

IBLAC

Independent Biodiversity and Livelihoods Advisory
Committee (IBLAC)
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 2022

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
IBLAC Operations	1
In-Country Visits to Uganda and Tanzania	3
Annual IBLAC Meeting at TotalEnergies Headquarters	5
Monthly Calls with the Social Programs.	5
Recruitment of the Marine/Fisheries Expert	6
Meetings with the EACOP Lenders Environmental and Social Consultant (LESC) Team	6
Meeting with the IUCN Great Ape Specialist Group ARCC Task Force	7
Summary	7
Annex 1. IBLAC Trip Report: May 30-June 15, 2022	8
1. Introduction	9
2. Uganda	10
2.1. The Landscape: Uganda	10
2.2. Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Uganda	11
2.3. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Uganda	12
2.4. Biodiversity Findings and Recommendations Uganda	13
2.5. Livelihood Findings and Recommendations Uganda	23
2.6. Summary and General Conclusions Uganda	25
3. Tanzania	27
3.1 The Landscape: Tanzania	27
3.2 Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Tanzania	28
3.3. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Tanzania	29
3.4 Biodiversity findings and recommendations Tanzania	29
3.5 Livelihoods Findings and Recommendations Tanzania	32
3.6 Summary and General Conclusions Tanzania	34
4. Acknowledgements	34
Annex 2. Schedule of Meetings and Visit	35
Annex 3. List of Meeting Participants at TotalEnergies Headquarters October 17, 2022	40

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 an 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, mitigation and offsetting measures that are in line with best practice 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 an agreed term of reference (TOR). These TOR were revised and drafted based on 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 and as well as the need for greater stakeholder engagement and transparency regarding IBLAC recommendations and company responses. The new TOR were finalized in early 2022, formally agreed by TEPU and EACOP, and now form the basis for the operations of IBLAC.

IBLAC Operations

The revised TOR established new 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. Some of the key elements of the revised operations are highlighted below:

- **Establishment of regularly scheduled monthly meetings.** The meetings were designed to ensure that IBLAC could keep abreast of activities in the field, especially with the increase in activities. The TOR defined monthly meetings for internal discussion and information sharing, quarterly meetings with the various Parties to ensure that IBLAC had up-to-date project information, and an annual meeting which would bring a broader stakeholder group together. IBLAC holds internal meetings, as and when

needed and several internal meetings were held this year. The monthly meetings have now evolved into rotating social and biodiversity themed meetings for the various teams (Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP), focusing on social and biodiversity issues. IBLAC and the Parties launched meetings with the social teams and IBLAC in the second semester of 2022. These meetings proved informative and useful, and a plan has evolved to build on this experience and establish a monthly schedule that will touch on both biodiversity and social issues so that each country and focus area will interact with IBLAC on a regular, rotating basis during the calendar year. By the end of the year, four of these meetings were held.

- **Establishment of broad-based quarterly meetings.** The TOR includes the organization of quarterly meetings to be held in March, June, September, and December of the calendar year. The quarterly meetings held in March will be designated as Annual General Meetings and will include additional stakeholders. During the quarterly meetings, IBLAC will receive project updates as well as a review of the status of recommendations presented to the Parties by the Committee (see section on recommendations below). In 2022 the in-country visits to Uganda and Tanzania served as the June quarterly meeting. The quarterly meeting for EACOP took place in September, while the Tilenga meeting occurred in October, due to scheduling issues.
- **Commitment to maintenance of a register of IBLAC recommendations and company actions regarding those recommendations.** Both EACOP and Tilenga developed registers that captured the recommendations coming from the IBLAC country visit held in June. Both presented the register of recommendations and the status of action toward those recommendations in quarterly meetings held in September and October respectively. There is still a need to finalize a register of recommendations with Kingfisher.
- **Organization of an annual meeting at TotalEnergies Headquarters.** IBLAC found it useful to meet annually with TotalEnergies in Paris to keep headquarters staff informed of project progress and obtain support for recommendations that the company would need to embrace. This year's meeting with TotalEnergies took place on October 17, 2022.

- Annual travel to the countries.** As part of its work, IBLAC will make one annual visit to both Uganda and Tanzania to assess progress to date in the field. This year’s annual visit took place from May 30th to June 15th and included a visit to both countries where IBLAC was able to engage with both the companies and local stakeholders, including government (e.g. UWA, PAU, NEMA Tanzanian Port Authority, etc.) and civil society (e.g. CSCO, various NGOs), in order to consult on and share information about the project and the net gain program. Information about the various meetings and workshops appear in the trip report in Annex 1. It still must be seen whether it works better to visit each country on separate occasions during the year or to combine the countries into one visit. In addition, individual members or smaller groups of members may be required to undertake separate visits during the year to address specific issues or needs. These would be arranged with the specific party requiring assistance.
-
- Annual Input into the Net Gain Program.** As part of the overall terms of reference and work plan, members of the IBLAC provide input into studies, program design, and terms of reference for work that needs to be undertaken.
 - Transparency.** The TOR indicates that IBLAC will provide the Parties with a transparent assessment of its findings through regular meetings and annual reports. The teams have agreed that IBLAC recommendations and company responses should be shared with relevant stakeholders and the exact processes and mechanisms for that sharing need to be agreed and finalized, including a decision on how information will be made available on the Internet.

In-Country Visits to Uganda and Tanzania

The IBLAC team visited both Uganda (May 30-June 7) and Tanzania (June 8-15) in 2022 to review the progress of project activities in both countries and provided specific recommendations. A copy of the detailed trip report, including recommendations arising from the trip, appears in Annex 1. IBLAC and the Parties are working to finalize a register of recommendations that will include IBLAC recommendations prior to 2022, along with the most recent ones. A draft register was finalized before the end of the year, showing both actions, and progress toward the specific recommendations; IBLAC hopes to final the register before the end of the first quarter of 2023. These tables will serve as the location to track recommendations and actions taken so that IBLAC, along with the various stakeholders can track progress toward the results. As new recommendations are made by IBLAC, they will be added to the register.

Although the trip report includes specific recommendations and provides the relevant background information, some important over-arching observations arising from the field trip have been listed here.

- Tilenga in Uganda, and EACOP in both Uganda and Tanzania, have expanded their outreach and connections to civil society. These increased consultations and information sharing with both governmental and non-governmental organizations is important to create better understanding of project activities and to address concerns that might arise from poor information or rumours.
- For the Tilenga project, IBLAC found that staffing for the social program is not adequate, and that the program needs to be strengthened.
- Net gain has been a goal of the Tilenga and EACOP programmes from the beginning but a lack of a clear understanding of what net gain means, and entails, appears to exist still among different agencies and organizations. This was apparent from discussions in Uganda, even though net gain is already written into national law. Both the companies as well as local NGOs have organized meetings and workshops around the concept of net gain, but continued education on the topic, including sharing of results of the net gain program will be useful so that stakeholders are more knowledgeable about the topic. This type of stakeholder education will also be beneficial to carry out in Tanzania, where, unlike Uganda, the environmental laws have not been updated to reflect recent best practice for biodiversity and livelihoods safeguards. The concept of the mitigation hierarchy and requiring achievement of net gain have yet to be embraced by the authorities, who may be interested in learning more about Uganda's legislation.
- Success in achieving net gain will require integration of the social and environmental programs. Social programs should have input into biodiversity initiatives to determine potential impacts on households and communities while the biodiversity program can help guide social investments to ensure that impacts on nature are limited and guide project design that link both social and environmental outcomes.
- Both Tilenga and EACOP are organizing to address cumulative impacts in the landscapes where the projects are operating. Cumulative impacts are especially acute in the Albertine Rift landscape but will also impact areas affected by the pipeline and marine storage terminal in Tanzania, especially in and around the Chongoleani Peninsula. The companies will need to develop appropriate mechanisms to address potential cumulative impacts to ensure that they can limit threats to net gain programs. This goes beyond the companies' direct sphere of influence and will require coordination with, and facilitation of engagement among other stakeholders in the landscape. Fortunately, there is recognition of this, and company efforts are underway to understand and address these impacts.
- The development of oil in Uganda and the establishment of the pipeline in Uganda and Tanzania have become quite controversial projects and potential net gain implementing partners among local NGOs and scientific organizations have indicated a reluctance to receive direct funding from oil and gas companies due to potential reputational risk.

These local organizations have expressed a desire to be involved in the implementation of net gain programs but have indicated a preference to work through third-party organizations, preferably locally established institutions. Both Tilenga and EACOP are now exploring opportunities to work with third-party organisations, such as conservation trust funds (CTFs), as potential third-party collaborators that can provide funding to those implementing partners. In the case, of Tanzania, a national CTF does not exist and EACOP is considering engaging with stakeholders to assess the feasibility of establishing one as suggested by IBLAC.

Annual IBLAC Meeting at TotalEnergies Headquarters

Several members of the IBLAC team, Ana Maria Esteves, Ward Hagemeyer, Sebastien LeBel, and Ray Victurine, visited TotalEnergies Headquarters (HQ) on October 17, 2022. The purpose for the visit was to brief company leadership on IBLAC's findings from the June 2022 trip and discuss issues arising from the points raised by IBLAC. Leadership at TotalEnergies expressed strong support for the social and biodiversity programs in both and in the work of IBLAC. They indicated their interest in keeping abreast of program progress and in progress toward meeting IBLAC's recommendations. These annual presentations are prescribed through the IBLAC TOR and provide a very useful venue for exchange of information and ideas; IBLAC believes they are a very useful component of the work plan. IBLAC expects to have follow-up virtual meetings with TotalEnergies HQ staff in the coming months to continue discussions. Annex 2 includes the list of people with whom IBLAC met during the visit to Paris.

Monthly Calls with the Social Programs.

IBLAC increased the frequency of meetings with the social teams from Tilenga and CNOOC to monthly in August 2022. Those meetings provided an opportunity for the different programs to present their activities, progress, and issues, and offered a chance for the teams to share information, ideas, and approaches. Already three meetings have been held, with the latest held on November 9, 2022.

IBLAC believes that this format creates an excellent opportunity for sharing among teams and could be used to increase integration between social programs as well as between the social and environmental programs. These meetings have proven to be very informative and resulted in good interaction between IBLAC and the teams, allowing IBLAC to make several recommendations on specific points raised by the various programs. IBLAC is recommending that the monthly meetings take place on a regular, rotating basis so that the Committee can keep abreast of developments and so that sharing across programs develops as part of the net-gain programme implementation approach. These meetings will be in addition to, and not replace, the quarterly meetings which will be held with the teams to review progress on the activities included in the recommendations register.

Recruitment of the Marine/Fisheries Expert

One of the priorities set by IBLAC in 2022 was the recruitment of a marine expert to assist with support and advice on project interventions related to coastal and marine resources in and around the Tanga area in Tanzania. The marine storage terminal and the jetty, where tankers will arrive for filling, are located in very sensitive biodiversity areas and mitigation activities related to those facilities as well as the planned port expansion will need to be put in place to minimize impacts both to biodiversity and to the livelihoods of people living around the Chongoleani Peninsula. Recruitment efforts for the marine expert to IBLAC suffered delays when the first candidate, identified by IBLAC and EACOP, had a medical problem and was unable to take on the position. Another round of recruitment led to the identification of two highly qualified candidates for consideration. A screening and interview process undertaken by both IBLAC and EACOP led to the selection of Professor Yunus Mbaya as a new member of IBLAC. Professor Mbaya will bring significant marine and fisheries experience to IBLAC, along with well-established relationships in the sector, and in government in general.

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

IBLAC held two meetings in 2022 (March and November) with the Lenders Environmental Social and Consultant (LESC) Team. The lenders have indicated their interest in having the LESC meet with IBLAC to share information and to gain any insights that IBLAC has from its travel to the project sites and from discussions with the field teams. LESC views IBLAC as an important accountability mechanism for the EACOP project for social and biodiversity issues. The most recent meeting with LESC took place on November 4, 2022. IBLAC was able to convey its findings from the field visit and respond to questions from the LESC team. The discussions were positive and IBLAC was able to report on progress that has been made. LESC was particularly happy to hear that the recommendations' registers have been created and that there will be regular updates to those registers as recommendations are addressed and new issues arise. LESC also asked about whether the new TOR provided sufficient guarantees of independence, transparency, and engagement with stakeholders. IBLAC was able to confirm that the experience so far has been positive, but that for some aspects it was still too early to reach a conclusion. Regular meetings will be scheduled between IBLAC and the LESC to continue the sharing of information.

Meeting with the IUCN Great Ape Specialist Group ARCC Task Force

In Uganda, IBLAC met with Genevieve Campbell, the representative of the IUCN Task Force to **Avoid, Reduce, Restore** negative impacts from energy, extractive and associated infrastructure projects on apes and contribute positively to their **Conservation** (ARCC). The Task Force is working with Tilenga and EACOP to provide guidance and oversight regarding efforts to manage impacts on chimp populations in the Albertine Rift, where project activities are taking place. IBLAC, along with ARCC, the companies, and various local NGOs, including the Jane Goodall Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society, Chimpanzee Sanctuary and Wildlife Conservation Trust, participated in a workshop to further the development of a chimpanzee action plan, that once completed, would identify specific priority actions for financing by the companies as part of the net gain program. As part of the action planning process, IBLAC and ARCC were able to carry out a visit to the field to assess the state of some of the forests that will need to be managed for chimpanzee conservation and meet with NGOs that are actively implementing programs on the ground aimed at corridor restoration.

Summary

This was a transition year for the IBLAC and its relationship with the Parties. Implementation of the new TOR proved positive in terms of achieving increased communication and dialogue between IBLAC and the companies. With the increase in meetings and project-level discussion, IBLAC is more engaged with the Parties and in providing recommendations and advice. IBLAC has also observed greater openness by the Parties to engage, not only with the Committee, but also with stakeholders on issues related to social and environmental program implementation and addressing impacts. The clear tracking of recommendations and reporting on progress will strengthen the role of IBLAC and enhance dialogue with the Parties and outside stakeholders. These are all positive signs for the Parties' effort to achieve net gain. In addition, the engagement of TotalEnergies from a HQ perspective, has been very encouraging.

Achieving net gain is a challenging and ambitious goal, and is one that will require dedication, commitment, and resources, over a long period of time. This year the companies have made great strides in building the teams and mechanisms to implement programs that can meet the established objectives, but much work remains to be completed. The IBLAC team is committed to support that process and provide input and support toward meeting those net gain objectives.

Annex 1. IBLAC Trip Report: May 30-June 15, 2022

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



May 30 - June 15, 2022

1. Introduction

The Independent Biodiversity and Livelihoods Committee (IBLAC), set up in 2013, advises the Tilenga (TotalEnergies Exploration Production Uganda BV, (TEPU)), Kingfisher (Chinese National Offshore Oil Company Uganda Limited (CUL)) and the East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP) projects on how best to conserve and enhance biodiversity and related aspects of community livelihoods within their areas of operation and the wider Projects' areas of influence within the landscape, before, during, and after the Projects. IBLAC advice aims to support Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP to achieve biodiversity net gain and enhanced livelihoods of communities influenced by their projects.

The IBLAC remit calls for an annual field visit to both countries to provide advice and guidance on biodiversity and livelihood issues related to each company's commitment to achieving a net gain in biodiversity for unavoidable impacts in both natural and critical habitats and improvement in livelihoods in those landscapes where the companies operate. In addition, IBLAC provides offsite advice and support through online engagements and reviews and inputs into project documentation.

The annual country visits provide an opportunity for IBLAC members to visit the sites where the projects are operating or planned, review impacts and assess the proposed activities planned to achieve net gain and livelihood enhancement. The field trips also allow IBLAC to engage with Ugandan and Tanzanian government institutions, civil society, relevant third-party institutions, such as the IUCN SSC Private Specialist Group ARCC Task Force, the Northern Albertine Rift Conservation Group (NARCG), the Eastern Arc Mountain Conservation Endowment Fund (EAMCEF), NGOs, and communities to observe and learn about conditions on the ground and make concrete recommendations.

From May 30th until June 15th, 2022, a team of IBLAC, comprised of Ray Victurine, Ward Hagemeyer, Ana Maria Esteves, Alex Muhweezi, and Charles Meshack, visited the Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP projects in Uganda and then travelled to Tanzania to visit critical areas for biodiversity and livelihoods as part of the EACOP pipeline development. Another IBLAC member, Sebastien LeBel, could not participate due to prior commitments.

The information in this report represents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the visit to key project sites and our interactions with the TEPU, CNOOC and EACOP project teams and the various stakeholders in the two countries.

The report presents the findings by country. Section 2 deals with Uganda, and section 3 with Tanzania. It should be noted that while Tilenga and Kingfisher are restricted to Uganda, EACOP operates in both Uganda and Tanzania. To avoid too much repetition, some of the general findings that apply to EACOP in both countries have been presented under the Tanzania chapters.

Both country chapters follow the same outline, starting with landscape wide issues, followed by supporting factors, constraints, biodiversity findings, livelihood findings and summary and general conclusions.

2. Uganda

2.1. The Landscape: Uganda

The team noted the complexity of working in the Albertine Graben due to the multiple actors operating in the landscape without a master plan or apparent coordination. Multiple state and non-state agencies are responsible for various environmental, biodiversity, renewable energy, land management and livelihood support projects. Coordination among different agencies is weak. Government investment in roads, planned energy investments, and agricultural expansion catalysed by the private sector, among other developments, will contribute to cumulative impacts that could have a detrimental effect on the ability of operators to achieve net gain and livelihood enhancement. There is a need for greater information-sharing and planning at the landscape level to ensure that cumulative impacts are understood and that they do not have negative effects on operator goals to achieve a net gain. The operators have plans to put in place a cumulative impact management strategy, as well as a program aimed at achieving greater coordination. These programs will be useful for addressing the continued pressures on the resource base in the landscape, while raising awareness around the importance of ensuring that projects, both those planned at a national as well as district level, avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive areas.

Coordination with different programs and entities operating in the landscape also provides an opportunity to further biodiversity and social outcomes. Some donor programs in the landscape have conservation, rural and tourism development, and climate goals similar to the Projects' net gain program. For example, The World Bank and the EU both have active short-term projects in the landscape. Shell is now negotiating a REDD+ agreement with the National Forest Authority (NFA) that will be implemented in Albertine Graben. A variety of NGOs have come together to draft a Chimpanzee Action Plan (CAP) which outlines programs and activities that could be undertaken to protect and restore forests and public and private land to reduce pressure on the species. Tilenga and EACOP area already providing support for this initiative which will also provide opportunities for funding net gain initiatives that will support chimp conservation. Moreover, company biodiversity and social commitments are consistent with mitigation and offset principles included in Ugandan legislation, which provides an opportunity to work with government agencies and regulators to achieve compliance with the law.

The factor of overriding dominance in the landscape is the increasing pressure on land and natural resources. Natural and induced population growth exceeds 3% per year in the region, creating land-use pressures for agriculturalists, especially pastoralists. Protected areas will face pressure for resource access, and conflicts over resource use and access can be anticipated,

especially if enforcement of boundaries and resource off-take regulations becomes more effective. Successful livelihood enhancement efforts promoted by the Projects could place further pressure on the scarce land and natural resources, while some conservation efforts run the risk of putting pressure on people's livelihoods by curtailing access to resources. The net gain program needs to ensure a coordinated effort between the social and biodiversity programs to balance the economic development efforts with conservation and vice versa, to avoid and/or minimize negative impacts on peoples' well-being and on the critical biodiversity.

For two years, the landscape has been experiencing very high-water levels in the Nile, Lake Victoria, and Lake Albert systems, resulting in severe flooding along the river and lake systems. This further exacerbates the pressure on the remaining available land. Although the causes of the flooding are not clear, the negative impacts on communities are. During the visit, the impact of the flooding was visible. There was evidence that flood waters were receding, but the flooding has caused and continues to cause disruption to many households.

2.2 Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Uganda

The team identified several conditions that support net gain and livelihood enhancement in the landscape and upon which the companies can build. We identified that:

- 1.) Each of the companies (TotalEnergies, CNOOC, and EACOP) has dedicated and committed staff, both at the central as well as at the field level, focused on exploring and developing programs toward meeting net gain.
- 2.) This commitment is complemented by a cadre of organizations on the ground, both international and national NGOs and institutions with experience working on conservation and livelihood programs. The companies have already taken advantage of the opportunity to partner with such organizations to implement coordinated programs on the ground, and the efforts to develop programs with third-party organizations in the country needs to continue. The companies support the Chimpanzee Action Plan process that will result in coordinated efforts among NGOs and other stakeholders to implement activities aimed at supporting the conservation of chimp populations in the landscape.
- 3.) Many of these programs can be coordinated with district development plans and management plans for national parks, wildlife reserves, forest reserves and wetlands to secure effective outcomes.
- 4.) In addition, donor programs operating in the region provide a further opportunity for synergies, provided that sufficient coordination occurs between initiatives to avoid duplication of efforts.

The emerging coordination between the Tilenga and Kingfisher teams provides an opportunity to share experiences and lessons for biodiversity and livelihood enhancement. Working in the same landscape offers challenges that can benefit from similar approaches and solutions while providing both companies with useful lessons.

IBLAC also noted that the teams are learning and adapting to improve livelihood enhancement approaches. There is a growing awareness of the need for longer-term attention to livelihood needs (beyond direct project impacts) if enhancement programs are to be sustainable.

2.3. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Uganda

- Besides the supporting conditions and catalysts for biodiversity net gain and livelihood enhancement, IBLAC identified various constraints to achieving these objectives. IBLAC has been concerned about delays in action on the ground to address the impacts in the landscape since baseline studies were undertaken. Given the dynamism in the landscape, delayed investment in biodiversity conservation and livelihoods enhancement programs represents one significant constraint. Some progress has been achieved with the initiation of some field-based activities and with increased resourcing of the net gain program. A variety of livelihood investments have also taken place and farmers have benefitted from project funding to plant trees and crops. IBLAC looks forward to seeing increased program investment in 2023.
- Another challenge is reconciling economic development linked to livelihood enhancement with the ambition to achieve biodiversity conservation outcomes. Development initiatives, including those undertaken by the companies in the framework of enhancing livelihoods, will potentially put additional pressure on forests, wildlife, protected areas, and the biodiversity therein. These pressures could pose challenges to achieving net gain, especially over the long term, as pressures grow in the landscape and cumulative impacts are felt. The program is aware of these concerns and has put in place an integrated conservation and livelihoods approach and will seek to achieve an appropriate balance. The lack of a spatial masterplan with a vision for how the landscape can support the needs of all stakeholders, including biodiversity, is strongly felt here and will need to be addressed as part of the cumulative impact management strategy.
- Considerable institutional challenges exist in the landscape. Many local government institutions are weak and unable to deliver technical services and support to livelihood enhancement and biodiversity conservation. In some cases, the companies have designed new organizational structures to address those limitations, while in other cases, those technical and compliance capabilities remain a constraint. This was clear from observing the state of management of forest reserves and the level of extension services available to landowners and/or land users in the region. The lack of institutional coordination represents another challenge. Achieving net gain, both in terms of reaching biodiversity outcomes and livelihood enhancement, faces the risk that projects and activities approved by different institutions foster land uses and create impacts that limit the ability of the project to achieve net gain. This coordination at a regional and

central level becomes particularly important with growing development pressures. Coordination may also involve working with local institutions to support funding of net gain and livelihood enhancement activities. The companies do not have adequate human resourcing to achieve their ambitious agenda by themselves and will need to continue working with partners and developing new partnerships and collaboration to ensure the success of the program.

- Uganda has recently seen the development of law conducive to safeguarding biodiversity and achieving net gain (Environment Act 2019). The legislation provides strong support for the net gain goals and objectives of the companies. The constraint is that there appears to be an inadequate understanding of and commitment to achieving net gain at an institutional level in the country, let alone the capacity to implement it. The achievement of net gain outcomes will neither be easy nor inexpensive, and approval for adequate budgets to achieve net gain is essential if success is to be achieved. In discussions with representatives from NEMA, there appeared to be a misunderstanding that the proposed investments needed for the net gain program were “extra” and were not considered part of the FID of the overall project. The need to demonstrate net gain has always formed part of the overall project design and included in project impact assessments and budgets. It is crucial that any misunderstanding is clarified and that all Parties are in equal agreement that achieving net gain for biodiversity and enhancement of livelihoods is equally integral to the project as producing and transporting the oil.
- Achieving the net gain will require an effective monitoring and evaluation system. Currently, there appears to be insufficient measurement of social and biodiversity/environmental outcomes as part of the M&E system. That limitation will make it difficult for the companies to respond and adapt to changes and challenges as the program implementation goes forward. Efforts are currently underway to develop an effective M&E system and address this constraint.

2.4. Biodiversity Findings and Recommendations Uganda

2.4.1 General (Policy and Engagement)

- Over the years IBLAC has identified and flagged the need for greater coordination and communication across responsible government institutions to promote and regulate projects and investments in the Albertine. We believe that there is an opportunity to build on the multi-stakeholder engagement process launched by WCS in 2018 through the Prime Minister’s Office. This Multi-Sectoral Committee was operating and was well-received but faltered due to a lack of sustained financial backing, and possibly other reasons. Still, it created a framework for work across agencies with the potential to coordinate decision-making and planning at a landscape scale. The companies recognize the potential benefits from this coordination and communication and have indicated interest in restarting an initiative like the Multi Sectoral Committee. IBLAC supports this

effort and recommends re-engagement with the Parties to determine the feasibility of establishing such a committee that can oversee planning in the landscape and support development and implementation of the cumulative impact strategy. Potential members would include the Ministries of Energy, Water and Environment, Tourism and Wildlife, Gender, Labour, and Social Development, along with relevant Authorities, including UNRA and NEMA, to coordinate developments in landscape-level and address cumulative impacts which threaten net gain/livelihood enhancement (e.g., spatial planning). Achieving net gain will require a strategic approach at a landscape level and the buy-in of multiple actors with decision-making authorities regarding investments in the landscape. This multi-sectoral engagement offers an opportunity for that to occur.

- IBLAC observes a strong need for coordination with biodiversity-oriented initiatives (opportunities) in the landscape. During the visit, the IBLAC team highlighted the ongoing donor projects in the landscape, all of which can support and influence the proposed net gain activities. These include among others:
 1. World Bank-funded “Investing in Forests and Protected Areas for Climate Smart Development Project “(IFPA-CD) activities through the Ministry of Water and Environment, UWA and NFA.
 2. the EU-funded project” Restoring and Conserving degraded fragile ecosystems for improved Community Livelihoods among the Refugee and Host Communities of West Nile Region and the mid-Albertine Rift” is being implemented by the Uganda Biodiversity Fund (UBF), in collaboration with a consortium of partners including Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Nature Uganda (NU) and Ecological Christian Organisation (ECO).
 3. a recently negotiated REDD+ project between Shell and the National Forest Authority around Budongo Forest.

IBLAC recommends that the companies meet with project implementing organizations to determine potential synergies and avoid duplication of efforts (biodiversity, livelihood enhancement) or negative impacts that threaten net gain and livelihood enhancement.

- During the visit, IBLAC met with the Civil Society Coalition on Oil and Gas (CSCO) to learn more about their concerns regarding the project. The representatives raised several issues, including the need for greater transparency and communication. The Tilenga team has taken steps to increase engagement with civil society actors. In line with points on transparency and openness of communication in the new TOR of IBLAC, the Tilenga team has stated it supports that IBLAC should (be facilitated to) communicate with CSCO and recommends sharing IBLAC findings and recommendations with CSCO. The Tilenga team also indicated its willingness to meet regularly with CSCO and share information on activities toward achieving net gain.
- In discussions with various NGOs and potential implementing partners, IBLAC learned that many of these organizations have concerns over accepting funds directly from oil and gas companies. At the same time, they indicated no concern about receiving

money from a third-party, such as from an independent conservation trust fund. IBLAC recommends that the companies explore the potential of working through an established national-level funding organization, such as the Uganda Biodiversity Fund, to provide a mechanism to disburse funds to organizations that implement projects designed to meet net gain objectives.

2.4.2. Tilenga

The construction of roads is a significant issue in the Tilenga and Kingfisher project landscapes. Especially in the Tilenga landscape, road construction is having a significant impact on biodiversity. Most of these roads are referred to by stakeholders as ‘oil roads’ although they are in some cases not part of the oil project infrastructure. IBLAC has made several recommendations over the years about the potential impact of these roads (e.g., the bridge over the Nile at Paraa) in terms of their risk to negatively impact the feasibility of achieving a net gain. During the June 2022 visit, a number of these roads were visited. The road from Masindi through Budongo Forest and MFNP that connects to the bridge at Paraa- as well as the Paraa - Tangi Road through MFNP are of particular concern. Main issues relate to:

- The roads are wide, much wider than the original murrum roads, and they will be paved. This has various effects. The width of the tarmac (two driving lanes, plus two shoulders) is such that it bisects Budongo Forest and Murchison Falls National Park, opening the canopy in forested areas and creating a wide barrier for wildlife to cross in the more open areas. Budongo Forest is important for chimps, and the original road was narrow and unpaved, with a closed canopy. Chimps routinely crossed the old road. The impact of the new road remains to be seen. The original design called for the road width to be reduced through the forest to minimize impacts in the forest areas. UWA indicated that the road-width through the forest is narrower than sections through non-forested areas, but that difference was difficult to discern, and the road still creates a significant barrier for wildlife crossing (particularly chimpanzees) and opens the forest canopy. In addition, the road as designed and constructed creates an opportunity for vehicles to travel at high speed through protected areas (see below).
- The width of the road and its smooth hardtop surface invites driving at speeds that are (much) higher than the maximum allowed speed in the MFNP, which is 40 Km/hr. While travelling on these roads in TotalEnergies vehicles that strictly follow the speed limits, IBLAC witnessed that most vehicles travelled at higher speeds than the established limit; there was basically no compliance with posted limits, and vehicles sped to overtake slower ones. So far, few measures have been implemented to enforce the maximum speed limit. There is signage but this appears not to work; we observed little enforcement or consequences for offenders. There are only a few physical speed humps, although there were signs of new ones being constructed. IBLAC recognizes that the road is still under construction and that road humps are included in the mitigation efforts, but the road is already in use and currently transited. However, IBLAC had concerns that the spacing between the proposed speed humps might be greater than originally planned and could limit their effectiveness. When discussing

spacing with UWA various distances were offered as possible with a range of between 150 and 300 meters between road humps. No other speed-control measures are in place. The risk of collision with animals, both in frequency and impact, increases significantly with higher driving speeds, so it will be important to ensure that effective controls are in place. It will be useful for the Parties to clarify the final design of these speed control measures; they should be designed to effectively reduce speed on the roads for the protection of wildlife; accommodation of motorists needs to be a secondary concern.

- On the Paraa – Tangi section of the new road through MFNP, IBLAC noticed high, and in some cases, relatively steep embankments that make crossing difficult for certain groups of animals. The road cuts through large embankments in the landscape and the construction process creates high barriers. No mitigation was visible to facilitate passage for animals and IBLAC was uncertain whether these were planned, or not. Information on specific road mitigation plans needs to be reviewed by UWA and efforts coordinated with UNRA to determine if they are adequate, and if not, revised and mitigation actions put in place. Management of the road mitigation should receive treatment under the revised General Management Plan that will be developed in 2023, as well.
- IBLAC held a meeting with the UWA Warden in charge of Compliance at MFNP. During this meeting the Warden:
 1. indicated that UWA expected Tilenga to assist with some of the mitigation efforts even though the road is the responsibility of UNRA.
 2. explained that the approach of UWA towards enforcing maximum speed limit using speed humps was not as resolute as it should be (and as required by the ESIA for the road through the park), partly due to the fear of complaints from drivers. He feared that too many speed humps located close together would be a source of frustration. Few speed humps have been put in place, and some were being added, but the spatial frequency, as prescribed by the ESIA, may not be enforced. The Warden talked about other measures such as measuring the time drivers take to pass through the Park or adding cameras to monitor drivers. However, enforcement currently appears lax.
 3. spoke about the potential risk that displacement of animals due to construction activities of Tilenga in MFNP would lead to increased human – wildlife conflict.

IBLAC recommends that TEPU work with relevant parties (e.g., UNRA and UWA) to ensure compliance with the mitigation actions stipulated and committed to in the approved ESIA/ESMP for the roads. It will need to be clarified whether UNRA or the road contractor will be responsible for implementing the mitigation measures. Potential impacts include fragmentation, that may need specific mitigation measures, collisions which precipitate animal deaths and injuries to humans, and pollution, especially from discarded trash. This is important since failure to deal with the impacts of the road could have negative impacts on the very species that the Project is looking to protect as part of the net gain program. For Tilenga the collaboration can thus be seen as part of efforts to achieve net gain, given the impacts on

species that trigger critical habitat. Identified mitigation efforts include speed humps, other speed control measures, and wildlife crossings (See Figure 1 (photo taken in October 2019), which shows a sign put up by the Chinese contractor building the road at the northern end of the Paraa-Tangi Road through the Park). Mitigation measures should be put in place as soon as possible and IBLAC recommends monitoring of the impacts and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, be included in the monitoring and evaluation system designed as part of UWA's management program, so that future corrective mitigation actions can be put in place as needed. Some of this work could be supported by Tilenga as part of the net gain monitoring effort.

IBLAC had other observations regarding the road and its potential impacts. IBLAC recognizes that the identified issues are not the responsibility of the company but are issues that can be communicated to UWA and to UNRA. It is also important to note that even though the road is not part of the Project, visitors and others will associate the road with the Project, given the scope of activities in Murchison.

- The road foundations, as currently constructed, could cause hydrological problems when blocking gulley's and/or other existing flow systems in the landscape. This seemed to be the case in certain areas along the road in Murchison where adequate engineering solutions did not seem to be in place. IBLAC looked out for engineering solutions such as adequate culverts for water to pass under the roads or stretches in the road prepared for letting lateral water flows pass (like in wadi-crossings in many desert roads). We saw no visible signs of those. Poor water management can significantly restrict waterflow and this can have very negative impacts: erosion and even collapse of road foundations, as well as impacts on the ecosystem. Natural flows can be blocked, leading to inundation on the high side and water shortages (drying out) on the low side of the blockage. There is recognition that the road was still under construction and that such drainage will be addressed but at the time of the visit no evidence of such drainage was noticed. IBLAC will highlight this for its subsequent visit to Murchison and will provide photographic evidence if the conditions are found to persist.
- The visual aspect of the roads and the bridge in the landscape, strongly reduce the aesthetic quality of these landscapes. IBLAC recommends that UWA and UNRA explore restoration activities, especially in areas around the bridge construction, to assist recovery of vegetation in those areas.



Figure 1. Signage with mitigation measures at Tangi entrance to MFNP

- The C1 road, in MFNP close to Pakuba Lodge, is being constructed by the Tilenga project. The IBLAC team visited a short stretch of this C1 road, which also featured steep embankments, although lower than the main Paraa – Tangi Road. Road construction did include wildlife crossing points – a kind of ‘slit’ in the embankments allowing animals to access the road without navigating the steep embankments. These slits appeared to be too narrow and deep, blocking the sight of the animals in approaching traffic and hiding approaching animals from the sight of drivers until they step onto the road, thus creating a risk for collisions.

While we heard that animals were using the crossing, IBLAC observed that animals crossed the road at alternative sites, scurrying up the steep embankments. IBLAC believes that the crossing may be more effective if widened and flattened so that animals have greater visibility of their surroundings and so that drivers can see animals coming more easily and recommends the modifications to enhance wildlife use.

- In 2015, IBLAC, along with Tilenga, met UWA to suggest the development of a supplement or annex to the Murchison Falls Conservation Area Management Plan

(including MFNP, Bugungu and Karuma Wildlife Reserves) to address oil development in the protected area system specifically. UWA chose not to adopt that recommendation. UWA suggested the possibility of creating a stand-alone document on the topic, but that idea did not progress either. The current Murchison Falls Conservation Area management plan (covering Murchison Falls National Park, Bugungu, Karuma and Kabwoya Wildlife Reserves) covers the period from 2012 to 2022, so a process will be launched soon to develop a new ten-year plan for the Murchison Falls Conservation Area. We recommend that Tilenga continue to engage with UWA and participate in and support that planning process so that oil program issues are addressed adequately, and that net gain outcomes are considered as part of that plan. This appears to be the best opportunity to engage UWA and other relevant stakeholders in a valuable discussion of the net gain program and activities required to achieve desired outcomes. Similar efforts should be made to engage NFA to develop a management plan for Budongo Central Forest Reserve. It is also recommended that the Project partners check with NFA and/or the World Bank regarding the World Bank project to prepare and implement the Bugoma management plan and the Albertine Rift Tourism Master Plan.

- Discussions with UWA and a field visit to Bugungu Wildlife Reserve indicated increasing demand for resources (grazing, fuelwood) and poaching of wildlife by communities surrounding the reserve, with UWA staff limitations making it difficult to control access and effectively enforce conservation of biodiversity. Resource use agreements for thatching and grazing had been in place, but these have lapsed and need to be renewed. Some uncertainty exists regarding the Bugungu trophy hunting concession with Game Trails and whether Game Trails has management responsibility for Bugungu or is only responsible for managing the sport hunting activity. That situation should be clarified. Effective management of Bugungu WR, including increasing staff numbers and capacity, can reduce poaching, while renewing resource sharing agreements can potentially support reduced resource conflicts. Determining the current management situation could help Tilenga identify potential investments and actions related to net gain and livelihood objectives that complement planned expenditures by other stakeholders (e.g., World Bank, Game Trails). These activities can then inform the development of the management plan.
- Tourism operators represent an important stakeholder group that will be affected by developments in MFNP. IBLAC spoke with a tourism ranger at MFNP who indicated that project updates and talking points about the oil project in MFNP would be helpful and would facilitate operators in explaining the project and the situation in the National Park to curious tourists, and better answer questions regarding the oil activities occurring in the PA. He suggested that having information at the proposed informational kiosk planned for Paraa would also be helpful. IBLAC recommends that TEPU improve communications with tourism operators, including continued engagement with the Uganda Tourism Board. In addition, develop of information kiosks in the Park at areas where tourists stop for services can explain the project and the activities the project is undertaking to support local livelihoods and conservation.

- Implementing effective programs and projects in the field as soon as feasible will be important in limiting adverse impacts and moving toward achieving a net gain. IBLAC recommends that TEPU consider channelling investments to implement net gain and livelihood enhancement activities through a third-party institution that would provide support as a fund manager, supervise technical aspects of the activities, and provide monitoring support. Using a third-party organization to support program implementation has additional advantages, such as offloading grant management and technical supervision work from TEPU while addressing the reputational complexities impairing the willingness of some actors to commit themselves to utilizing funds received directly from oil companies. In addition, working through a third party to fund project implementors can help support coordination and efficiency while relieving the Operators from the administrative burden of a grant program. IBLAC recommends that TEPU assesses the feasibility of this model and identifies eligible entities that can serve this purpose. Conservation Trust funds (CTFs) have the flexibility to develop specialized accounts that provide opportunities for management oversight via a steering committee or other structure. The Uganda Biodiversity Fund is an example of a Ugandan-based CTF. Discussions with the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of UBF indicated a willingness by the institution to support the development of a bespoke mechanism to support project financing, providing the operators with the opportunity to achieve funding flexibility and management and oversight control. Also, the business of CTFs is to provide grants and other funding to NGOs and other parties and are thus well-placed to manage funds in support of field-based activities.
- IBLAC attended a project-supported Chimpanzee Action Plan meeting in Hoima to discuss the proposed activities and actions which will contribute to addressing the predicted residual impacts of the respective projects on chimpanzee habitat as well as addressing current threats to chimpanzees. The workshop provided an opportunity for discussion between the ARRC Task Force, IBLAC and the developers as part of the finalization of the Chimp Action Plan. IBLAC recommends that the developers continue to support the CAP process and implementation of the identified actions. IBLAC learned that many of the organizations involved with the CAP may be reluctant to receive money directly from the companies and would prefer to work through a third-party. This relates directly to the point raised in the above bullet point.
- Although not related to Tilenga activities, IBLAC noticed that relatively large water run-off retention ponds had been constructed along the side of the road passing Bugungu WR to Buliisa. None of the ponds is protected or fenced, creating hazards to people and wildlife, including the potential for human-wildlife interactions. Although the roads and ponds have nothing to do with the project, the roads are considered oil roads and if there was a loss of life or serious injury, the companies could be blamed. This represents another case where the company needs to consult with UNRA and UWA to ensure that proper mitigation procedures are followed. Although TEPU has no

responsibility for mitigation of these hazards, IBLAC recommends alerting the relevant agencies so that problems can be avoided.

2.4.3. Kingfisher

The IBLAC team visited the Kingfisher site and held discussions with the biodiversity and livelihoods team. IBLAC recommends coordinating Kingfisher and Tilenga to exploit synergies in their programmes and aim at harmonizing their approaches.

The flooding of Lake Albert has caused challenges for the planned project development and created difficulties for people in the area who have lost access to land now under water. To protect its oil infrastructure, CNOOC is now looking at using sheet piles at the lake's edge to protect well pads. IBLAC recommends including nature-based solutions to address the flooding along Lake Albert to avoid erosion and scouring along the water's edge. For example, a wetland buffer could be employed to attenuate wave energy. Next to the primary objective of protecting assets, this would create substantial biodiversity value (e.g., habitats for birds and fish nursery potential along the shoreline of the lake).

Another nature-based solution identified is the use of natural systems for wastewater treatment. Such systems (e.g., using ponds and plants) have proven effective in treating wastewater and would ensure the availability of clean water for multiple uses – and ensure that any discharge was clean. Again, such solution would also bring additional biodiversity value.

The CNOOC team mentioned the concern of local stakeholders over the cost of aquaculture feed as a constraint to maintaining aquaculture projects that had been developed after the project support stopped. IBLAC suggested that food waste from the camps and community could potentially be used as a low-cost feed for fish. Given that, IBLAC recommended that the company test the technical and health feasibility of using human food waste as feed for cage aquaculture on the lake.

IBLAC also recommends that CNOOC coordinate with Tilenga and EACOP to support the preparation and eventual implementation of the Chimpanzee Action Plan in relevant areas in the Murchison – Semliki landscape. There is considerable capacity for implementation available through CSOs that are active in the landscape. However, some show reluctance to receive funding from oil companies directly. There is a need to explore the potential of providing funding for the various plans and activities through a third-party institution that can administer the funds and oversee the technical aspects of the activities. CNOOC, Tilenga and EACOP could all benefit from this approach to fund part of their portfolio of activities while continuing to oversee project implementation through their participation through oversight committees.

2.4.4. EACOP

IBLAC visited sites that will be affected by the pipeline in Uganda at Wambabya Central Forest Reserve, Kafu River/ wetland, and Tala Central Forest Reserve.

An important area for collaboration with the other operators will be the implementation of the Chimpanzee Action Plan (CAP). Forest restoration and management activities in forest areas such as Wambabya can be implemented as part of a broader program of establishing forest connectivity in the realization of the CAP. This will require effective coordination with the NFA as well as local communities. IBLAC notes that NFA's management presence and level of control in these forest reserves have been poor. Forest areas like Wambabya have been highly impacted by logging and exploitation occurring in the internal sections, thereby limiting the habitat for chimpanzees. It is recommended to develop effective management plans for these forest areas and implement them as part of the overall CAP. In addition, EACOP may be in an important position to help lead in the implementation of the CAP, given that its expenditures will not be subject to review and approval under cost recovery provisions like those faced by Tilenga.

Tala Central Forest Reserve has been converted into a plantation forest by private farmers licensed by NFA to establish and manage plantation forests. IBLAC observed that portions of the forest reserves had been planted with maize, allegedly for clearing forest before planting pine trees to establish a commercial plantation. In this regard, the impacts from the pipeline on forest reserve will be minimal in terms of biodiversity. However, IBLAC does recommend that EACOP engage with the oil program focal point in the NFA to address access and land use along the RoW. Developing an effective working relationship may also benefit EACOP's and Kingfisher's work with forest reserves that could see more significant resource pressure and require management strengthening.

IBLAC visited one of the wetlands that will be crossed by the pipeline. The visit was at a road crossing through a Papyrus swamp along the Kafu River and the team noted several points.

1. As part of the work with communities EACOP will need to sensitize communities to plans to restore the wetlands along the ROW after the pipeline has been installed. Some communities might see an opportunity to keep the area open for food production or access to fishing and must be made aware of restoration plans. Oversight and monitoring to ensure compliance with ROW restoration are recommended at wetland crossings to ensure regeneration and minimize encroachment. This should be complemented by livelihood enhancement support for nearby communities.
2. When constructing in the wetland, the companies and contractors need to ensure that construction activities do not create conditions for non-wetland plants to be introduced. At the road site crossing, IBLAC noticed that invasives were introduced, most likely from the construction of the road.
3. The difficulty of performing an effective pre-clearing survey to avoid impacts on biodiversity (e.g., nest of Shoebill, or Grey Crowned Crane) was discussed. During construction, the companies and contractors could explore hiring community members with knowledge of the biodiversity of the wetlands to screen for important biodiversity

features, such as shoe bill and crowned crane nests. This local knowledge could be paired with scientific expertise to avoid impacts on critical species. Such an approach has been used to plan for and manage anticipated effects on wetlands in the Lake Victoria drainage system.

4. There is also a potential to explore whether communities adjacent to the Kafu river wetlands might benefit from the use of reeds and papyrus that will be cut for the ROW. Local people use these materials to make mats for roofing, and other products. If they are advised ahead of time, they could plan to take advantage of the available material.

2.5 Livelihood Findings and Recommendations Uganda

2.5.1 General

Landscapes do not exist devoid of people. There is a risk that net gain initiatives displace people's livelihoods, while livelihood initiatives place pressure on natural resources. As a general theme across Uganda and Tanzania, IBLAC is concerned about the absence of social staff input into biodiversity programming and vice versa. Moreover, many of the biodiversity outcomes toward achievement of net gain will require working with and investing in social and economic development initiatives. We recommend that the respective environment/biodiversity and social functions formalise a system for coordination.

Practical examples of recommended coordination between social and biodiversity teams include:

- Environment staff should evaluate potential biodiversity impacts in the conceptual designs of all livelihood programs. The social team should also evaluate social/livelihood impacts in the conceptual designs of all biodiversity programs. The respective effects and measures to address these should be explicit in program-level M&E.
- Livelihood Restoration Plan (LRP) teams should learn from the approaches of the livelihood programs being implemented by conservation NGOs operating in the same landscape, and the biodiversity team should learn from the practices of LRP implementation partners when evaluating potential NGO partners. A simple mapping exercise can enable this.
- To reduce population pressures on natural resources and to avoid unduly and unnecessarily restricting natural resource-based livelihoods, the projects should continue efforts to manage influx. Further, supporting updates to resource use agreements between communities and protected areas is recommended, ensuring the incorporation of these agreements into the new protected area management plans that embrace the balanced principle of sustainable use by communities dependent on access. This recommendation applies to all relevant protected forest reserves (particularly important for Bugungu), with community agreements built into management agreements, where both protection and restoration efforts will need to

take place. Without that balance in the agreements or plans, enforcement will be ineffective on its own in restricting access when there are no viable or socially acceptable alternatives. Unless responsibly implemented, enforcement risks conflict and possible human rights violations. Management plan updates and new management plans should consider the sustainable community use and management of resources in and around the protected areas. For these reasons, the perspective of the social teams is essential in advising on the development of these plans.

- The social and environmental programs face challenges in the broader landscape given the influx of new people into the landscape, adding to already intense existing pressures. IBLAC recommends that the social and environmental teams target directly impacted and broader communities to explore programs that contribute to the reduction in pressures on natural resources. For example, a program to promote reduced fuelwood use through alternative and renewable/clean energy options is recommended to reduce pressures on forest and help people meet their cooking needs. Such an approach will require providing incentives to invest in new technologies and business opportunities and provision of incentives for people to adopt the approaches. People do not simply change behaviour because they have participated in an education program: such initiatives need to be informed by the projects' social specialists/community liaison officers, lessons learnt by the organisations experienced in implementing such programs in the target communities, and adequate incentives offered for people to transition to alternative options.

2.5.2 LRP

- IBLAC notes that good practices are evident in LRP efforts across all the different operators' projects and recommends a program for sharing approaches and lessons learnt. Instead of a linear, sequenced approach consisting of transition support followed by livelihood restoration and then by livelihood enhancement, we recommend a multi-layered approach oriented to creating conditions that support livelihood enhancement from the start. This approach requires the LRP to develop a social investment strategy with an adequate budget and staff. IBLAC noted that the current approach to LRP programs seems to be centred on the resourcing constraints of the project rather than on the needs of project-affected people and the communities that host them.
- The target groups for the social investment strategy should include host communities and other indirectly affected communities, such as those involved in Net Gain projects and affected by in-migration.
- The Tilenga social team appears to be critically under-resourced to implement its Global Livelihoods Plan. Here, we support the decision to extend the time horizon for the RAP-1 LR and recommend planning for a longer time horizon for remaining LRPs, as it is

infeasible that households have the conditions to sustain their livelihoods within the original schedule for close-out.

- Across the projects, it was not evident to IBLAC how income generation programs provide ongoing support in the medium- to long-term for market access, capacity-building on managing enterprises and alignment with Parish Development Plans in Uganda. Without this, efforts are likely to be unsustainable.

2.6. Summary and General Conclusions Uganda

The IBLAC recognizes the operators' significant institutional and development challenges and constraints in achieving their net gain objectives. This section summarises some of the main findings and conclusions from the visit.

1. *Lack of a landscape masterplan and common vision* result in poor institutional coordination among UWA, NFA, UNRA, Ministry of Energy and Minerals Development (MEMD) and the various project implementers in the landscape. Striking examples include the road infrastructure in Murchison Falls National Park and the increased land use for commercial agriculture displacing remaining natural forests. In addition, an above-ground powerline built through the park to service the lodges was put in place without any consideration of potential impacts. This poor coordination can lead to cumulative impacts that hinder achievement of net gain objectives. Going forward with the planned multi-sectoral mechanism, and the planned cumulative impact strategy to support review of development plans and for building broad support for the net gain program implementation is considered an important step and highly recommended.
2. *Limited institutional capacity* compounds the lack of coordination. Low institutional capacities at various levels for implementing net gain programs, livelihood initiatives, or enforcing mitigation measures in approved ESIA/ESMP represents a serious implementation challenge. Efforts to ensure that road mitigation measures are enforced by UNRA, for instance, are important for meeting program objectives as are finding strong implementation partners, while supporting the capacity of local institutions.
3. *Opportunities for positive biodiversity and livelihood outcomes* are possible with greater operator coordination between TILenga, Kingfisher and EACOP to ensure synergies and complementary approaches and processes in the landscape. IBLAC understands that coordinated efforts are planned as part of Tripartite Agreements among the operators and these efforts are encouraged.
4. *Delayed implementation of net gain programmes* has had a negative effect on the ability to address pre-construction impacts in the landscape and is likely to increase the cost of achieving the net gain objectives over the long-term. IBLAC was pleased to see that project implementation is moving forward on several fronts.
5. *Funding activities on the ground.* IBLAC discovered that various NGOs and potential project implementors are uncomfortable receiving money directly from an oil company,

or extractive industry, especially given issues around climate change. Exploring opportunities to work with third-party funding organizations in the countries can help alleviate bottlenecks as well as stakeholders concerns or uneasiness. The approach is recommended and should allow for more rapid funding of projects, while building up the capacity of local institutions to manage net gain programs.

6. *Management plans for Wildlife and for Forest Protected Areas* are either outdated or non-existent. Revising the Murchison Falls Conservation Area Management Plan, which expires in 2022, offers an opportunity to include the net gain program and address the impacts as part of an official planning document. IBLAC was pleased to learn that UWA had accepted to work with Tilenga on the development of the management plan and that the collaboration on development of that document will take place in 2023. Such plans need to set long-term conservation and management objectives and strategies embedding net gain principles and addressing livelihood issues related to resource use. Similar opportunities exist for the development of management plans for forest reserves.
7. *There is a need for a better Information database* (Baselines) and monitoring framework for the net gain investments to ensure that net gain results can be demonstrated and communicated to a broader public.
8. *Communication about the project and operator efforts* to mitigate impacts needs to be shared more widely. Stakeholders such as PA staff and tour operators have limited access to up-to-date information about the oil development activities and cannot adequately address questions from clients.
9. *Increased pressures on resources within wildlife and forest protected areas* due to increased human population in the landscape is likely to increase, along with potential human wildlife conflict as well as conflict between communities and protected areas regarding resource use. Strategies need to be developed to reduce these pressures while responding to the economic needs of communities.
10. *Poorly defined or unclear development of alternatives* for- or diversification of tourism products in MFNP could exacerbate activities. Greater engagement with this sector is recommended; this could be achieved as part of the engagement required for development of the General Management Plans (GMP).
11. *Obstacles in mobilizing non-state actors /NGOs* to participate in net gain programmes due to “reputational risk” factors have the potential to limit the participation of NGOs with needed expertise. This obstacle could be overcome through working with a third-party funding institution. Working through a third-party can also increase efficiencies and reduce funding bottlenecks, without the operators giving up oversight of the funding.
12. *Sustained high water levels in Nile and Lake Albert* and resulting floods increase the pressure on biodiversity and available land (e.g., for use in pastoralism); there is also significant displacement of livelihood assets and opportunities. The flooding also makes development of a meaningful wetland pillar of the Net Gain programme more difficult. Lake levels need to be monitored and plans put in place to respond to changing conditions.

13. *There is an absence of social staff input into biodiversity programming and vice versa.* Moreover, many of the biodiversity outcomes toward achievement of net gain will require working with and investing in social and economic development initiatives. We recommend that the respective environment/biodiversity and social functions formalise a system for coordination to ensure success of the program.
14. *Mainstreaming/integration of Livelihoods enhancement programmed activities* with ongoing or planned investment by the government through Parish Development Models will help ensure buy-in and can take advantage of possible capacity-building programs funded by donor initiatives. Greater coordination with existing donor programs in the landscape is recommended. As part of stakeholder engagement meetings, NGO and Government meetings, and information from IBLAC members, the Parties could compile a list of donor programs relevant to the net gain program that would facilitate future discussions.
15. *An EACOP focus on conservation and restoration of the Chimpanzee corridor* (Bugoma / Wambabya / Budongo landscapes and their connectivity) provides an opportunity for big conservation and potential livelihood gains. Investments could also be combined with funding from Tilenga and Kingfisher to achieve positive outcomes. Most of the activities planned for the chimpanzee corridor will be outlined in the Chimpanzee Action Plan. IBLAC recommends that engagement with the authors of the action plan to determine the programs that can be supported toward meeting net gain and support the conservation of the chimpanzees in the Albertine Rift.

3. Tanzania

3.1 The Landscape: Tanzania

IBLAC observes that EACOP works in diverse socio-ecological landscapes (marine/coastal, savanna woodlands, forests, wetlands, etc.) with unique socio-economic and biodiversity scenarios for each landscape, including sensitive ecological attributes. This diversity poses a challenge to EACOP in terms of implementing investments that must be relevant to each location. IBLAC supports the approach of EACOP to explore the option of concentrating on specific landscapes/locations and not spreading too thinly on the ground. This still means that net gain needs to be achieved for all critical habitat triggering situations, but it recognizes that there are 'Big Ticket' opportunities where it is feasible to do even more good with sensible investments. These 'Big Ticket' items should at least include the most sensitive and critical areas such as the Tanga coastal area, Burigi-Chato, and at least one 'signature' papyrus wetland crossing.

Where low hanging fruit can be found in terms of easy wins for biodiversity without negative social impacts against low investment rates, these should also be explored. The same arguments could be made for Uganda where the Chimpanzee corridor (Bugoma / Wambabya / Budongo landscapes and their connectivity) would receive priority and possibly the Kafu papyrus swamp.

Unfortunately, meetings with Government officials, such as the Director of NEMC, were not possible due to conflicting time schedules. Despite that inability to hold such meetings, IBLAC members have the impression that the policy environment is conducive to the implementation of the net gain program, although legislation supportive of the application of the mitigation hierarchy and net gain requirements is lacking. One of the favourable conditions is that cost recovery issues (which are often obstacles for program investment in the Tilenga context) do not affect funding decisions in Tanzania. IBLAC would hope to meet with the Director of NEMC in a subsequent visit to explain its role and general issues related to ESIA and the mitigation hierarchy.

There are ecologically very sensitive areas in the EACOP landscape as well as a range of livelihood challenges to overcome in certain circumstances. The IBLAC team noted that the Project team is aware of those issues and is exploring ways to address them. Various projects are under consideration and if successfully implemented, over the long-term, have the potential to contribute positive 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.

3.2 Supporting Conditions for Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Tanzania

The IBLAC team noted that the EACOP had assembled a competent and dedicated staff that appears to be very committed to meeting biodiversity and livelihood objectives. Resources have been dedicated to programs, and budgets are available to initiate needed studies. EACOP staff has also engaged various program implementors (e.g., NGOs, contractors) that can implement programs in the project's areas of operations. This combination of internal resourcing and external implementing partners has the potential to deliver positive biodiversity and livelihood outcomes.

Regarding pipeline planning and routing, the IBLAC team was impressed with EACOP's efforts to minimize impacts through modifications to the pipeline route. This was particularly evident with the routing changes undertaken through Burigi-Chato National Park. Although the protected area could not be avoided, routing decisions attempted to minimize impacts to forested areas and habitat for red colobus, for example.

As mentioned earlier, there appears to be a favourable policy environment that will not limit the company's ability to invest sufficient resources in its efforts to achieve net gain. Success will depend on finding strong partners. Although the policy environment appears favourable, the government's desire to invest around Tanga port may lead to cumulative impacts that could threaten biodiversity and livelihood objectives around the Chongoleani Peninsula. Already negative impacts on livelihoods are evident in the region, especially related to access to resources, while the potential cumulative impact effects are unknown given the current level of uncertainty regarding government development plans around the port area. Ideally, EACOP can

play a role in supporting planning in the region so that any severe impacts can be avoided and any threats to the company's net gain objective are minimized.

3.3. Constraints to meeting Net Gain and Livelihood Enhancement in Tanzania

The land acquisition in Chongoleani for the marine storage terminal has created a “honey pot effect” drawing other developments to that site. The potential for cumulative impacts that the company cannot influence could jeopardize the conservation and livelihood programs in which the company will invest, especially if investment cuts people off from marine resources. The future viability of the Putini community is in question, especially if resource access is restricted (fishing, gleaning). Demand for land for production and for resettlement of people from the peninsula has put pressure on local livelihoods and is likely to impact land use and options for livelihood maintenance. Few alternatives appear to exist for the community in that area, especially if the government were to restrict access to the entire peninsula, because of the various developments planned in the area.

Another challenge is the weak capacity and governance of marine protected areas and BMUs in the region. EACOP will need to explore implementation mechanisms to ensure effective management of marine resources in the larger Tanga region, especially managing the protected areas located around the terminal and jetty site.

Another challenge faced by EACOP is the extensive landscape over which it works. Trying to work across all the various ecosystems affected by pipeline construction will be impossible and inefficient. A focus on specific critical areas and species, along with targeted investments that will deliver the most gain, is likely to be the best strategy.

Finally, people depend to a large degree on natural resources-based livelihoods which creates significant pressure on land and biodiversity. Feasibility studies are recommended to inform identify alternative sectors and value chains with potential for development, to achieve greater diversification and to improve value addition to enhance local economies. This would require that development of productive economic opportunities have linkages to processing and markets so that people are able to derive an income. Working throughout the value chain will be important in achieving success.

3.4 Biodiversity findings and recommendations Tanzania

The itinerary and program outlined in Appendix 1 demonstrates that the field visit focused on two areas – the landscape/seascape around Tanga in the east and the Burigi-Chato National Park in western Tanzania.

- The visit confirmed the strategy that EACOP has developed to focus on critical habitats (marine and terrestrial) to push for net gain. The marine protected areas around Tanga

are poorly funded, and management is weak. The WCS marine program is currently funding the development of management plans for those areas that will determine management actions and budgets. EACOP will have an opportunity to work with agencies and NGOs to support the implementation of those management plans and monitor the changes resulting from the management interventions. The monitoring programs will allow EACOP to determine the effectiveness of the investments and quantify gains.

- The migratory bird studies conducted by EACOP confirmed the importance of the coastal habitats around Tanga for several flagship migratory water birds in the West Asian – East African Flyway. Awareness of this Flyway and of the importance of the Tanzanian coast is low and this results in a poor funding situation - few donors are willing to invest in conservation and development of sustainable management plans here (especially when compared with the interest of donors in the conservation of the well-known East Atlantic Flyway on the West African coast). EACOP has an opportunity to support implementation of a study and demonstration project using marking and satellite tracking for migratory shore birds to establish and enhance the awareness of the importance of this coast and of this Flyway and thus lay a foundation for more interest from other donors and improvement of the funding situation for this Flyway. This may not necessarily contribute directly to net gain now but could serve as an additional conservation action and important contribution by EACOP to avian conservation.
- A similar opportunity exists in Burigi-Chato, where a management plan must be developed. EACOP already has a budget to undertake a wildlife baseline survey in the region, which will inform the management plan and lay the groundwork for quantifying net gain. Financing the implementation of the management plan will contribute to the conservation of this area and protection of important species such as the red colobus and would contribute to net gain.
- Notwithstanding the need to focus, the pipeline will affect other rare or critical ecosystems that will need management support and can contribute to the overall net gain strategy. Minziro Forest, the Itigi Thicket, specific wetlands, rangelands or poorly managed forest reserves and other habitats that are home to particular biodiversity features like the Karamoja Apalis or the Pancake Tortoise, and that could be supported through NGOs or other implementing groups and could contribute to a net gain. Much will depend on the potential impact on rare or threatened species. There is also an opportunity to engage with local communities on conservation initiatives, thereby achieving biodiversity and livelihood objectives in an integrated way. IBLAC did not have a chance to visit these areas during this visit and thus recommends exploring options and requests to be involved in their evaluation. The critical habitat study, once finalized, should also offer some useful recommendations.

- An opportunity exists to achieve a combination of livelihood and biodiversity outcomes through participation in or contribution to the Tanga Water Fund, a new initiative in the worldwide portfolio of Water Funds run by the Nature Conservancy, focusing on the watershed of the Sigi River. IBLAC members held a zoom meeting with the Nature Conservancy to learn more about the Fund. The Tanga Water Fund represents a “ridge to reef” program aimed at improving land management in the upstream sections of a watershed to decrease sediment-run off and water turbidity while helping to increase the annual water flow from the watershed through initiatives that contribute to livelihood enhancement. The reduced siltation and improved water quality benefit reef health. IBLAC recommends that EACOP explore partnering with other interested parties to develop the Water Fund in the Sigi watershed in terms of meaningful and integrated biodiversity conservation and livelihood enhancement initiatives. TNC is already working with the Eastern Arc Mountains Conservation Endowment Fund (EAMCEF), which supports conservation actions in the upper watershed. EACOP’s role in the Fund should be explored. Watershed restoration activities could also benefit from community forestry projects that pay farmers for carbon sequestration. Tilenga is planning to work with Ecotrust in Uganda on such a program, and similar programs are underway in other parts of Tanzania using the Plan Vivo Standard. IBLAC could not obtain a clear idea of the structure of the Fund at this time nor its plan to operate sustainably. Those issues do need further analysis as part of overall due diligence. As with the other programs, a monitoring program will need to be put in place to determine results, provide adaptive management guidance, and assess contributions to a net gain. IBLAC plans to hold additional meetings with TNC.
- During the visit, various stakeholders raised concerns about a proposed exit route for tankers that would have the vessels move north from the jetty through a narrow channel, frequented by fishers and with essential coral reefs adjacent to it. Stakeholders want to understand why tankers cannot leave via the same open water route used to access the jetty. IBLAC understands that study is underway by EACOP and that there is no definitive position yet but recommends that the final routing decision ensures consideration of avoidance and minimization of impacts and that a final routing decision, and the process for concluding it, are shared with local stakeholders.
- IBLAC visited Fish Eagle Point to observe reef restoration work being carried out by the proprietor of the tourist operations there. The proprietor at Fish Eagle Point is using the restoration techniques proposed by the local NGO, MWAMBAAO, but indicated that he did not have the resources to conduct monitoring. Continued pilot efforts are recommended that should include monitoring to determine whether the systems employed are delivering the desired outcomes. The dedication of the Fish Eagle Point owners, coupled with the MWAMBAAO approach, makes the site an attractive one to test the feasibility of the restoration approach and its broader applicability.
- In addition to supporting targeted reef restoration, support for developing and implementing fisheries management plans (zoning, closures, restoration, etc.), including

mangrove conservation/restoration, is recommended. The reef restoration and fisheries management plans could form part of the marine PA management plans, broadening their reach to have a greater positive impact on the seascape. Mangrove conservation/restoration program have the potential to generate carbon benefits. Such payments could potentially support livelihood enhancement while providing biodiversity and adaptation benefits. There is some uncertainty as to the scale of carbon financing that can be achieved.

- As was the case in Uganda, some Tanzania NGOs may be reluctant to take EACOP funds directly because of reputational issues. Unlike Uganda, however, to IBLAC's knowledge, there is no national-level conservation trust fund in the country. IBLAC recommends that EACOP assess whether an appropriate funding mechanism exists within the country through which EACOP could channel funds or whether helping to establish national-level conservation fund is warranted. A short study could be conducted to determine whether there is donor and stakeholder interest in establishing a Fund that would be able to manage EACOP and other donor funds that would support conservation and sustainable livelihoods. The legal system in Tanzania allows for the establishment of such a Fund. EAMCEF was set up through the Tanzanian legal system, had an endowment invested offshore, and has managed different donor funds. Given that its mandate is restricted to the Eastern Arc Mountains it may not be fit for purpose for the need that IBLAC sees for a national Fund. Working with stakeholders to create a national fund to address conservation issues across the entire country would then be recommended.

3.5 Livelihoods Findings and Recommendations Tanzania

Specific recommendations that have been elaborated in the Uganda section of this report also apply to Tanzania, in summary:

- Formalise coordination between the social and the environment/biodiversity teams.
 - a. Develop a social investment strategy targeting livelihoods enhancement of directly and indirectly affected communities and implement it in parallel to the LRP.
 - b. Provide ongoing support to facilitate market access for income generation projects; and
 - c. Formalise regular sharing of lessons learnt with the Uganda projects.
- The imperative of social staff involvement in Net Gain programs is heightened in the present Tanzanian country context. IBLAC's visit to Tanzania coincided with police firing on and detaining Masaai in the Loliondo area as part of eviction of Masaai from their

lands for conservation and trophy hunting purposes¹. This incident has resulted in international condemnation and a spotlight on the impacts of conservation initiatives on the rights of Indigenous peoples worldwide. EACOP should be sensitive to potential displacement impacts of its Net Gain efforts on Indigenous peoples.

- IBLAC recognises that EACOP, even with staff's best intentions, is hamstrung by difficulty finding implementation partners due to reputational concerns. We recommend mapping existing foundations, trusts, and funds, to deepen the knowledge base of potential partners. Finding suitable funding vehicles also potentially ensures positive impacts beyond the project's life by not relying on project operational expenditure to fund livelihood enhancement programs, leveraging funds, and contributing to national SDG action plans.
- The visit to the Chongoleani peninsula, and especially the village of Putini, highlighted two main concerns, namely, the potential for the project, for reasons of security, to prevent gleaners (mainly women) from accessing the area under the jetty; and the cumulative impacts of projects on the peninsula on people's access to terrestrial and marine resources. IBLAC recommends:
 - a. Revise the LRP to reflect the totality of people's experiences of all the various projects planned and under development on the peninsula that will affect their access to resources.
 - b. Reconsider the methodology for categorisation of households (A to D), as it does not reflect all the conditions that people need to re-establish their livelihoods (the current approach seems to confuse support for livelihoods re-establishment with compensation for loss of resources); and
 - c. Ensure affected people have access to land and marine resources necessary to sustain their livelihoods.
- The visit to Burigi-Chato identified relatively less severe livelihood impacts. When the PA converted to a national park from a wildlife reserve, communities living on the periphery lost access to the areas, but it was not possible to determine the effects on communities. IBLAC noted the potential to support nature-based tourism opportunities linked to the park by providing vocational skills and enterprise development support.
- As a further enhancement/benefit-sharing measure, IBLAC recommends that planned solar installations also provide access to energy to surrounding communities.

¹ See for example in <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/tanzania-thousands-of-maasai-flee-into-the-bush-after-dozens-shot-and-detained-following-evictions-for-trophy-hunting-and-conservation/>

3.6 Summary and General Conclusions Tanzania

The IBLAC recognizes that EACOP is actively exploring opportunities to achieve net gain and address the impacts to livelihoods. This section summarises some of the main findings and conclusions from the visit.

1. EACOP should continue with efforts to focus on specific areas where biodiversity gains can be achieved. These “big ticket” sites include Burigi-Chato National Park and the marine protected areas their surrounding areas around Tanga. Implementing management plans and documenting outcomes will demonstrate progress toward net gain. Reef restoration activities can also be considered as part of these activities.
2. Some additional biodiversity gains can be achieved through conservation efforts aimed at habitat and species protection. Minziro Forest, the Itigi Thicket, specific wetlands, rangelands or poorly managed forest reserves and other habitats that are home to particular biodiversity features such as the Karamoja Apalis or the Pancake Tortoise; these offer potential options for conservation actions.
3. EACOP has opportunities to combine biodiversity, livelihood, and climate benefits through participation in a “reef to ridge” project, as part of a Tanga Water Fund initiative (after assessing the feasibility to engage through this initiative). The project could help reduce water turbidity that affects reef health while providing livelihood enhancement in the upstream watershed. The project would be collaboration with other entities and has the potential to deliver positive benefits. It also has the potential to engage with multiple stakeholders toward achieving positive social and biodiversity outcomes. IBLAC recommends continued discussions with TNC and other partners to explore this opportunity.
4. An assessment of non-government funding institutions (e.g., foundations, trusts, etc.) that operate on a national level and could be used understand the potential to use existing third-party organizations to channel funds to organizations and institutions in the country, or whether there is a need to support the creation of new national-level fund in the country that can support conservation and livelihood programs. The timeline for the creation of a new institution in the country is estimated to be around 18 months to two years.
5. Continue to assess the plans for the Chongoleani peninsula and the impact on peoples’ access to resources (fishing and gleaning), especially those in Putini who have no other alternatives. EACOP has a role to play in assessing cumulative impacts and issues of access, including providing access to the area under the jetty for gleaning.

4. 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 Visit

Itinerary IBLAC in-country visit May-June 2022					
DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS	ACCOMMODATION
Sunday 29th May	Arrive in Uganda (RV, WH)	Entebbe International Airport	Transport from Entebbe to Golden Tulip Hotel, Kampala		Golden Tulip, Kampala
Monday 30th May	Arrive in Uganda (AME, CM)	Entebbe International Airport	Transport from Entebbe to Golden Tulip Hotel, Kampala; IBLAC team for this visit complete (AM, AME, CM, RV, WH), preparatory meetings (RV, WH)		Golden Tulip, Kampala
Tuesday 31st May	Kick-off Meeting	Golden Tulip Hotel	Kick off with TEPU & CUL GMs, H3SEL Managers, (1 hour) Joint Meeting with NEMA/UWA/PAU (2 hours) Meeting with CSCO (2 hours)	MDAs (NEMA, UWA, PAU) CSCO	Golden Tulip, Kampala
Wednesday 1st June	Travel to Pakuba Lodge (via R3 road)	MFNP, Pakuba Lodge	Travel from Golden Tulip Hotel to MFNP via Masindi (R3 Road) (including COVID test) Meeting with manager of Pakuba Lodge and lodge staff.	Pakuba Lodge staff and tour guide	Pakuba Lodge, MFNP

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS	ACCOMMODATION
Thursday 2nd June	Murchison Falls National Park / Buliisa District	Well-pad civil works Nile Crossing Location Resettlement Houses	Visit the well-pad civil work site and C1 Road construction activities Meeting with MFNP Head Warden for Compliance; Visit to Industrial Area Review of RAP (2,3), visit to two farms, resettlement houses construction & livelihood restoration activities, hospital Travel to Hoima	Crew at C! Road MFNP Compliance Warden Farmers (cassava and tree production) Head doctor at hospital	Miika Resort, Hoima
Friday 3rd June	Tilenga Feeder Pipeline Route	Tilenga Feeder Pipeline	Travel from Hoima up to KP20, Waiga wetland (tentative) Review of RAP4 activities Visit to Bugungu WR (meeting with warden) Visit section of R2 road through Budongo FR, meeting with BFCS Travel to Mika	UWA Warden (BWR) Budongo Field Conservation Station Game Trails station	Miika Resort, Hoima
Saturday 4th June	Kingfisher	KFDA Feeder KFDA Area	Pipeline corridor along edge Bugoma FR Schedule TBC by CUL, review of facilities (considering flooding), review or RAP and livelihood restoration activities	CUL	Miika Resort, Hoima
Sunday 5th June	Bugoma / Wambabya chimpanzee corridor	Bugoma / Wambabya corridor	Site visit to look at corridors and Debrief with Kingfisher and Tilenga	IBLAC, EACOP, ARRC, Kibale Primate Centre, IUCN, Budongo Primate Centre, Jean Goodall Institute	Miika Resort, Hoima

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS	ACCOMMODATION
Monday 6th June	Chimpanzee Action Plan workshop	Mike Resort, Hoima	Lay foundation for development of chimpanzee action plan.	IBLAC, EACOP, ARRC, Kibale Primate Centre, IUCN, Budongo Primate Centre, Jean Goodall Institute,	Miika Resort, Hoima
Tuesday 7th June	Kafu River, Taala FR - Kampala	Travel	Travel back to Kampala Debrief with TEPU Management		Golden Tulip, Kampala
Wednesday 8th June	Travel Kampala - Dar es Salaam (via Nairobi)	Arrive in Tanzania	Common debrief session with Tilenga, Kingfisher and EACOP on the 8th. Morning Debrief, closed session and recommendations, then travel to Dar es Salaam		Elements Hotel, Dar Es Salaam
Thursday 9th June	Kick-off Meeting & Travel to Tanga City	EACOP Offices 08:00 - 10:00 Fly to Tanga 12:00 - 12:40 Packed Lunch Visit Chongoleani 14:00 - 17:00	Kick off, E and LSOC presentation Fly to Tanga and visit MST		Tanga Beach Resort

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION	ACTIVITY	(EXTERNAL) STAKEHOLDERS	ACCOMMODATION
Friday 10th June	Tanga City - Fish Eagle Point	Visit Fish Eagle Point 07:00 - 14:00 Return to Tanga 14:00 - 15:00 Stakeholder meetings 15:00 - 17:00 Fly to Dar 17:30 - 18:00	Reef regeneration at Fish Eagle Point and have lunch there. Return to Tanga and meet with local stakeholders and fly to Dar by the end of the day	Stakeholders: Mwambao, TACMP, TFS, TPA	Elements Hotel, Dar Es Salaam
Saturday 11th June	Travel from Dar to Bukoba/Chato	Fly to Bukoba 09:20 - 12:15 Drive to Chato 14:00 - 17:00	Fly to Bukoba and drive to Chato to be as close as possible to the BC NP		Chato Beach Resort
Sunday 12th June	Travel to Burigi-Chato NP.	Burigi Chato	Burigi Chato National Park - hike to / on RoW with guides and TANAPA rangers	National Park managed by TANAPA	Chato Beach Resort
Monday 13th June	Chato - DAR	Drive to Bukoba 08:30 - 11:30 Fly from Bukoba to Dar 12:45 - 15:40	Return to Dar		Elements Hotel, Dar Es Salaam
Tuesday 14th June	DAR	Hotel and EACOP Office	Meet and work on recommendations, presentation to EACOP and report		Elements Hotel, Dar Es Salaam
Wednesday 15th June	DAR	Hotel and EACOP Office; Airport	Debrief 16:00 - 17:30; Depart for DAR Airport		

Annex 3. List of Meeting Participants at TotalEnergies Headquarters October 17, 2022

Name	Position
Henri-Max NDONG-NZUE	Senior Vice President Africa
Xavier ECOMARD	Vice-President Uganda & Tanzania, EP Africa Division
Philippe GROUEIX	General Manager of TEP Uganda
Cheick-Omar DIALLO	Leader of Communications Taskforce for Tilenga and EACOP
Carole LE GALL	Senior Vice President Sustainability & Climate
Catherine Remy	Senior Vice President for Environment and Social Performance
Kojo BEDU ADDO	Head of Social Performance
Troels ALBRECHTSEN	Senior Vice President HSE EP - HSE/EP
Claudine CHAVEE	Head of Social for EP HSE/EP/SOC
Claude-Henri CHAINEAU	Head of Environment for EP HSE/EP/ENV
Ana Maria Esteves	Social & Livelihoods Expert IBLAC
Ward Hagemeyer	Wetlands Expert IBLAC
Sebastien LeBel	Community and Wildlife Expert IBLAC
Ray Victurine	Mitigation and Conservation Finance Expert – IBLAC Chair