There is insufficient community appreciation of the value of connectivity interventions.
- TAWA plans for Wembere as a wildlife reserve corridor are too immature to inform an EACOP decision.

Recommendations for Uganda

- Support capacity of implementation partner(s) to scale up activities related to corridor maintenance and restoration in the Albertine landscape.
- With Kasokwa forest, identify the suitable entity to engage district government/other landowners and stakeholders to prevent converting remaining habitat fragments to sugarcane, and to re-establish connectivity e.g., through payments for ecosystems services (fallow land).
- Engage UNRA on impacts on connectivity that have arisen from construction of the oil critical roads, in terms of compliance with project mitigations.
- Continue with and expand monitoring efforts on road impacts on key species (e.g. chimpanzees) and use the results to advocate for funding for effective mitigation measures (e.g. canopy bridges for colobus monkeys and other smaller primates, and either overpasses or underpasses for chimpanzees).

Recommendations for Tanzania

- Determine whether EACOP's planned interventions in Burigi-Chato, Mkungunero, Wembere can indeed deliver connectivity objectives that are socially acceptable. For example, at Wembere, we were told that the action to implement the corridor would include eviction of people referred to as 'encroachers'.
- Determine the feasibility of a Tanzania Forest Service (TFS)/communities co-management of Mgori Forest Reserve whether it could be supported by EACOP.

3.4 Livelihood successes are visible at household level of project-affected people and less at community level in those areas where impacts are concentrated (Tilenga landscape and Chongoleani Peninsula) and need to be upscaled.

Observations

- Agricultural livelihoods program efforts seem to be more about production (supply driven) than market-led (demand driven). This has been essential for subsistence/food security in the short term but is not oriented to sustainable income security in the longer term.
- EACOP Uganda seems to be relatively more advanced/attentive to value addition and considering the full value chain of activities and linkages to markets and finance - others could be learning from their experience.
- EACOP's discretionary Social Investment budget only has a very short term (next two years) time horizon, while livelihood enhancement at a broader community-level requires longer term financing.

Recommendations

- Extend horizon of Social Investment strategy and include upscaling of positive examples emerging from livelihood program implementation to date. Evaluate if service providers are ready and if program is scalable. (See Scaling Scan tool: <https://repository.cimmyt.org/handle/10883/20505>)
- Extend the time horizon and reach of the Social Investment strategy to communities neighboring protected areas and communally managed village land, to ensure livelihoods enhancement is also targeting communities whose use of natural resources is restricted due to biodiversity conservation efforts.
- Design value addition/enterprise development programs incorporating market feasibility assessments; value chain analysis; linkages to possible buyers, input providers, and access to finance (requires multiple service providers using a coordinated approach responsive to the entrepreneur, in other words, an ecosystem for enterprise development).

7. Efforts for achieving landscape level livelihoods and net gain goals don't seem to be synergistic at landscape level

Observations.

- Biodiversity does not appear to be fully integrated into livelihood programs where biodiversity could be negatively impacted, reducing the potential program benefits. For example, goats/livestock rearing, shrub removal and grazing management not integrated.
- Some livelihood activities could pose a threat to biodiversity and should be assessed in terms of their impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services. As an example, more livestock in the Kingfisher area means more grazing pressure.
- For sustainable impact, initiatives need to have a larger geographic scale or focus. Programs in the Albertine Rift and in selected areas in Tanzania, need to operate at the landscape level, not individual farmer plots or demo farm level to address socio-economic and conservation issues. This may require more dedicated resources, and potentially creation of partnerships.

Recommendations

- Use spatial planning to understand how the landscape can support livelihood activities in balance with biodiversity and other functions of the landscape.
- For example, Buhuka flats could have respective areas designated for livelihood development and for biodiversity; replanting could be encouraged in certain areas, livelihoods could avoid a (biodiversity-rich) lagoon; and the carrying capacity for grazing would be considered.
- Planning needs to be participatory, involving those that use the landscape for their livelihood activities.

7.6 Land-based livelihoods programs are vulnerable to water stress/climate change effects

Observations

- Poor management of water sources, compounded by the effects of climate change, is placing pressure on existing water resources. This hampers people's ability to enhance livelihoods.

Recommendations

- Under the Social Investment strategy, collaborate with government and other partners on supporting communities in relation to Climate Smart Agricultural Practices through, e.g.:
 - More efficient use of water in agricultural practice: mulching, trenches, shade trees
 - Protection of water resources, including at the source
 - Adoption of technologies for water transfer where appropriate, e.g., irrigation schemes, water harvesting, dams for livestock, and mitigation of climate change risks, e.g. promoting small scale irrigation, and conservation of water sources and or catchments, among others.

8. Sustainability of B&L initiatives is at risk wherever local government is not embedded

Observations

- The district level of government needs more capacity to deal with B&L issues:
 - to incorporate B&L considerations more explicitly into district development plans and other government programmes implemented through districts (e.g., Parish Development Model in Uganda);
 - to take ownership in livelihoods initiatives by providing e.g., extension services and social welfare; and
 - to mediate/interface between Projects and their local communities.

Recommendations

- When scoping B&L programs, ensure they align with existing district development plans (where they exist) and other government programmes implemented through districts (e.g., Parish Development Model in Uganda). Where such plans do not exist, engage with districts and provide support in developing these.
- Coordinate, co-create and align activities with district governments to ensure activities and programs are locally endorsed and included in district plans, as appropriate and feasible. Seek buy-in from districts to ensure support and identify areas of potential local government support (e.g., extension services, social welfare, and monitoring) to build sustainability. Use a risk-based approach to prioritise districts.

9. Community-based conservation programs design need both social and ecological science

Observations

- Baseline studies for community-based conservation may omit crucial intangible dimensions: why people behave the way they do, power/interests, network structures, exclusion/inclusion in decisions.

- Program teams mainly comprise non-social scientists and thus have blind spots to these dimensions, which have the potential to make or break a program.

Recommendations

- Engage service providers with the essential skills to analyse social and political capital dimensions in community baseline studies and implications for program design. The requirements should be prescribed in Scopes of Work.

10. Supporting law enforcement of protected areas without simultaneously addressing the root causes of illegal activities, presents risks to livelihoods and to the Projects

Observations

- Tilenga and Kingfisher are considering supporting NFA and UWA in law enforcement which presents risks associated with community conflict.
- EACOP is considering supporting TFS in Mgori co-management with the community.

Recommendations

- Maintain effective due diligence processes to identify, avoid and mitigate the risks of displacing people or restricting their access to livelihoods resources – from the perspectives of human rights, national legal framework, and company reputation when designing and implementing projects, including offsets.
- Increase efforts and investments to ensure compliance with the legal mandates related to resource use and conservation: In addition to investing in support for law enforcement related to natural resource use, invest in avoiding and mitigating drivers of illegal behaviour and unsustainable exploitation of nature resources.

11. Community wage-based livelihoods are at risk from gaps in contractor management of working conditions

Observations

- Risks to livelihoods exists when unskilled workers hired from local communities are subject to non-compliant working conditions amongst Project contractor firms. At multiple sites, we were informed of issues including: lack of contracts, late wages payment, leave, and hours worked. These suggest gaps in contractor management (industrial relations).

Recommendations

- Continue current efforts to put in place a strong industrial relations system, including continued monitoring, in order to ensure contractor compliance.

12. Uganda

13. Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement

There is growing collaboration between the Projects and infrastructure development institutions responsible for roads (UNRA) in key biodiversity habitats such as MFNP, Budongo Central Forest Reserve and Bugoma Central Forest Reserve. Engagement with the NGO-led Civil Society Coalition on Oil and Gas (CSCO) and media has improved. There is ongoing collaboration among the three companies and their efforts for learning and sharing lessons and experiences are commendable.

The Projects have addressed most previous IBLAC recommendations. Examples under Tilenga include construction of the tourism circuit road in MFNP, levelling of road shoulders to render animal crossing less risky and continued investment in agriculture enterprises. CNOOC has progressed towards mitigating risk of the fluctuating water levels in L. Albert. EACOP is promoting agriculture-based livelihood activities.

The Projects have also made good progress towards integrating local content, such as increasing the skills and capacity of locals to better qualify them for jobs, access to procurement contracts as local suppliers, among others.

There is growing institutional support among some important actors such as UWA, and there are ongoing stakeholder planning processes geared toward developing the National Chimpanzee Action Plan, the management Plan for MFNP, the management plans for Budongo and Bugoma Central Forest Reserves; all at various stages of development. IBLAC is optimistic that these processes will provide a sound basis for implementing commitments to net gain and the biodiversity offset programs. Project support to these planning processes is recommended to ensure that net gain and livelihood enhancement are entrenched in these plans.

14. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement

The concept of net gain and livelihood enhancement seems to be still unevenly understood, with possibility of misinterpretation, within and among the stakeholders, including mandated institutions (UWA, NFA) and regulators (NEMA, PAU) and to some extent Project staff. Communication and education around this concept need continued effort, including greater information-sharing and planning at the landscape level to ensure that cumulative impacts are understood and do not impede efforts to achieve net gain.

The building blocks for assessing and monitoring impacts on B&L are weak or less emphasised. Current practice is biased toward compliance monitoring. Contrary to what IBLAC recommended in 2022 Annual Report, Projects have not put in place robust monitoring systems that would document and analyse trends and changes in B&L during and after the investment period. IBLAC recommended development of sound monitoring systems with impact indicators along with building capacity for implementing this monitoring system. That system would measure progress toward outcome indicators that would determine net gain.

Efforts towards livelihoods restoration (e.g., housing, compensations, income generation activities, etc.) are evident. However, there are gaps in addressing the sustainability of investments as well

as integrating biodiversity concerns and priorities in livelihood programs. Such integration would align with other government programs, especially those under Local Government and community conservation programs as well as existing benefit sharing schemes under UWA. It would also require investments in value chains and increasing access to agricultural extension. Agriculture-based livelihoods programs seem to be vulnerable to effects of climate change in form of either extreme dryness or excessive humidity, both of which can adversely affect crop production. Integrating technologies and approaches to mitigate such risks is essential, e.g., promoting small scale irrigation (as with the Kirama 2 water scheme being supported by Tilenga), conservation of water sources and or catchments, among others.

Net gain program initiatives are moving slower than expected, partly due to procedures for approving the investment and procuring service providers. Addressing this requires proactive engagement with the decision-making process within Projects and in regulatory agencies.

15. Specific recommendations - Tilenga

4.3.1 Reduce risks to biodiversity

- Ensure landscaping and fencing design around JBR5 minimizes risk to animals.
- Improve signage and speed humps on C1 road and wellpad access road to respect crossings, keep tourists out, and promote more careful driving.
- Before levelling out (even small) vertical surfaces (e.g., along roads), check for holes with active nests of breeding birds (martins, bee-eaters, kingfishers etc.)
- Collaborate with EACOP and Government agencies to identify potential sites for road mitigation investments especially those that can facilitate primate and chimpanzee crossings to help minimize animal deaths. Determine availability of funds from UNRA and then explore a financing strategy to pilot and test feasible options.

4.3.2 Reduce risks to livelihoods

- Monitor and mitigate impacts on households adjacent to Wellpad Ngiri 3 which we noted as a site of specific concern to people's wellbeing and therefore their livelihoods.
- Identify other drilling pad sites, and other installations that may require adequate buffer areas and monitor to avoid impacts on people.

4.3.3 Build internal capacity to monitor and evaluate impacts

- Document baseline information for both B&L in net gain and livelihoods initiatives.
- Develop and apply robust monitoring systems + indicators for both B&L impacts.
- Strengthen staff capacity to implement monitoring systems and, including capacity for data collection and analysis.

4.3.4 Strengthen sustainability of livelihood investments

- Integrate or build on synergies with UWA community conservation programs and revenue-sharing schemes.
- Integrate or build synergies with existing District-based programs e.g., Parish Development Models (PDM).
- Increase access of local communities to agricultural extension services.

- Promote value addition and market access to reduce dependence on subsistence farming and increase income generation.
- Improve Human Wildlife Conflicts (HWC) mitigation by involving UWA and affected communities.

4.3.5 Build stakeholder capacity to manage impacts

- Support and strengthen MFNP management to enable effective response for oil spill contingency planning purposes i.e. work with UWA, and any future MFNP manager to operationalize the comprehensive contingency plan and ensure there are adequate resources and capacity within management to deal effectively with any spills and with oiled wildlife.
- Embed net gain and livelihoods enhancement in management Plan for MFNP and Budongo.
- Continue community sensitization programs and other avenues for increasing awareness of the opportunities for livelihoods enhancement and for responding to impacts of oil activity. Continue to engage with all relevant stakeholder to determine how best to ensure long-term funding for program implementation. Explore options to ensure that investments are secured to ensure outcomes.

16. Specific recommendations - Kingfisher

4.4.1 Reduce risks to biodiversity

- Update biodiversity management plan to respond to change that has happened at Buhuka. (including change induced by livelihood enhancement programs)

4.4.2 Reduce risks to livelihoods

- Assess the synergies between livelihood and biodiversity programs to help achieve sustainable results, including mitigating negative livelihood impacts (if there are any) of the participatory ecosystem restoration initiatives.
- Expedite the implementation of Phase 2 Livelihoods Program.
- Update and implement influx management strategy and plan.
- Invest in solid waste management (use CSR as tool to demonstrate that although plastics are by-products of oil, they can be better managed to maintain a clean environment).

4.4.3 Strengthen sustainability of livelihood investments

- Water is a scarce resource on the Buhuka flats and is of vital importance for the vegetation, animals and people, including for the CNOOC operations. Depressions located on the flats play an important wetland function. IBLAC recommends that CNOOC assess the potential conflict existing between the use of these areas for livelihoods and the wetland functions and develop livelihood solutions that balance these different values. This may include zonation, temporary access (and temporary closure), regulated access, leading (excess-)water to infiltration areas etc.
- Develop and apply methods and tools for upscaling and consolidating livelihoods activities to benefiting broader communities.
- Promote value addition and market chains for mushrooms and poultry.
- Support strategies or incentives for sustaining school enrollment and attendance (e.g., school feeding program).

4.4.4 Build internal capacity to monitor impacts

- Document baseline information for both B&L.
- Develop and apply robust monitoring systems and indicators for both B&L impacts.
- Strengthen Project staff capacity to implement monitoring systems, including capacity for data collection and analysis.

17. Specific recommendations – EACOP Uganda

4.5.1 Reduce risks to livelihoods

- Continue to publicize access to the Grievance Redress Mechanism.

4.5.2 Strengthen sustainability of livelihood investments

- Upscale and consolidate existing livelihoods activities to benefit communities more broadly, including community members involved in RoW restoration and other B&L programs.
- Continue to disclose information on permissible/prohibited uses of land in the RoW.

18. Tanzania

19. Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement

There has been good progress in mobilizing institutional stakeholders to support B&L programs. EACOP has engaged the Central Government agencies (Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA), Tanzania Forest Service (TFS), Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA), Marine Parks and Reserves Unit (MPRU), Tanzania Ports Authority (TPA), National Environment Management Council (NEMC) and Districts along the pipeline route. Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) have been signed by EACOP or are at advanced stages of negotiation. These MoUs will provide the institutional framework for collaboration and engagement with EACOP.

Engagement is seen to be ongoing with various NGOs, research organizations that are potential implementors of EACOP programs on net gain and livelihoods.

EACOP has supported establishment of a nationally recognized Biodiversity Trust Fund that could serve as its "Fund Manager". IBLAC is optimistic that this will be completed soon through a stakeholder process and that this institution will be capable to serve as Fund manager.

The Project team is aware that there are ecologically very sensitive areas in the EACOP landscape as well as livelihood challenges to overcome, and the company is exploring ways to address them. Various initiatives are under consideration and if successfully implemented, over the long-term, have the potential to contribute positively to meeting net gain objectives. Effective monitoring of outcomes and addressing some of the critical issues outlined below will be crucial to meet that potential.

EACOP is pursuing net gain and livelihoods enhancement through supporting the management of Mgori Forest Reserve and Mkungunero Wildlife Reserve. EACOP is pursuing establishment of biodiversity corridors between Chato-Burigi NP, Biharamulo Reserve and wetlands adjacent to Lake Victoria, as well as Kimise Game Reserve and Rwanda in collaboration with TANAPA and between Serengenti NP (in the north) and Rungwa-Kizigo-Muhesi Game Reserves (in the south) in collaboration with TAWA.

Supporting management of the protected areas requires social-economic and biodiversity baseline surveys; and using participatory approaches to defining management objectives and strategies as well as institutional arrangements and other modalities for implementing management plans (and net gain and livelihoods investments) for the areas.

The proposals for establishing corridors seem technically viable, however, these have unconfirmed social-economic-political dimensions which need to be considered, such as the displacement of people. This recommendation aims to cushion EACOP from reputational risks.

Discussions with Tanga Port Management and the tour of the Project area showed good progress in preparing for the oil activity and risks. However, while there is a strategic plan in place for management of the area, the collaboration between Tanzania Ports Authority and Marine Parks and Reserves Unit is weak. This may undermine efforts to integrate biodiversity and livelihoods concerns. The gazetting of the MNP to include the active port area seems to create difficulties in achieving objectives of both ‘territories’; operation of the port will necessarily be constrained while conservation actions in the marine park will be compromised.

20. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement

Tanzania’s country policy and legal framework lag behind compared with Uganda with regard to mitigation policy. The policy environment (for wildlife, marine, environment, forestry) differs from that in Uganda, in that Tanzanian law and policy frameworks are silent on aspects of requiring mitigation and investor adherence to the mitigation hierarchy and delivery of biodiversity offsets. During the meeting with NEMC, IBLAC was invited to share insights and recommendations to support the ongoing environmental policy reforms aiming at entrenching biodiversity offsets.

21. Specific recommendations – EACOP Tanzania

5.3.1 Reduce risks to biodiversity

- Support Environment Policy reforms to entrench net gain and livelihoods enhancement into national law so that all developers follow practices similar to what EACOP is following as part of its Project design and implementation. Do this through the provision of specialist inputs into the reform processes.
- Support management of Mgori Forest Reserve and Mkungunero Game Reserve through:
 - Baseline surveys and participatory management planning processes;
 - Policy level framework for co-management of the forest reserves and wildlife reserves in Tanzania; and
 - Costed management plan and plan for the sustainable financing of the sites.

- Expedite the Trust Fund/Fund manager and engage service providers (NGOs/NGO networks) to implement programs.
- Follow-up on suggestion regarding degazettement of the port area from the Marine National Park to take into account the reality of the changed situation at the site.

5.3.2 Reduce risks to livelihoods

- Ensure affected people are adequately informed on how their livelihoods may be impacted by continuing to disclose information on permissible/prohibited uses of land in the Right of Way.
- Continue to disclose information on permissible/prohibited uses of marine resources around Chongoleani peninsula.

5.3.3 Build capacity to monitor impacts

- Document baseline information for both B&L in/around selected EACOP activity areas.
- Develop and apply robust monitoring systems and indicators for both biodiversity and livelihoods impacts along the pipeline route/EACOP activity areas.
- Strengthen staff capacity to implement monitoring systems, including capacity for data collection and analysis.
- Advocate for development of the preparation of a strategic plan to guide the Project activity at Tanga Port and between Tanga Port and Chongoleani peninsula.
- Advocate for establishment of collaboration between Tanzania Ports Authority and Marine Parks and Reserves Unit.

5.3.4 Strengthen sustainability of livelihood investments

- Upscale and consolidate current livelihoods activities to benefit broader (non-directly affected) communities, including community members involved in biodiversity initiatives. This could form part of a broader level, longer term, investment plan for achieving biodiversity and livelihood outcomes.

5.3.5 Avoid reputational risk

Assess the likely social-economic and political ramification of establishing the corridors between Serengeti, Wembere Steppe and Usungu Game Reserve prior to supporting corridors for the conservation of *Karamoja Apalis*.

22. IBLAC Administration

Observations

- The visit and information we receive is weighted towards biodiversity. The comparatively fewer livelihood cases shared are limited to success stories, which does not provide an opportunity to fulfil our advisory function.
- Valuable time during visits is spent bringing us up to speed, when that information could be provided prior to the trip; time would be better spent focusing on challenges and problem-solving.

Recommendations

- More balanced interaction across biodiversity and livelihoods, to enable us to respond as per our full mandate.
- Provide timely pre-visit briefing materials about activities in the itinerary.
- Sustain monthly meetings, each meeting focusing on one JV partner/country and either biodiversity or livelihoods. For each of the 8 teams involved, this means at least one online meeting per year.
- Focus monthly meetings on discussing emerging issues.

Acknowledgements

IBLAC wishes to thank the Tilenga, Kingfisher, and EACOP teams for hosting IBLAC in Uganda and Tanzania and organizing an informative trip.



Annex 2 . Schedule of Meetings and Visits

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS
Sunday 23rd July	Arrive in Uganda (YM, WH, AME, CM, YM, SL)	Entebbe International Airport	Transport from Entebbe to Golden Tulip Hotel, Kampala; IBLAC team for this visit complete (AM, AME, CM, WH, SL, YM)	
Monday 24th July	Kick-off Meeting	Golden Tulip Hotel	Kick off with TEPU, EACOP & CUL, (3 hours) Feedback from CSCO on NGO visits (2.5 hours) Meeting on Oil Critical Roads with the UNRA team (2 hours) Briefing for the field visit IBLAC debrief meeting - evening. Dinner at Mediterraneo.	UNRA, CSCO
Tuesday 25th July	Site Visits	Tangi Camp JBR5/4/3 and Buligi track	06.30 Depart Kampala for Tangi Camp (stopovers at Nakansongola & Kigumba) 14.00 Arrival at Tangi camp, check-in and lunch 15.00 Transfer from Tangi Camp to JBR5 (via C1 road) 16.00 Transfer from JBR5 to JBR 4 and 3 & Buligi track 17:30 Transfer back to Tangi camp 18.30 Introduction to RSES North and Management Team for project overview.	
Wednesday 26th July	Site visits	Mubako Hoima	07.00 Depart Tangi Camp for UWA office at Mubako 08.00 Meeting with UWA Chief Warden & team, WCS for snare removal program 10.00 Transfer to Industrial Area for site tour, lunch at Ind Area 13.00 Transfer from IA to resettlement/cash/training/apiary - Emily Faucan Start-up kits - Brian Tumwine Welder (Ngwedo), Agriculture - Ezra, Scholar family 16.00 Transfer to Mika Eco Hotel - Hoima	UWA, Emily Faucan, Brian Tumwine Welder, Scholar Family

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS
Thursday 27th July	Site visits	Rwentumba or Nabakazi River	<p>Option 1: Forest Program</p> <p>07:00 Briefing on day activities</p> <p>08:00 Visit to R2/R3 road locations for overview of chimp suvey</p> <p>10.00 Visit to St John Bosco School for Conservation Education Program with CSCWT</p> <p>12.00 Visit to Rwentumba CLA for Corridor Restoration Program with Ecotrust</p> <p>14.00 Visit to individual farmers</p> <p>16.00 Transfer back to Mika Hotel</p> <p>Option 2: EACOP WETLAND PROGRAM</p> <p>8:00 depart Mika Eco for Nabakazi River crossing (next to railway crossing: fairly protected/pristine wetland).</p> <p>14:00 Visit Kafu River crossing (northern section: evidence of farmers cultivating by riverbank right next to the river)</p> <p>16:00 Transfer back to Mika Eco.</p> <p>Meeting with Social team in the evening</p>	Chimpanzee research monitoring; chimpanzee trust Eco trust; St John Bosco Primary school, CSCWT.
Friday 28th July	Site visit - Kingfisher	KFDA Feeder KFDA Area	<p>Visit Pipeline</p> <p>Review of facilities construction including rigs, review of RAP and livelihood restoration activities</p>	CUL
Saturday 29th July	Travel to Entebbe	Project Affected Person	<p>Site visit to Farm Field School, Project Affected Person – houses.</p> <p>Travel back to Kampala/Entebbe</p>	
Sunday 30th July	Travel – Kampala – Arusha via Kilimanjaro	Arrive in Tanzania	IBLAC meeting in the afternoon	
Monday 31st July	Kick-off Meeting & Meeting TANAPA	Arusha (Sheraton Four Point hotel) and TANAPA HQ	<p>Kick off meeting with EACOP -</p> <p>Meeting with TANAPA (for Burigi-Chato MOU and baseline survey).</p> <p>Meet with Tim Davenport</p>	TANAPA, Tim Davenport

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS
Tuesday 1st August	Arusha to Singida - Mgori / Itigi Thicket.	Singida	Meeting Ndimu Village Government – Mgori forest; Visit Mgori Forest Reserve, then travel to Singida and meet TAWA representative.	Ndimu Village government, TFS, TAWA
Wednesday 2nd August	Singida to Wembere (2 - hours) meet with TAWA in Wembere) Wembere to Babati (4 hours)	Wembere GR Packed Lunch	Visit Replacement Housing site close to Singida Meet with TAWA and LEAD Foundation: Visit Wembere corridor GR and meet with village representatives. Discussing with LEAD Foundation/KISIKI HAI on Farm managed natural regeneration Leave at 1 pm for Babati.	TAWA, LEAD Foundation, village
Thursday 3rd August	Babati to Tarangire (1 hour) Meet with TAWA	Visit Tarangire/Mkungunero 07:00 - 14:00	Visit pancake tortoise habitat in Mkungunero Game Reserve (Omary to guide the visit). IBLAC meeting in the evening	TAWA
Friday 04th August	Travel from Arusha to Tanga	Drive to Tanga 07:00 - 16:00	Meeting with stakeholders in Tanga, in the evening	Stakeholders; Mwambao, WCS, Northern Coalition
Saturday 05th August	Visit the Tanga Port and Chongoleani	Tanga Port and Visit Chongoleani	Meeting Tanga Port and visit Jetty site and Chongoleani construction site. Filming of IBLAC members Split into two groups – Visit Livelihood restoration at MCPY15	Tanga Port
Sunday 06th August	Tanga – DAR	Drive to Tanga 07:00 - 17:00	Return to Dar	
Monday 07th August	DAR	Hotel, EACOP and NEMC offices	Meet with NEMC; Meet with EACOP to discuss and update the recommendations register. Review of EACOP Livelihoods Program Meeting with MWAMBABAO	NEMC MWAMBABAO

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS
Tuesday 08th August	DAR	Hotel	IBLAC report writing - Work on the recommendations and presentation	
Wednesday 09th August	DAR	Hotel and EACOP Office	Update recommendation register; Debrief meeting 14:00 - 16:00;	



Annex 3. List of Paris Meeting Participants at TotalEnergies Headquarters November 17, 2023.

Name	Position
In Person Participants	
Mike Sangster	Senior Vice President Africa
Xavier Ecomard	Vice-President Uganda & Tanzania, EP Africa Division
Steven Dickinson	Group Biodiversity Specialist, Group Environment Advisor
Cheick-Omar Diallo	Leader of Communications Taskforce for Tilenga and EACOP
Carole LeGall	Senior Vice President Sustainability & Climate
Romarc Roignan	Senior Vice President for Environment and Social Performance
Kojo Bedu Addo	Head of Social Performance
Troels ALBRECHTSEN	Senior Vice President HSE EP - HSE/EP
Bruno Courme	Vice President, Exploration Services
Pauline Macronald	Biodiversity Director, Tilenga
Stephan Plisson-Saune	Head, Environment Department
Anastasia Zhivulina	VP Social Engagement and Foresight
Céline Duheron	Senior VP HSE E&P
Romain Tanti	Senior Social Performance Advisor
Stephanie Platat	Lead Communications
David Ochanda	Biodiversity Manager Tilenga
Claudine CHAVEE	Head of Social for EP HSE/EP/SOC
Claude-Henri CHAINEAU	Head of Environment for EP HSE/EP/ENV

Kerstin Braunerder	Biodiversity Lead HSE/EP/ENV
Ana Maria Esteves	Social & Livelihoods Expert IBLAC
Ward Hagemeyer	Wetlands and Biodiversity Expert IBLAC
Sebastien LeBel	Community and Wildlife Expert IBLAC
Ray Victurine	Mitigation and Conservation Finance Expert – IBLAC Chair
Alex Muhweezi	Biodiversity Expert – IBLAC, Uganda
Charles Meshack	Forestry Specialist – IBLAC, Tanzania
Yunus M gaya	Marine Specialist – IBLAC, Tanzania
Participants joining remotely	
Philippe GROUEIX	General Manager of TEP Uganda
Martin Tiffen	General Manager EACOP
Wendy Brown	General Manager Tanzania Branch and HSE Director, EACOP
Lodewijk Werre	Head of Environment & Biodiversity, EACOP
Joy Mubale	Livelihoods Specialist Uganda
Tiffanie Billey	Environmental Engineer, IBLAC Coordinator, EACOP
Nebat Athuhara Kasozi	Project Manager, Conservation, Tilenga
Godrey Lukwago	Social Services Tilenga
Collins Opiyo	Social Services Tilenga
Elizabeth Pion	Social Performance Advisor, EACOP