

PN-ABZ-434

**TOWARDS AN
IMPROVED FRAMEWORK FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
IN GUINEA**

**Guinea Natural Resources Management Project
Contract No. 624-0219-C-00-2094-00**

**Prepared by:
Frederick E. Gilbert**

**Prepared for:
U.S. Agency for International Development
Conakry, Guinea**



October 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	
LIST OF ACRONYMS	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
SECTION I	BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF STUDY I-1
A.	National Environmental Action Plans in Africa I-1
B.	The NEAP Process in Guinea I-1
C.	Draft Chapter IX I-3
LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED	I-5
SECTION II	THE CONSULTANCY: OVERVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS II-1
A.	Purpose of the Consultancy II-1
B.	Chronological Overview of Trip II-1
C.	Planning the Workshop II-3
C1.	The Problems and Parameters II-3
C2.	The Proposed Plan II-4
D.	Observations on Decentralized and Local Environmental Management II-6
D1.	Decentralized Central Government Functions and Staff II-6
D2.	Local Government II-7
SECTION III	RECOMMENDATIONS III-1
A.	Recommended Improvements to Draft Chapter IX III-1
B.	Workshop Preparations III-2
C.	Rural-Level Environmental and Natural Resources Management Capability III-2
D.	Community Woodlot Development III-3
ANNEX A	PROPOSED PLAN FOR TECHNICAL WORKSHOP A-1
ANNEX B	TECHNICAL NOTE—SESSION A B-1
ANNEX C	TECHNICAL NOTE B C-1
ANNEX D	TECHNICAL NOTE C D-1



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A great deal of assistance was received in preparing for and carrying out this consultancy. Peter Veit of the World Resources Institute, Catharine Cassagne of the World Bank, and Catharine Swan of Chemonics International worked together to define terms of reference that accounted for the complexity of the task and the uncertainties involved. All three were generous with their time and in sharing documents in the briefing process. Catharine Swan was an unfailing model of crisp operational efficiency, all the while cheerfully making her feats seem deceptively easy. Marissa Ramos, with unlimited patience, helped me to master aspects of Word Perfect that I was not familiar with.

Upon my arrival in the field, I received a highly useful briefing from S.K. Reddy, Chief of the USAID Rural Development Office, as he was leaving for the United States. During the consultancy, I was well supported by Dan Jenkins, Acting Chief of the USAID/Guinea Rural Development Office, who was ably supported by Facine Kalo and Ms. Dalanda. K.B. Paul, Chief of Party for Chemonics' Natural Resources Management Project, gave detailed and informative briefings on current project activities and the constraints on their replication.

World Bank Resident Representative Eduardo Locatelli and USAID Mission Director Wilbur Thomas provided indispensable guidance and, when required, management decisions on issues encountered in the course of the consultancy. Despite demanding schedules, they always managed to be responsive to my timing constraints. World Bank Economist Cherif Diallo offered invaluable advice and information that always proved correct. Rose Marie Camarra of the United Nations Development Programme contributed useful background information, sound advice, and skillful operational assistance.

Special recognition is due to the patience, wisdom, and skill of Rafiou Barry, Secretary General of the Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and the Environment. He managed a difficult situation in a fair and constructive fashion.

Last and most important is the contribution of Mamadou Saliou Diallo, National Consultant (and former Coordinator of the National Environmental Action Plan Secretariat) mentioned so frequently in this report. We worked side by side for six days a week for four weeks in close, fully reciprocal partnership. All aspects of the work reflected in this report were discussed and debated with, and strongly influenced by, him. His skill, knowledge, and insights were essential in accomplishing our task. He is the coauthor of all documents that form the annexes to this report. Our work together ranks high among the most satisfying professional collaborations of my 30 years of African development work.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BCPA	Office for the Coordination of Agricultural Projects (Projets Agricoles)
BCNE	Office of the National Council for the Environment
BRP	Bassins Representatives Pilotes (see WMU below)
CG	Commissariat General
CGRNE	General Commission (Commissariat General) for Natural Resources and the Environment (proposed in place of the DNE in draft Chapter IX of the NEAP)
CNDD	National Council for Sustainable Development (Development Durable) (proposed in place of the CNE by draft Chapter IX of the NEAP)
CNE	National Council for the Environment
CRD	Rural Development Community (Commune Rurale de Developpement)
DNA	National Environment Directorate
DNC	National Directorate for Decentralization, MIS
DNCT	National Directorate for Cartography and Topography
DNE	National Directorate for the Environment, MNREE
DNFC	National Directorate for Forest and Wildlife (Chasse), MARA
DNH	National Directorate for Water Resources (Hydrologie), MRNEE
DNP	National Directorate for Plan, MPF
DNS	National Directorate for Health
DPDRE	Prefectural Directorate for Rural Development and Environment
DPJCAS	Prefectural Directorate for Youth, Culture, Arts and Sports
DPSAS	Prefectural Directorate for Health and Social Affairs
DPUHTTP	Prefectural Directorate for Urbanism, Housing, Transportation and Public Works
EC	European Community
EA	Environmental Audit
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
FDHIRD	Fouta Djallon Highlands Integrated Rural Development Project
GOG	Government of Guinea
IDA	International Development Association (World Bank)
MARA	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
MAT	Ministry of Infrastructure Development (Aménagement de Territoire)
MEPFP	Ministry of Pre-university Education and Vocational Training (Formation Professionnelle)
MIS	Ministry of Interior and Security
MPF	Ministry of Plan and Finance
MRNEE	Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and the Environment
MRAFPT	Ministry of Administrative Reform, Civil Service and Labor
MSPAS	Ministry of Public Health and Social Affairs

NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan (PNAE Plan National d'Action pour l'Environnement)
NGOs	Nongovernmental Organizations
NRM	Natural Resources Management
PASE	Programme d'Ajustement Sectoriel de l'Education
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Educational Fund
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WMU	Watershed Management Unit (in Guinea they talk about BRPs - Bassins Representatives Pilotes, and BRP teams)
WRI	World Resources Institute

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Guinea, like many African countries, has embarked on the development of a National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP). The draft document was completed in January 1994. Chapter IX of the draft NEAP is on the institutional framework for environmental management. Although the other sections of the NEAP had undergone semi-public consultations, this has not yet occurred for draft Chapter IX or the consultants' reports that preceded it. As a step in completing the NEAP documentation process, the Government of Guinea (GOG) and donors envisioned a workshop that would produce recommendations for improving and finalizing Chapter IX. However, a new entity in the Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and the Environment (MRNEE), called the Office of the National Council for the Environment (BCNE), apparently opposed consideration of Chapter IX as the principal working document for a workshop and set in motion preparations for a workshop that would seriously inhibit systematic consideration of the main issues that need to be resolved. These issues pertain to the structure, status, functions, and location of the bodies responsible for trans-sectoral coordination of environmental policy and management. See subsection I.C for an assessment of draft Chapter IX. See Section III for general recommendations on the nature of changes that this consultancy has found to be desirable.

In consultation with the concerned donors and pending the convocation of a meeting of the NEAP steering committee (which did not occur during the consultancy), the national consultant and I proceeded to hold more than 20 meetings with officials of relevant national directorates and ministries. With the benefit of these consultations, we prepared the proposed workshop plan which forms Annex B of this report. Three technical notes concerning key issues slated for discussion during the first two days of the four-day conference form Annexes C, D, and E. With reference to areas where draft Chapter IX is in need of strengthening, the technical notes draw substantially on a report prepared by consultant Michael Furst in late 1993.

At the end of my consultancy, the national consultant and I visited the USAID-financed watershed management unit (WMU) team, the community secretary of the rural development community (CRD) in Sougueta, and prefectural-level officials in Kindia. We also saw a number of facilities and initiatives that the WMU team, with technical support of the Labe-based Chemonics team, has launched under the auspices of the USAID/Guinea Natural Resources Management (NRM) Project.

Conceptually, the elements of an institutional framework for NRM in rural areas appear to be in place. CRDs have the potential to translate village-level needs into plans. WMU teams and technical staff at the prefectural and sub-prefectural levels are potentially available to provide needed technical support in realizing them.

But broad-scale implementation of NRM activities throughout rural Guinea will not be possible in the near future. Only one practical constraint to this—the testing and evaluation

of NRM interventions—is currently being addressed. Presently, the donor-financed WMU teams are the only NRM technical staff operational in the field. Wide-scale implementation will require that these efforts are shared with additional WMUs or technical staff at the prefectural and sub-prefectural levels—many of whom are not even in place, let alone operational. The additional technical staff needed for replication of NRM activities will need to be indoctrinated, at a minimum, or trained in the NRM intervention recommended for broad-scale implementation. This will require the preparation of field manuals, and budgetary allocations will be required for the interventions to become operational. Most rural development communities were put in place within the last two years and are only now beginning to function. Their roles, responsibilities, and authorities are in need of further definition. Their elected officers and the members of the community and district councils are all acting in new roles for which they have reportedly had no training or prior experience. Meanwhile, informal decision-making forums continue to operate, thereby diminishing the representativeness of the CRD and the supporting structures. Here again, indoctrination and training are required. Legislation and regulations governing application may be needed as a foundation for the manuals and training developed for government technical staff and members of the CRD-related structures.

Before any of these procedures can be effective, the government needs to consider the broad options available and select a realistic institutional model for NRM-focused development in rural areas toward which to work. Phasing this effort properly is all-important because of the need to avoid indoctrinating and training prematurely, increasing operational budgets before there is reason to expect a suitable pay-off, or raising unrealistic expectations among the various interested parties. But it is not too soon to start framing the broad options and testing their realism in human resources and financial terms. As soon as an institutional model emerges, and especially if tested, it would have sustainability-enhancing implications for the replication of the Fouta Djallon Highlands Integrated Rural Development (FDHIRD) Project.

In the Sougueta sub-prefecture, increasing numbers of people are shifting from agriculture to charcoal making because it is much more profitable. To curb this practice, the CRD is refusing to collect taxes from and thereby sanction many charcoal kilns, and the CRD has called upon the *gendarmérie* to halt the operation of illicit kilns. There is interest in bringing land under a long-term sustainable management system for fuel production in a community woodlot, but the problems involved in transferring usufruct or ownership rights from individual families to the community are, in the absence of an adequate legal-administrative framework, perceived to block this course for the present. Given the urgency of dealing with the charcoal production problem and the potential revenues that communities could earn, the NRM project should actively explore the prospects for establishing some pilot community and/or commercial woodlots for fuel production. This could improve understanding of the constraints and accelerate their removal.

SECTION I BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF STUDY

A. National Environmental Action Plans in Africa

For a number of years the World Bank has encouraged African countries to prepare National Environmental Action Plans. The Bank, as lead donor supported by other donors and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), has provided financial and technical assistance to the process. The NEAP process aims to be broadly participatory, involving all concerned organizations and interested groups within both the government and the civil society, including the private for-profit sector and NGOs.

The NEAP process is also the subject of World Bank conditionality. At least one member country, the United States, has attached conditions to its participation in International Development Association (IDA) replenishments requiring the Bank to limit use of IDA resources to countries that have completed acceptable NEAPs.

B. The NEAP Process in Guinea

In 1989, the Government of Guinea undertook the development of a NEAP with support from the World Bank and other donors. In 1992, in view of disappointing progress, a decision was reached to give the task of coordinating the process to Guinée Ecologie, an NGO. Guinée Ecologie, through a subsidiary called SEPIA, provided a secretariat headed by Mamadou Saliou Diallo as coordinator.

The NEAP and the secretariat are overseen by a steering committee, chaired by the Minister of MRNEE. The membership of the steering committee comprises the ministers of the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MARA), Ministry of Infrastructure Development (MAT), and MPR, and the heads of the World Bank, USAID, and UNDP offices. The contract with SEPIA/Guinée Ecologie for this work concluded at the end of January 1994.

The approach of having an NGO coordinate the NEAP process is unique to Guinea. Also unique was the degree of consultation with environmentally oriented agencies (*departements*) of the central government, decentralized levels of government, rural development communities, NGOs, and the for-profit private sector. This process has attracted much favorable attention from the international community, including donors—such as the European Community and various bilateral donors, as well as the World Bank, USAID, and UNDP/UNSO—and international NGOs, such as the World Resources Institute (WRI).

This arrangement was largely successful. After initial delays, the SEPIA-managed process, involving more than 30 national and 12 international consultants, yielded a draft

NEAP, including a Chapter IX on the institutional framework. Considered a "livre blanc," plans for its completion include the following steps:

- Chapter IX will be developed further, based on the recommendations of a long-planned workshop on the institutional framework for managing the environment (see Annex B);
- A generalist consultant will help to synthesize the "livre blanc" into a strategy document of 40 or more pages; and
- An economist will complete the economic analysis and help prepare an action plan to include projects for donor financing.

The World Bank is obliged under the terms of the last IDA replenishment to ensure that IDA-receiving countries complete NEAPs. As of mid-May 1994, the Bank's position was that the Guinea NEAP, including an improved Chapter IX, would have to be completed to its satisfaction before three currently pending IDA projects can go to the Board of Directors in July 1994.

The preparation of draft Chapter IX was preceded by studies by Mohamed Ali Mekouar in 1990, mostly on the legal framework, and by Michael Furst in 1993, mostly on the institutional framework for managing the environment. The Mekouar study describes in detail the organizations charged with environmental management and with the sector programs that have environmental ramifications, but the bulk of the study deals with inconsistencies in the mandates of the sector agencies, which produces duplication of mandates in some areas and gaps of responsibility in others. The Furst study describes the existing institutional structure, but consists mostly of an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of several options for structuring the trans-sectoral institutions. Furst makes a strong case for a sharp division of responsibility between the operational sector agencies and the trans-sectoral agencies that should avoid involvement in operations and program implementation, concentrating instead on coordination and management of trans-sectoral issues. The Furst study and recommendations indicate that the trans-sectoral management agency should not be located either in a ministry with sectoral implementation responsibilities (the present arrangement with the National Directorate for the Environment [DNE] located in the MRNEE) or as a separate ministry unto itself. The Furst study recommends that the trans-sectoral management agency should instead be independent, above the levels of the various national directorates that it must coordinate, located either in a trans-sectoral ministry such as the Ministry of Plan and Finance, or, preferably, in the Presidency. Independent agency status is desirable because this would open the way to exceptional salaries and application of more exacting management practices than is possible in line ministries, favoring recruitment of high quality staff. Location in the Presidency would give the environmental management body a strong position vis a vis the line agencies.

In Guinea, all but one major substantive area covered by the NEAP have been the subject of semi-public consultations—sometimes workshops, sometimes more formal gatherings. There have been longstanding plans for a workshop on the single exception—the

institutional framework for environmental management. This was to be based on the Furst study. But, the French version of that report did not arrive in Guinea until late November. By then the presidential electoral campaign was making it almost impossible to organize a workshop (ministers were unavailable for consultation), and the pressure was on to generate a Chapter IX so that a draft NEAP would be completed by the end of January expiry of the SEPIA contract. Chapter IX was drafted by the NEAP coordinator with the help of three Guinean consultants.

C. Draft Chapter IX

Draft Chapter IX shows evidence of having been produced under pressure. It falls considerably short of constituting a complete, integrated document. In parts, as in the way it incorporates the outline but none of the content of the Mekouar report, it is purposely incomplete, because the authors included the outline to focus the attention of the workshop on that document and its potential utility. In other areas the chapter is incomplete because the group couldn't reach a consensus in the time available. Thus it is largely silent on specific functions to be carried out by various components of the proposed trans-sectoral environmental management coordination body (a semi-autonomous Commissariat General for Natural Resources and the Environment [CGRNE]).

Although the substance of draft Chapter IX is based largely on the Furst study, it is also significantly different in several respects. Like the Furst study, it favors making the environmental management agency an independent agency and locating it either in the Presidency or in the Ministry of Plan and Finance. But unlike the Furst study, draft Chapter IX says little about the proposed agency's responsibilities for protection of the environment and conservation of natural resources. Instead it evinces a preoccupation with putting natural resources to rational and sustainable use. It suggests that the resource management system be thought of as a kind of resource bank to which sector agencies would come for authorization to develop resources. Although attractive at first, this concept would place enormous power in the environmental agency. It also implies an impossible workload for the environmental agency while tending conceptually to absolve the sectoral agencies of all responsibility for environmental management at their levels.

Draft Chapter IX reflects the wish of one member of the drafting group to give CGRNE sectoral departments, with staff in each major river basin conservation area who would collaborate in developing and implementing sector agency programs. Meanwhile, the document says little about the need for creating and enforcing an appropriate body of laws, regulations, and standards for the protection of the environment and conservation of natural resources. This absence plus other specific statements in draft Chapter IX give the impression that the Commissariat General will be involved in operations and will seek to influence sector programs' environmental impact through involvement rather than through more formal, documented, and transparent processes based on the establishment, monitoring, and enforcement of laws, regulations, and guidelines. This impression could be further reinforced by the proposal to change the present National Environmental Council (CNE) into a National Council for Sustainable Development (CNDD), which would have the mandate of the current CNE plus unspecified new sectoral functions.

At the policy coordination and oversight level, draft Chapter IX presents some promising new ideas. One is that the national directors of the sector bodies would function as a board of directors for CGRNE, and also provide advice on matters referred to them by the ministers who make up the CNDD. Another idea is for an annual national conference on the environment that would bring together representatives of all governmental, quasi-governmental, private voluntary, private for-profit, and community-based organizations interested in the environment.

Like the Furst study, draft Chapter IX does not deal in-depth with relations between the central government environmental management system and (a) the decentralized government structures (at the regional, prefectural and sub-prefectural levels), (b) local communities, and (c) the private voluntary and for-profit sectors. Nor does it deal with the need for human resources development for institutional strengthening. By citing the Mekouar study, it refers to the problem of inconsistent and overlapping sector agency mandates, but does not propose an approach to resolving the resulting conflicts and gaps of coverage.

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

A. Donors and International Organizations

U.S. Agency for International Development

Mr. Wilbur Thomas, Mission Director
Dr. S.K. Reddy, Chief, Rural Development Officer
Mr. Dan Jenkins, Project Officer (and Acting Chief from May 17 to June 11, 1994),
Rural Development
Dr. Facine Kalo, Rural Development Assistant
Dr. K.B. Paul, Chief of Party, Chemonics International Team, Natural Resources
Management Project

World Bank

Mr. Eduardo Locatelli, Resident Representative, Conakry
Mr. Cherif Diallo, Economist, Conakry
Mr. Mamadou Saliou Diallo, National Consultant, NEAP (and Coordinator of
Guinea Ecologie and through December 31, 1994 Coordinator of the NEAP
process)
Ms. Catherine Cassagne, Environmental Specialist, West and Central Africa
Agriculture Operations, Washington

European Economic Community

M. Guy Petitpierre, Delegate

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

M. Gerard J. Bernard, Resident Representative

United Nations Children's Educational Fund

Dr. Harold Randall, Program Manager

United Nations Development Programme

Mr. S. Dyomin, U.N. Coordinator and UNDP Representative
Mme. Rose Marie Camara, Program Specialist

United Nations Fund for Population Activities

Mme. Agniola Zinsou, Director for Guinea

B. Government of Guinea

The Presidency

M. Cellou Diallo, Special Advisor to the President

Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources

M. Ibrahima Sory Sow, Minister

M. Sagnah Satenin, National Director, Forests and Hunting

Dr. Ahmadou Cherif Bah, Chief, Rural Forests Division, DNFC

M. Ahmed Tidiane Baldé, Agro-Pastoral Section, Directorate of Animal Husbandry

M. Amadou Oury Diallo, National Director, BCPA

Ministry of Infrastructure Development

M. Ibrahima Diallo, Minister

Dr. Moussa Soumah, Secretary General

M. Thierno Hassan Sow, Advisor

M. Bambo Fofana, National Director, Institute of Topography and Cartography

Mme. Nene Mariame Baldé, Member of project study group for PADEULAC (an environmental sanitation project for the City of Conakry)

Ministry of Interior and Security

M. Mamadouba Tounkara, National Director for Decentralization

M. Ismael Camara, Chief, Division of Studies and Projects, DND

M. Mory Magassouba, Chief, Micro-project Section, DND

Ministry of Planning and Finance

M. Goudhoussy Baldé, Macroeconomist, DNP

M. Hady Barry, Economist, DNP

Ministry of Administrative Reform, Civil Service and Labor

M. Billy Nankoumouma Doumbouya, National Director for Public Affairs

M. Mohamed Bill Camara, National Director for Administrative Reform

Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and the Environment

M. Rafiou Barry, Secretary General
M. Lansana Kourouma, Coordinator, BCNE
Mme. Idiatou Barry, BCNE
M. Pierre Lama, BCNE
M. Ciradiou Baldé, National Director of Hydrology
M. Fofana Lansana, DNH
Mme. Idiatou Camara, National Director for the Environment

Ministry of Public Health and Social Affairs

Minister of Public Health and Social Affairs
Prof. Mandy Kader Kondé, National Director for Health

Ministry of Pre-university Education and Vocational Training

Mme. Aicha Bah, Minister
M. Ali Doukoure, Secretary General
M. B. Souaré, Coordinator, PASE
M. Brandolin, Technical Advisor, PASE
M. Michel Princet, Consultant, CEED National Project (Educational Center on Environment and Development)

Prefecture of Kindia

Secretary General of Administration
M. Sako, Prefecture Director of Rural Development and the Environment
Mme. Diakitè, Chargée d'Affaires for Women, Secretary General of Decentralized Collectives

Prefecture of Sougueta

M. Nouhou Diallo, Community Secretary, CRD
M. Pe Vincent Gamy, Director, Dissa WMU
M. Pe Vincent Maomy, Water and Soil Section, CRD
M. Morlaye Keita, Specialist, Agroforestry Technician, Dissa WMU
M. Abdoulaye Touré, Community Enterprises Section, Dissa WMU

Other

Dr. Bakary Coulibaly, National Directorate for Scientific and Technical Research
Dr. Sekou Cissé, Chief, Division Management of Scientific Information, CERESCOR
Dr. Maxim Haba, Sciences Department, University of Conakry

SECTION II

THE CONSULTANCY: OVERVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS

A. Purpose of the Consultancy

The purpose of the consultancy—which covered the period May 14 through June 11, 1994—was to provide four weeks of technical support to the Government of Guinea and cooperating donor missions (USAID, UNDP, and the World Bank as lead donor) in resolving issues concerning the improvement of the institutional framework for environmental management and in finalizing the relevant chapter (IX) of the National Environmental Action Plan. Central to this process was the preparation of a plan for a workshop on the subject so that representatives of the trans-sectoral and sectoral central government agencies, decentralized government structures, private voluntary organizations, and local communities could have input to the process.

B. Chronological Overview of Trip

I arrived in Conakry on Saturday night, May 14. That evening I met with the chief of the USAID Rural Development Office at the airport as he was preparing to depart Guinea for a month. Monday and Tuesday, May 16 and 17, were devoted to initial meetings with the director and deputy director of USAID/Guinea; the World Bank resident representative and economist, respectively; the UNDP program specialist responsible for NEAP matters; the World Bank national consultant for the NEAP; the acting chief and rural development specialist of the USAID Rural Development Office; and the coordinator of the BCNE.

The discussions confirmed that all parties believed a workshop should be held to discuss and make recommendations on the institutional framework for managing the environment and implementing the NEAP. The dates targeted for the workshop were June 6 to 9.

However, there was a significant divergence of views between the involved donors, on one side, and BCNE, on the other, as to which issues the workshop should address and how preparations for it should proceed. Although the donors agreed that the purpose of the workshop was to address and resolve issues emerging from the analysis and recommendations of the Furst study and draft Chapter IX, the BCNE coordinator felt that these reports merited little, if any, further consideration because many of their recommendations were inconsistent with retention of the existing institutional structure and existing laws and regulations that pertained to them. Instead, the BCNE coordinator wanted the workshop's focus to be on analyzing and recommending improvements to the distribution of responsibilities and mandates (eliminating overlapping responsibilities and gaps in coverage) of the existing agencies, and to their financial, human, and material resource endowments. He had already engaged national consultants to prepare documents addressing these issues with reference to the following intended main themes of the workshop:

- Management and preservation of natural resources (flora, fauna, soil, sub-soil water, and air);
- Sanitation, health, and pollution prevention and control;
- Education, information, research, and data collection;
- Environmental policy (definition, coordination, and monitoring and evaluation); and
- Environmental structures at the territorial (regional) level.

The consultants had been given the Mekouar report as a reference document, but were not given the Furst report or draft Chapter IX. There were also disagreements as to counterpart relationships and methodological questions.

These issues needed to be addressed by the NEAP steering committee. But this was not possible in the near term because some GOG members were absent or unavailable. So, in consultation with the donors, it was decided that, pending such a meeting, the national consultant and I would consult the other environmentally oriented organizations—first at the national directorate level and then at the ministerial-level—to ascertain their interests and desires. We expected a steering committee meeting to occur before we met with the ministers. In total, we had more than 20 meetings and met with seven national directors, two acting national directors, two coordinators, four ministers, two acting ministers, and other representatives of environmentally oriented bodies, and the special advisor to the President of the Republic. However, no steering committee meeting occurred during my four-week consultancy.

The national consultant and I developed a proposed plan for the workshop and drafted working documents to support major subjects and issues to be addressed by the attendees. During this process we checked several times to see if copies of the BCNE consultants' reports were available so that these could be taken into account in our work. We were told that the reports were available in handwritten form only. We offered to work with photocopies of the manuscripts but these never became available.

On Wednesday, May 18, the national consultant and I began our meetings at the national directorate level. These meetings continued on an organization-by-organization basis with the level of meetings rising to the ministerial level by the end of the following week. The input we received enabled us to present verbally at our meeting on May 24 with the secretary general (and acting minister) of MRNEE a proposed plan for the workshop. At the secretary general's request, we delivered a draft plan on the morning of May 26 so that it could be reviewed for submission to the steering committee. A date was set for a review meeting in his office for the following Tuesday, May 31, prior to the draft's submission to the steering committee, which was expected to meet later that week. On May 31, the secretary general requested that revisions be made in the proposed plan and instructed the BCNE to prepare a detailed budget for the workshop. Plans for a steering committee

meeting that week were deferred because the World Bank in Washington requested postponement of the workshop so it could coincide with the delayed arrival in Guinea of the UNSSO-financed generalist consultant and economist to aid in the preparation of the NEAP strategy and action plan. Also the Bank's efforts to recruit international facilitators for the workshop had not proved successful. The suggested new time frame was the first half of July. Subsequent scheduling of the steering committee meeting was delayed because the detailed budget was not forthcoming from BCNE.

Based on the plan for the workshop, the national consultant and I prepared the technical notes for the key issues to be addressed. My time was divided between that and briefings of the wider donor community during the week of May 30-June 3. Work on the technical notes continued during the week of June 6-10, in combination with a detailed briefing of the special advisor to the President of the Republic, and a field trip to Sougueta on June 9-10 to observe the field work in progress under the NRM Project and to appraise environmental management activities and capabilities at the prefectural, sub-prefectural, and CRD levels.

C. Planning the Workshop

C1. The Problems and Parameters

Our consultations revealed that there was strong interest in holding a workshop on the institutional framework for managing the environment. Many of our interlocutors expressed discomfort with the current location of the bodies responsible for trans-sectoral coordination in the MRNEE. The existing institutional framework for coordinating planning and resolution of issues is viewed as not working effectively. Operational coordination is due largely to ad hoc and informal arrangements reached directly between sectoral agencies. Every sectoral agency has problems with other agencies owing to ambiguous and overlapping mandates. This leads to conflicting responsibilities and coordination problems. Finally, a strong and frequently repeated theme was that the workshop should be truly open with no orchestration of the proceedings toward a predetermined outcome and/or approval of a pre-existing document. This sentiment was not directed against either pre-existing document because only a handful of our interlocutors were familiar with the Furst report or draft Chapter IX.

With a draft Chapter IX in hand it would no longer be appropriate to use the Furst report as the principal working document. Given draft Chapter IX's imperfections, the outcome of the workshop needed to be either an improved Chapter IX or sound recommendations for improving it. Although the Furst report is strong in a number of areas where draft Chapter IX needs rethinking, workshop participants could not be depended upon to digest and compare two fairly lengthy documents, even if such an approach would be acceptable.

A complicating factor was that about 25 agencies of the central government have a reasonable claim to representation in the workshop. This doesn't take into account the regional, prefectural, sub-prefectural, local government, NGO, and private sector

organizations that are potentially inevitable. Add to this the fact that special skills or knowledge, often displayed or acquired during previous work on the NEAP, made many individuals highly desirable participants in the workshop even though their invitations would have to be additional to those of the principal officers of their agencies and ministries. The principals' tendency to attend only sporadically made the participation of these "worker bees" all the more essential. Hence, even though the number of invitees could not be firmly decided upon without a detailed budget (and therefore remained undecided during the consultancy), any significant representation of the sub-national, local government, and nongovernmental entities implied as many as 90 potential invitees. The majority of participants, from sectoral or operational agencies, would bring little in-depth understanding of the multiple functions that need to be exercised by trans-sectoral environmental management and policy coordination bodies.

Although there was strong interest in the question of overlapping and conflicting responsibilities, this topic would be highly problematic for the workshop. The Mekouar report, universally acknowledged to be an excellent resource, had become outdated since 1990. Even if it were up to date, resolving the anomalies that it revealed would require months and years of detailed and painstaking work—including dialogue, if not negotiations—among sector agencies and the trans-sectoral environmental bodies. Also, the issues involved are emotionally charged. If not handled adroitly, the topic could lead to acrimony inconsistent with accomplishing the main objective of improving the trans-sectoral institutional framework.

C2. The Proposed Plan

The proposed plan for the workshop, as submitted to the secretary general of MRNEE on May 31, forms Annex B of this report. The proposed workshop spans four days. The first two days would be used for joint reflection and debate on the following topics:

- What constitutes the institutional framework for the environment and what are its overall objectives as a system? (in plenary)
- What should be the respective functions of sectoral/implementing bodies and of trans-sectoral bodies? And how should they relate to and facilitate one another's work? (in working groups followed by plenary)
- How should the environmental functions of trans-sectoral and sectoral bodies be structured? Where should trans-sectoral bodies be located within the government administrative structure? (in working groups followed by plenary)

Each of these sessions will be supported by a technical note distributed to attendees (and the facilitators) before the workshop. These documents, which form annexes C, D, and E of this report, owe a good deal to the Furst report, especially in areas where draft Chapter IX diverges from it.

At the end of the second day, draft Chapter IX (and any other working documents) will be distributed to the attendees as they are briefed on the program for the final two days.

During the third day the attendees will be divided into five working groups to discuss the following topics:

- Consideration of several possible frameworks (schemas in French text) for a system for managing natural resources and the environment in Guinea;
- Relations between the central government framework and those at the prefectural and local levels;
- Relations between the government structures and the private commercial and private voluntary sectors;
- Overlapping responsibilities and resulting coordination problems and the steps required to resolve them; and
- Environmental training and education needs.

The first working group will be charged with developing recommendations for the improvement of draft Chapter IX, based, to the extent possible, on discussions held during the first two days of the workshop. The other four groups will work on topics that are essentially uncovered by either the Furst report or draft Chapter IX. A Technical Note D.2/3 is in preparation for the second topic. The task of working groups 4 and 5 will be to define the measures to be included in the action plan to resolve the problem of overlapping responsibilities and to develop a training program for the strengthening of the environmental management system. The first may take years of patient work on the part of interministerial committees. The second will require surveys and analyses on the part of international and national experts leading to a realistic and affordable plan that makes proper use of national academic and non-academic training capacities as well as international resources.

Managing the workshop will be difficult. For the greatest chance of success, at least two international facilitators should be engaged to assist and coach a team of national facilitators. The World Bank is recruiting the international facilitators. As of June 11, national candidates had been provisionally identified by the national consultant for discussion with the workshop planning group once it became operational.

D. Observations on Decentralized and Local Environmental Management

The following observations are based on a brief visit to Kindia, Sougueta, and the area around Sougueta. The information gathered is incomplete. The picture presented below is therefore impressionistic and offered only to stimulate reflection and discussion—including corrective feedback—from readers who are closest to the facts and the issues.

At the field level in rural areas, environmental management issues revolve heavily around the essentially mixed agricultural and agroforestry-based livelihoods practiced by the overwhelming majority of the population. Therefore, we felt it appropriate to focus our attention on current NRM activities under the USAID-supported element of the FDHIRD program and on the institutional capacities needed to sustain them.

D1. Decentralized Central Government Functions and Staff

D1a. Background

Guinea has four regional governors, 33 prefects, and 334 sub-prefects. The governors, prefects, and sub-prefects are the representatives of the central political and legal authority of the state and have broad responsibilities for civil administration. Although technical staff of various ministries are based at the headquarters of the governors of Guinea's four regions, the lines of responsibility in most environmentally oriented ministries seem to run from the national directorates to the prefectural and sub-prefectural levels.

At the prefectural level, technical staff are grouped into four directorates: Rural Development and the Environment (DPDRE); Urbanism, Housing, Transportation and Public Works (DPUHTTP); Health and Social Affairs (DPSAS); and Youth, Culture, Arts and Sports (DPJCAS). Although each of these directorates has actual or potential environmental protection functions, DPDRE has the broadest spectrum of functions. It has staff responsible for agricultural extension (*promotion agricole*), animal husbandry (*promotion des ressources animales*), agricultural engineering (*genie rurale*), forestry protection (*protection forestiere*), and agricultural processing (*conditionnement*). Provisions exist at the sub-prefectural level for the assignment of staff responsible for education, rural development, health, and financial management. Many intended positions at the sub-prefectural level have apparently not been filled.

In the Fouta Djallon highlands, the government is carrying out the Integrated Rural Development Project (FDHIRD) with assistance from several donors, including USAID under the Guinea NRM Project. Watershed management units (WMUs) exist in the three USAID-assisted watersheds. These WMUs consist of well-equipped technical teams financed in large part by the project. We visited the WMU team for Dissa at its Sougueta headquarters. No one I asked could tell me what role the WMU teams would be given beyond the life of the current project—that is, the second or pilot phase of FDHIRD—when the methods currently under development should be implemented across the board under a third phase of FDHIRD. I have tended to assume that their functions would most likely be eventually integrated into the responsibilities of the decentralized technical staffs at the prefectural and sub-prefectural levels working in collaboration with the CRDs.

D1b. Observations

Kindia Prefecture technical staff suffer from an extreme lack of operating funds, logistics, and program funding. They have little or no means for applying their knowledge and skills at the rural community level. DPRDRE staff had no knowledge of activities

carried out by the Dissa BRP team of the PGRN. As long as this situation continues there can be no broad-scale implementation of NRM measures being developed with donor assistance in the Fouta Djallon watersheds.

Changing the current situation will not be a simple task. The current penury of means has been the case for a long time. As a result, the affected individuals tend to consider it their only problem. In their view, if they only had adequate resources they would be ready to carry out rural development and NRM programs as and where needed. It is difficult to share this confidence because there is no evidence for it.

Thus in Kindia Prefecture there are two barriers—one material and another attitudinal—that currently inhibit the development of a mutually beneficial relationship between DPDRE staff and the WMU team.

D2. Local Government

D2a. Background

Urban areas. Each prefecture has only one urban commune. In urban areas the nomenclature is different than for the rural areas described below. However, institutional issues that arise in ensuring that environmental management concerns are integrated into urban development programs are similar except that urban areas are also prefectural centers and, hence, have direct access to decentralized technical staff. They also require a different mix of technical support, and they may have better access to ministerial-level staff located in Conakry. It would not be surprising if they also have more revenue from local taxation.

Rural areas. The government has adopted and put in place a structure consisting of CRDs, community councils (*conseils communautaires*) for each CRD, and district councils (*conseils de district*). It is intended that eventually each sub-prefecture will have a CRD; the number currently in existence is reported to be more than 300.

District councils are elected by all adults. Each district council elects two of its members as its representatives on the community council. The community council elects from its membership the president and vice president of the CRD. In addition to the elected officials, each CRD has a community secretary (*secrétaire de commune*) who is assigned by the government from the territorial administration officer corps. The secretary is responsible for CRD administration, including the preparation of an annual plan and the implementation of CRD programs. CRDs are entitled to levy certain fees and taxes. A portion of these revenues go to the treasury and the remainder are for the use of the CDR. The accounting officer of the sub-prefecture—or, if there is a vacancy, the assistant sub-prefect—serves as treasurer of the CRD.

D2b. Observations

D2b(1). The Rural Development Communities

The CRD concept is promising and should be built upon. However, making CRDs function as they should will take time and a lot of training, as well as refinement of the relevant legislation, policies, and procedures. The overwhelming majority of the 300 CRDs were put in place during the last two years. This implies that many people are exercising new roles and responsibilities. The community secretary with whom we met, an impressive young officer seconded from the territorial administration service, had attended a seminar concerning his new responsibilities, but we learned of no training or other preparation having been provided to the elected members of the CRDs or the other representative bodies of local government. Training in these new roles was ranked by prefectural technical staff second only to the lack of operating funds and logistical capacity as a constraint inhibiting effective rural development and environmental management.

The following will help to illustrate the importance of sustained attention and assistance to the full realization of the CRDs' potential. We were told there are areas in which the powers, rights, and responsibilities of CRDs have yet to be spelled out. Presently, there seems to be provision for CRDs to retain only one professional staff member—the community secretary. Whether this will prove sufficient for the conduct of any appreciable development activities is doubtful. We were told that clan elders play an important role in making local decisions of any importance. Apparently this transpires at the level of mosque councils. Moreover, elections to the district councils of the Kindia Prefecture involve having the supporters of each candidate line up behind him. We had insufficient time to probe the practical significance of this, but it is possible that at this stage the CRDs constitute a new institutional setting for clan-elder decision making, and currently the CRDs' real scope for decision making is quite circumscribed.

D2b(2). Efforts to Curb Charcoal Production; the Importance of Community Forests; the Land Tenure Constraint

Discussions with the community secretary and the WMU team in Sougueta revealed that accelerating abandonment of agriculture in favor of charcoal production is a major worry. The income earned from charcoal making is much higher than the income from agriculture. In a bold step aimed at curbing this trend, the CRD has ceased to collect taxes from and thereby sanction many charcoal kilns. It has also called in the *gendarmérie* to close down illicit kilns and arrest the operators.

The need to bring charcoal making under a sustainable management system is strongly felt not only by the CRD but also by the members of the Dissa BRP team. A method of doing this would be to establish community woodlots that would be managed on a long-term sustainable basis for the production of firewood and charcoal for the community, and possibly for sale outside the community. Given the returns involved, this could be a promising source of revenue for CRD development needs. Unfortunately, this course has been blocked by the lack of a legal-administrative framework governing ownership and title to rural land. Moreover, the problems may go beyond the simple lack of the relevant statutes and regulations.

The lack of precedent for land changing hands through market transactions makes negotiating the transfer of family- and clan-held lands to the community a daunting task. The traditional formulas for transferring usufruct rights to land involve tokens of respect and, perhaps, fealty (for example, gifts such as kola nuts) which bear no relation to the potential value of wooded land for such uses as charcoal production. Meanwhile, with no precedent-setting market-based transactions, little basis exists for establishing reasonable compensation. The development and promulgation of sound procedures for the application of the new rural property ownership legislation are important and urgent. Our interlocutors often referred to this as an important need in various development contexts.

D2b(3). Natural Resource Management Interventions

We observed several activities launched by the NRM Project by the Dissa BRP team with technical support from the Chemonics' team based in Labe. Results of project activities include:

- Two nurseries
- Two Kenyan beehives,
- Two capped springs (*sources captées*)
- Reforestation around one of the improved water sources
- A carpenter shop producing Kenyan beehives
- An artisan making improved woodstoves (*foyers améliorés*).

We were told that these interventions had been planned and carried out with local community participation.

We observed the president of the management committee for one of the water sources carrying out her duties. Only the capped springs and the tree planting around one of them seemed to be community based. The nurseries, the beehives, and the improved stoves seem to be more a matter of direct management by the WMU team or working with interested artisan/entrepreneurs. We learned that there is suspicion at the village level toward project activities. Villagers find it hard to credit that the interventions are really for their benefit rather than serving some other agenda that may or may not be in their interest. In this context, spring capping and other water supply interventions are highly sought after activities and leads naturally to other interventions, especially tree planting as a means of stabilizing the soil above springs.

Presently, there seems to be little routine communication between the WMU team and the CRD about project activities. However, we were told of one case where the BRP team consulted the CRD about a problem that had arisen with an activity and that the CRD had acted promptly to remedy it. Improved communications between the Dissa WMU technical team and the Sougueta CRD are needed.

D2b(4). Toward a Sustainable Institutional Framework for NRM in Rural Areas

Conceptually the elements of an institutional framework for NRM in rural areas may now be in place. CRDs have the potential to be responsible for translating village-level needs into plans for interventions in NRM and other fields. CRDs will often need support from decentralized technical staff at the prefectural or sub-prefectural levels (possibly including WMU teams) for their implementation. In addition, with guidance and assistance from the environmental officer at the prefectural level, the CRDs and sub-prefectural technical staff can make suitable arrangements for environmental monitoring and information flows. The exercise of this latter function could, in keeping with plans now in progress to incorporate environmental protection into school curriculums, involve the sub-prefectural education officer and the schools, the rural development officer, and members of the CRD-related structures.

But broad-scale implementation or replication of NRM activities throughout rural Guinea will not be possible in the near future for a variety of reasons. The interventions now in progress under the FDHIRD project need to be completed and evaluated to determine their utility. Presently, the donor-financed WMU teams are the only Guinean technical staff operational in the field. Their effort will have to be shared either by additional WMU teams or with technical staff at the prefectural and sub-prefectural levels—many of whom are not even in place, let alone operational. The staff responsible for replication will need to be indoctrinated and trained in the NRM interventions recommended for broad-scale implementation. This will involve preparation of field manuals. Just as importantly, budgetary allocations will be required to make them operational. Similarly, CRD members, community secretaries, and members of the community and district councils will probably need indoctrination and selected individuals will need training. Manuals may be needed for this training also. Legislation and regulations governing application may be needed as a foundation for the manuals and training developed for government technical staff and the members of the CRD-related structures.

Before any of this can begin, the GOG must consider the broad options available and select a realistic institutional model for NRM-focused development in rural areas.

Phasing this effort properly is crucial because of the need to avoid indoctrinating and training prematurely, increasing operational budgets before a significant pay-off can be expected, or raising unrealistic expectations among the interested parties. It is not too soon, however, to start framing the broad options and testing their realism in human resources and financial terms. Once a model emerges, and especially if it is tested, it would almost certainly have sustainability-enhancing implications for NRM activities currently being carried out under the FDHIRD Project. When analysis has proceeded far enough, this is a subject that should figure in the policy dialogue between the FDHIRD donors and the GOG concerning the sustainability of NRM efforts after completion of current projects.

SECTION III RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Recommended Improvements to Draft Chapter IX

Improvements to draft Chapter IX of the NEAP will be formulated according to the recommendations of the workshop carried out in accordance with the draft plan for the workshop (see Annex B of this report). However, recommended changes to Chapter IX are presented below:

1. Remove the outline of the entire Mekouar report, and replace it with a brief appreciation of its significance and contribution.
2. Spell out the specific functions that each component of the proposed trans-sectoral environmental management agency will exercise.
3. Clarify whether the environmental management system will be oriented mainly toward protecting the environment and conserving natural resources or toward planning and cooperating in the implementation of environmentally sound use of the country's natural resources. Choose the names for the trans-sectoral policy coordination and management bodies accordingly, keeping the names used in draft Chapter IX only if use is primary. Similarly, clarify the priority given to the creation and enforcement of an appropriate body of laws, regulations, and standards through formal, documented, and transparent processes.
4. Define a process of reflection and dialogue on the environmental management and NRM structures to be put in place in rural areas, taking full account of budgetary, technical, and human resource constraints.
5. Define the steps and technical resources needed to prepare a plan for strengthening the environmental management system through human resources development.
6. Define a process for updating the Mekouar report and resolving the conflicts and filling in the gaps it describes in the mandates of the various elements of the environmental management system.
7. Define a procedure for managing the public's interest in private sector commercial and voluntary activities that impact on the environment.

B. Workshop Preparations

Further preparations for the Workshop on the Institutional Framework for the Environment are needed in the following areas:

1. Approximately five national facilitators should be hired in time to receive pre-workshop training.
2. At least two international facilitators should be recruited by the World Bank to arrive in time to work with and train the national facilitators prior to the workshop.
3. The members of the Session D.1 working group should be selected in time to allow them to fully immerse themselves in the relevant technical notes and consulting reports that have been written to date. (Without this, they will not be able to properly deal with the ideas and issues that come out of the first two days of the workshop.)
4. Technical notes should be developed for the sessions on human resource development, relations with the private sector, and the problems of overlapping and conflicting mandates. The technical note on relations with the prefectural and local government levels is in preparation and should be completed by the national consultant upon the receipt of my comments.

C. Rural-Level Environmental and Natural Resources Management Capability

Development of environmental and natural resource management capability at the rural levels will take years, but the development should begin on a carefully phased basis as follows:

1. The government and donors should begin to consider the potential roles in sustaining NRM-oriented development of prefectural and sub-prefectural technical staff of the WMU teams and the CRDs. The technical, budgetary, and human resource constraints should be carefully analyzed. This should lead to the formulation of one or more realistic models.
2. The implications of the resulting model NRM structure(s) should be appraised as to their implications for the multi-donor NRM efforts now under way within the framework of the FDHIRD Project. The results of the appraisal should be fed into the project's NRM implementation process.
3. Considering the leadtimes required to breath life into now dormant structures on one hand and to generate a body of NRM technology suitable for replication on the other, a phased plan should be developed for putting the model NRM structure in place. This could eventually involve undertaking

pilot applications either of alternative models or of a sole model—perhaps under a variety of conditions.

4. When an analysis of the issues has proceeded far enough, the subject should be addressed in the policy dialogue between the FDHIRD donors and the GOG.

D. Community Woodlot Development

The reluctance of the USAID-funded Guinea NRM project to pursue community woodlot development is understandable under the current circumstances. Removing constraints—such as the inadequate legal-administrative framework governing land tenure—to bringing wooded land under sustainable management for fuel production purposes deserves high priority. In addition, fostering a few pilot community and private commercial forest development interventions might bring to light unanticipated constraints and speed their removal.

ANNEX A

PROPOSED PLAN FOR TECHNICAL WORKSHOP

22

Republic of Guinea

National Action Plan for the Environment

**TECHNICAL WORKSHOP
ON
INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK
FOR
MANAGEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT**

Conakry, June 6, 7, 8 and 9, 1994

PROGRAM

**Technical Workshop on Institutional and Legal Framework for
Management of the Environment**

A. Objectives and Practical Organization of the Workshop

A1. Objectives

The workshop takes place within the preparation of the National Action Plan for the Environment (NAPE) that intends to undertake a series of actions through different programs, and whose common goal is the improvement of the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources.

One of the seven programs of the NAPE deals with the institutional and legal undertakings that constitute an important fulcrum for managing the environment.

The workshop groups the staff from several technical departments and private sector to discuss the key problems of the institutional component that the NAPE must prioritize over the short-term (5 years), mid-term (10 years), and long-term (25 years).

The workshop's actions will be the base for the amelioration of Chapter IX of the White Book and the preparation of an action plan for the institutional and legal component of NAPE.

A2. Practical Organization

A2a. Dates and Location

The workshop will take place in Conakry on June 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1994 at the People's Palace (The October 2 Room). This location was chosen as it was the most appropriate place for the varied groups in need of separate work spaces.

A2b. Recommendations for the Operation of the Workshop

To achieve its objectives, the consultants adopted an open and participating format for the groups' dynamics, including both genders.

In the framework of the workshop, this was the unanimous wish from the people of the National Consultant and the International Consultant. The interested parties clearly stated that there was no point in participating in this workshop unless it was open and not predetermined with preconceived ideas in pre-established documents.

Thus, the workshop will not accept any academism requiring the participants to listen to the readings of preselected intermediates and to give an opinion on the contents of those

texts. Contributions in this vein, if they occur, will be distributed as texts giving the point of view of the authors. They will not be the object of any particular discussion, but could eventually help in the formulation of certain recommendations.

The work sessions will be reinforced by technical notes from a very practical approach of the problems. These notes will only be an aide-mémoire to allow the participants to start from a given point, in view of discussing and making recommendations. They are completely free to give their point of view to the workshop. The latter one will receive and appreciate all the proposed actions to be undertaken within the framework of the workshop's objectives.

A facilitator will lead each session and will have a recorder of minutes who will present a written document condensing the main ideas expressed during the session (either of the group or the plenary).

During the first two days the participants will be encouraged to reflect and debate in sessions of groups or plenary.

When it comes to questions related to overlapping of responsibilities and other identifiable but insolvable problems within the limits of the workshop, the problems will be tackled with caution. It will be clearly explained to the participants that the workshop's objectives are not to resolve this kind of problems, but to analyze them and to give recommendations on what actions to undertake to resolve them in the future.

A2c. Workshop's Program

DAY ONE

09:00-10:00: OPENING SESSION

- Workshop introduction by the Organization Committee
- Speech by the President of the Steering Committee of NAPE
- Speech by the local representative of the World Bank
- Speech by the local representative of the PNUD
- Speech by the USAID director in Guinea

10:00-10:15: Coffee break and leave of the officials

10:15-10:30: Presentation and adoption of the workshop's program

10:30-10:45: Organization, administrative and logistical facilities

10:45-12:15: SESSION A (plenary): What is the institutional and legal framework of the management of the environment, and what are its objectives overall as a system?

12:15-13:15: Lunch (sandwiches and juice)

13:15-15:00: SESSION B.1. (Groups): What should be the respective functions of the sectorial/executive organisms and of the trans-sectorial organisms? How should these organisms be related to one another to facilitate reciprocation of each one's work?

15:00-15:15: Coffee break

15:15-15:30: Introduction of the second day's program

15:30-16:30: Meeting of the Organization Committee

DAY TWO

08:30-10:30: SESSION B.2. (plenary): Report from the Session B.1. groups

10:30-10:45: Coffee break

10:45-12:15: SESSION C.1. (groups): How should be structured the environmental functions of the trans-sectorial and sectorial organisms? Where should the trans-sectorial organisms be placed in the administrative structure of the government?

12:15-13:15: Lunch

13:15-15:00: SESSION C.2. (plenary): Report from the Session C.1 groups

15:00-15:15: Coffee break

15:15-15:30: Introduction of the third day's program

15:30-16:30: Meeting of the Organization Committee

DAY THREE

08:30-10:15: SESSION D (groups)

SESSION D1. Consideration of several possible plans for a management system of natural resources and of the environment in Guinea.

SESSION D2. Connections between the central government structure and the prefectural and local structures.

SESSION D3. Connections between the central government structures and the structures of private profitable sectors and of volunteer private non-profitable sectors.

SESSION D4. Overlapping of responsibilities and coordination problems that ensue. Competency conflicts and attributions, and necessary measures to solve them.

SESSION D5. Reinforcing institutional capacities: training in environmental management.

10:15-10:30: Coffee break

10:30-11:30: SESSION D: Continuation

11:30-13:00: SESSION E.1 (plenary): Reports from the D.2. and D.3. groups and discussions

13:00-14:00: Lunch

14:00-15:30: Session E.2. (plenary): Reports from the D.4 and D.5 groups and discussions

15:30-15:45: Coffee break

15:45-16:30: SESSION E3. Work of the recorders. Distribution to the participants of the evaluation sheets of the workshop.

16:30-17:30: Meeting of the Organization Committee

DAY FOUR

08:30-09:30: SESSION F (plenary): Presentation of the draft report of Group D.1.

09:30-10:30: Last suggestions. Gathering the evaluation forms of the workshop.

10:30-10:45: Coffee break

10:45-12:15: Meeting of all the recorders

12:15-13:15: Lunch

14:00-15:00: SESSION F (plenary): Presentation and amendment of the recommendations of the workshop

15:00-16:00: Closing ceremony

- Reading of the recommendations
- Speech of the local representative of the World Bank
- Speech of the representative of PNUD
- Speech of the USAID director in Guinea
- Speech of the president of the PNAE steering committee

16:00-17:00: Final meeting of the Organization Committee.

A2d. Administrative and Technical Coordination

The coordination of the preparation and development of the workshop is the responsibility of a **DIRECTORY** including:

- The coordinator of the Bureau of the National Council of the Environment
- The national consultant
- The international consultant

The Directory is responsible for the administration and the technical coordination of the workshop. To this end, it must:

- Analyze all the organizational aspects of the workshop and take all necessary dispositions to make it work smoothly.
- Prepare the basic document of the workshop that will be distributed to the participants and focusing on the objectives, the contents and the expected results of the workshop.
- Conceive and produce the technical introductory minutes for the different sessions of the workshop.
- Ensure the follow-up of the unfolding of the work.
- Coordinate the preparation and presentation of the reports of the working groups and draft the synthesis-report of the workshop.

The Directory is assisted by an accountant and by four commissions:

- i. Logistical commission.
- ii. Official protocol commission.
- iii. Welcoming commission of the participants.
- iv. Clerical/media/publicity commission.

The accountant is responsible for:

- For the correct execution of the budget of the workshop, in accordance with the directives of the Directory.
- The payment of all expenses incurred within the framework of the workshop.
- Of a written report on the carrying out of expenses.

The **Logistical Commission** is responsible for:

- renting of rooms;
- acquiring secretarial services (equipment and personnel);
- purchase and management of supplies;
- transportation of participants;
- Coffee breaks and lunches (through the services of a caterer).

The **Official Protocol Commission** is responsible for:

- To manage the list of officials invited to the opening and closing sessions.
- To prepare and mail the invitation letters to the officials and to attach also a copy of the workshop program.
- To prepare the opening and closing speeches of the workshop.
- To welcome and settle the officials.

The **Welcoming Commission** is responsible for:

- Managing the list of participants of the ministerial departments and of the private sector, including the ONG, and the list of the participants from the inside of the country.
- To prepare the invitation letters for the participants and its mailing along with a program.
- To welcome and register the participants.

The Clerical/Media/Publicity Commission is responsible for:

- To obtain, reproduce and distribute to the participants the working documents of the workshop.
- To prepare a press dossier and to distribute it to the interested reporters.
- To coordinate the participants' interviews with the press.
- To fabricate the banners for the workshop.
- To undertake the necessary steps for the coverage of the event by the press, radio, and television.

ANNEX 1

List of Necessary Equipment and Supplies for the Workshop

1. Equipment

The equipment cited below is necessary to the smooth running of the workshop. It could be rented from a small, local, private enterprise. This rental will be sanctioned by a service contract. Included in the contract, will be the rental cost for the equipment, the services of a resource person from the enterprise who will be responsible for the transportation, handling and ensuring that the rented equipment is functioning.

List of the equipment:

- 2 micro-computers (with Wordperfect)
- 1 laser printer (with a cable)
- 2 stabilizers
- 1 extension cord (with a multi-plug)
- 1 photocopying machine
- 1 retroprojector and its accessories
- 3 whiteboards
- 6 large paper clips
- 3 small fasteners
- 1 large fastener
- 4 bulletin boards (with tripods)

2. Supplies

- **Large rolls of paper.** For writing purpose during the different work sessions (groups and plenary). They are used on the whiteboards with the large paper clips.
- **Paper A3:** Reproduction of sketches and diagrams that will be on the bulletin boards as aide-mémoires for the work sessions.
- **Paper A4:** For printing work documents prepared by the clerical office.
- **Transparencies:** By retro-projection for exhibits.
- **Various:** Dry erase markers, thumbtacks, glue, scotch tape.
- **Participants' supplies:** Expanding file folders with flap, legal size pads, ballpoints.

ANNEX 2

PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS LIST

The workshop will have 90 statutory participants of which 60 representatives of the State central departments and of the territorial administration of the country's interior, including the CRDs, and 30 representatives of the private sector, including ONGs nationals.

The international ONGs in Guinea, the aid and cooperation agencies, and the businesses of large development projects as well as the press have been invited.

1. Planning and Finances Ministry

National Director of Planning and Economy

National Director of Statistics

Mr. Djéry Keita

Mr. Ghoudoussy Baldé

Mr. Hady Barry

Mr. Yaya Diallo

2. Agriculture and Animal Resources Ministry

National Director of a.i. Forestry and Game Hunting

National Director of Animal Husbandry

Director a.i. of B.C.P.A.

Mr. Mohamed Lankan Traoré

Mr. Foumba Kourouma

Mr. Ahmed Tidiane Baldé

3. Land Development Ministry

National Director of Land Development

Topography and Mapping Institute Director

National Director of Financial Development

Mrs. Nènè Mariama Baldé

Mr. Jean Tolno

Mr. Hassimiou Fofana

4. Ministry of Health and Social Affairs

National Director of Public Health

National Director of Care Services

5. Interior and Security Ministry

National Director of Decentralization

Chief of Study and Projects
Mr. Mory Magassouba

6. Pre-university Teaching and Professional Formation Ministry

National Director of Pedagogy Institute
Mr. Lamine Barry (I.P.N.)

7. Natural Resources, Energy and Environment Ministry

National Director of the Environment
National Deputy Director of the Environment
National Director of Hydraulic
National Director of Geology
National Director of Energy Sources
National Director of Mining

8. Higher Education and Scientific Research Ministry

National Director of Scientific Research

9. Administrative Reform, Public Function and Labor Ministry

National Director of Administrative Reform
National Director of Public Function

10. Commerce, Transportation and Tourism Ministry

National Director of Tourism and Hotels
National Director of Merchant Marine

11. Industry, Small- and Mid-enterprises Ministry

National Director of Industry

12. Justice Ministry

13. Foreign Affairs and Cooperation Ministry

National Director of International Cooperation

14. Youth, Arts, Culture and Sports Ministry

National Director of Culture

15. State Secretariat for Social Affairs, Women Advancement and Childhood

National Director of the Advancement for Women

16. Communication Ministry

National Director of Information Services

17. Government Secretariat General

18. Conakry Governorate (1 participant)

19. Maritime Guinea Governorate (6 participants)

Prefectoral Director of Boké Habitat

Chief of the Department of Environment, DPDRE of Fria

Chief of the Department for Forestry and Game Hunting, DPDRE of Coyah

Forécariah Chief of the Department of Mines and Quarry

A Representative of the Prefecture of Dubréka

President of the CRD of Bangouya (Kindia)

20. Mid-Guinea Governorate (4 participants)

A representative of the Urban Commune of Mamou

Director Prefectoral of the Dalaba Prefectorat

Labé Regional Director of Hydraulic

President of CRD for Timbi-Madina (Pita)

21. High-Guinea Governorate (8 participants)

A Representative of the Governor

A Representative of the Urban Commune of Kankan

A Representative of the Kouroussa Prefecture

Mandiana Prefectoral Director of Health

A weatherman from Kankan

Chief of the Environmental Department, DPDRE of Faranah

Siguiré Chief of the Department of Forestry and Game Hunting

Chief of Department for Mines and Quarry, Kérouané

22. Guinea Forestry Governorate (7 participants)

A Representative of the Governor

A Nzerekoré representative of the Urban Commune

The Director of the Yomou Prefectorat

A chief weatherman of Kankan

The Department Chief of the Environment, DPDRE of Gueckédou

The Macenta Department Chief for Forestry and Game Hunting
The president of the CRD of Fouala (Beyla)

23. University of Conakry

The Vice-Rector
The Director for the Center of Environmental Studies and Research
Mr. Alhassane Sow, sociologist

24. Non-governmental Organizations

CENAFOD
OVODEG
EUPD
VGE
ASSOANE
AGFC
CECI
AFVP
GVC-Bologne
Fondation Frederik Ebert

25. Commercial or Industrial Organizations and Societies

Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Salguidia
Friguia
Elf Guinée
Ciment de Guinée
Sogecac
Adramé Construction
SBK
CBG
Port Autonome de Conakry

26. Large Development Projects

Bassins Versants Haut Niger et Haute Gambie
Gestion de l'Espace Rural et des Forêts
Progerfor
Soguipah
PGRN (Usaid)

27. International Cooperation Agencies

PNUD, FNUAP, ONUDI, World Bank, Union Européenne, FAO, OMS, UNICEF, CFD, USAID, ACDI, GTZ.

ANNEX 3

Provisional List of Facilitators and Recordors

1. Alhassane SOW	University of Conakry
2. Ibrahima Boiro	CERE/University of Conakry
3. Mohamed Keita	BCNE
4. Aliou K. Diallo	P.D.I. Fouta Djallon
5. Néné Mariama Baldé	D.N.A.T.U.
6. Salémoussa Soumah	Foundation F. Ebert
7. Djiba Kané	D.N. Environment
8. Mohamed L. Traoré	D.N. Forestry and Game
9. Néné Ousmane Sow	Cabinet MRNEE
10. Aminatou Bah	University of Conakry
11. M. Lamine Doumbouya	D.N. Environment
12. Thierno Oumar Diallo	D.N. Forestry and Game
13. Mamadouba Sylla	D.N. Environment
14. Hassimiou Fofana	I.T.C./MAT
15. Mory Magassouba	D.N. Decentralization
16. Lansana Fofana	D.N. Hydraulics
17. Ahmed Tidiane Baldé	D.N. Husbandry
18. Amadou Oury Diallo	B.C.P.A./MARA
19. Foumba Kourouma	B.C.P.A./MARA
20. Bambo Fofana	I.T.C./MAT
21. M.Yaya Diallo	M.P.F.
22. Ghoudoussy Baldé	M.P.F.
23. M. Billo Diallo	M.I.P.M.E.
24. Seydou Dioubaté	D.N. Culture

ANNEX B

TECHNICAL NOTE—SESSION A

ANNEX B
TECHNICAL NOTE—SESSION A

1. What is the institutional framework for the environment?

1.1 Discussion

There are two ways to look at the institutional framework for managing the environment. Both are correct. The inclusive one is based on the fact that the linkages involved in managing the environment (that is protecting the environment and conserving natural resources) can be as extensive as the interrelationships that characterize the environment itself. The exclusive definition recognizes that we must take into account that, of all the development activity at a given point in time—even in the more environmentally sensitive sectors of the economy—only a part consists of environmental protection and natural resource conservation, thus falling within the scope of the institutional framework for managing the environment.

1.1.1. Inclusive Definition

It must be noted that the term “environment” has a broad meaning here. It includes life and the resources on which it depends, as well as the interactions among various components. Obviously, it includes the rural world directly dependent on natural resources, but it also includes the urban world, especially since more and more a greater proportion of the population resides there. In light of this, the environment itself is not reduced to one sector, as for example, education, health, agriculture, animal husbandry, forestry, pollution control, or water purification. Rather, environment can involve any sector of life as soon as that sector has a direct or indirect impact on natural resources such as air, water, soil or biodiversity. Thus, rather than a sector alone, the environment is a trans-sectoral issue.

Environmental problems are also generally complex, often involving several sectors, as noted above. Soil degradation in one region can be the result of itinerant agriculture, over-intensive farming, or indiscriminate cutting down of trees. In addition, the interaction among sectors is as important, if not more, than each group's dynamism. For example, fiscal and land regulations affect the management of forestry resources; similarly, urbanization results in greater demand for drinking water that eventually dries out the underground aquifer. Activities in one sector can have an environmental impact on other sectors and can aggravate macro-level environmental problems instead of correcting them. Thus, the parcelling of the lower lands for irrigated agriculture resolves a production problem but creates new problems for the management of land or for regulating surface water. Each environmental problem is in fact only a particular perspective of the same system whose components are all interrelated. Environmental issues more often than not are

of a systemic order, which is why concepts of ecosystems and ecology are essential to effective environmental management.

Proper management of the environment must be based on a better understanding of environmental processes in order to avoid constraints such as the depletion or degradation of resources, and the subsequent effects on economic, social, and cultural development. In other words, environmental management is a prerequisite to ensuring the durability of the development process.

Taking into account the trans-sectoral nature of environmental problems, the issues and processes encompassed by environmental management are very numerous, and thus it is not realistic to expect a comprehensive, rigorous control system—one that would in fact be contrary to the openness of the political system. The goal is instead to institutionalize a system that quantifies and effectively manages the impacts on the environment of all government and private sector decisions and actions taken by ministerial departments, regional or prefecture sub-departments, local authorities (e.g., districts and rural communities), and civilian entities (e.g., associations, groups, and private enterprises).

1.1.2. Exclusive Definition

Governments have many responsibilities. Therefore, they have multiple objectives and functions. Among the most widely recognized of each government's responsibilities is the rational pursuit of economic and social development of the country's natural and human resources. Another objective, and one that people all over the world are increasingly concerned about, is the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources.

In the process of governing, governments formulate policies, make decisions and take actions that necessarily involve balancing and blending their various objectives and functions. In pursuing rational economic development, major decisions are based on technical, economic, social, and—increasingly in recent years—environmental considerations. By the same token, agencies responsible for implementing government programs seldom have the luxury of being concerned only with the technical, economic, social, or environmental protection aspects of these programs.

Of the many government agencies and individual public servants involved in environmental protection, only a relative few of them are able to dedicate their efforts to that exclusively. Moreover, most practical work of environmental protection and natural resource protection is accomplished in the field by those who have other responsibilities as well.

1.2. Proposals

- **It will lend clarity to our reflections in this workshop if we define the legal and institutional framework for the environment as encompassing only those functions—varied, complex, and extensive, both vertically and horizontally**

though they must be—which are being exercised to manage the environment. This recognizes the multiplicity of bodies and individuals involved but recognizes also that they and their work address other needs and are part of other institutional frameworks as well. Thus, when we talk about the environmental institutional framework we won't be referring to—or attempting to encompass—that portion of many bodies' programs that is directed toward general or sectoral development, environmentally sound though it may be.

- **It will help us further if we adopt the same nomenclature for various classes of government bodies engaged in environmental protection and natural resource protection:**
 - At the central government level, **sectoral** bodies are those responsible for vertical elements environmental functions such as those related to forests and wildlife, livestock, and water resources. These are also **implementing** bodies. To link these elements into a coherent framework, **trans-sectoral** bodies are required for **horizontal** coordination and management of the multiple flows of communication and data that are entailed in the policy, planning, and decision making processes as well as in the monitoring of developments in the field.
 - For the sake of efficiency and variety's sake, we will also refer to the institutional framework for the environment protection and natural resource conservation as the **environmental management system** or simply the **environmental system** or the system or the framework.

2. **What are the objectives of the environmental institutional framework?**

2.1. **Discussion**

The following are some objectives pursued and responsibilities fulfilled by environmental management systems around the world.

- Monitor the environment and the natural resource base as they evolve under the impact of human habitation and economic activity.
- Identify and analyze potential threats to the environment in order to determine their severity.
- Formulate measures to manage potential environmental threats for the near, medium, and long terms.
- Ensure that the public and all levels and branches of government are aware of important environmental protection and natural resource conservation issues.

- Formulate policies for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources.
- Ensure that environmental policies are converted, as appropriate, into legislation, regulations, procedures, and programs for implementation.
- Ensure that all environmental management policies, legislation, regulations, and procedures are applied and implemented.

2.2. Issue

- Are these appropriate for Guinea?

ANNEX C

TECHNICAL NOTE B

ANNEX C
TECHNICAL NOTE B

1. What should the respective functions of sectoral/implementing bodies and trans-sectoral bodies be?

1.1. Discussion

Here we need to enumerate the functions entailed in addressing the objectives that we identified in the preceding session and, in doing so, determine which are the responsibilities of the sectoral bodies and which fall to the trans-sectoral bodies. A list of functions that are generally exercised by environmental institutional frameworks in other countries is set forth below. This list should be reviewed for its applicability to Guinea's special needs and circumstances. Then for those functions retained plus any new ones that may be added, it will be instructive to annotate each function with the symbol "s" or "t," according to whether it is a sectoral or trans-sectoral function. Some will be seen to require action at both the sectoral and the trans-sectoral levels. For these, it will be useful to consider which elements of a function belong at the sectoral and trans-sectoral levels.

1.2. Functions Proposed for Consideration

- Collecting information on the evolution of the environment and direct field-level monitoring.
- Analyzing available data to identify threats to the environment and assess their severity and implications.
- Producing or procuring well-executed environmental impact assessments (EIAs), environmental impact statements (EISs) and environmental audits (EAs) on all government, donor, and private sector programs and projects potentially affecting the environment.
- Developing and introducing new methods of assessing and measuring the environmental implications, particularly the environmental costs of resource uses; for example, efforts are under way to make practical the use of resource accounting systems based on methods of valuing natural resource depletion.
- Making sure that all branches and levels of government take environmental and conservation issues into account in planning and implementing their programs.
- Providing guidelines for EIAs, EISs and EAs.

- Reviewing and approving EIAs, EIS, and EAs.
- Reviewing the public investment program for its environmental implications and to ensure that environmental concerns are integrated into economic and social planning.
- Collaborating with sectoral development programs for their environmental implications and to ensure that environmental concerns are integrated into them.
- Maintaining liaison with the research community to secure coordination of research on environmental protection and natural resource conservation matters.
- Planning environmental projects and programs.
- Helping local governments, communities and NGOs in environmental planning and management.
- Informing and educating the public about threats to the environment and measures that they can take to protect it and conserve the natural resource base.
- Communicating important environmental issues to other levels and branches of government.
- Monitoring and enforcing (and aiding enforcement of) compliance with environmental legislation, standards and regulations by government bodies, local communities, and the private sector.
- Conducting public hearings on environmental issues, including environmental impact assessments and environmental audits.
- Formulating and recommending environmental legislation, regulations, and standards.
- Reviewing legislation, regulations, and standards pertaining to broader economic and social development matters for environmental content and implications.
- Monitoring compliance with international treaties and agreements.
- Providing advice on new regional or international agreements on environmental issues.
- Negotiating international environmental treaties and conventions.
- Promoting and coordinating environmental public awareness and mass education programs, including the use of the informal and formal education systems.

- Do so at the national level.
- Do so at the community, NGO, and private commercial levels.
- In collaboration with other responsible authorities, develop academic and non-academic as well as residential, in-service, and on-the-job manpower training programs on the technical and managerial aspects of environmental protection and natural resource conservation.
- Do so at the national level with university, professional, technical, and secondary educational authorities.
- Do so with the community, NGO, and private commercial levels.

2. How should sectoral and trans-sectoral bodies relate to and facilitate one another's work?

2.1. Discussion

Here we need to consider what is needed to ensure that the collaborative objectives pursued and the functions exercised by the sectoral and trans-sectoral bodies that compose the environmental institutional system are characterized by technical soundness, effectiveness, and efficiency. In general, it would seem best to objectively determine for each function and type of function: (a) where the greatest capacity is located, (b) how inefficient duplication and competition (rivalry) can be avoided, and (c) how to ensure the communication and collaboration necessary for a great deal of shared effort to proceed smoothly and successfully.

One way of classifying functions could be the following: operational implementation, project planning, management, information collection, information analysis, monitoring and enforcement, communications and liaison, policy formulation, formulation and proposal of laws, regulations and standards, and so forth.

One way of classifying components or levels of the institutional framework is the following:

- Sectoral
- Trans-sectoral management (secretariat or professional level)
- Trans-sectoral coordination (policy/political level)

3. Tasks

1. Prepare a matrix that shows which functions need to be carried out at each level.
2. Consider whether it is possible to construct a successful system in which each component can operate on its own.
3. Consider how the various components and levels of the system can best contribute to and facilitate the work of the others.

ANNEX D

TECHNICAL NOTE C

ANNEX D
TECHNICAL NOTE C

How should the environmental functions of the trans-sectoral and sectoral bodies be organized within the Guinean Public Service?

1. Sector Level

1.1. Discussion

The bodies involved at the sector level in the management of the environment are the following:

- The Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
- The Ministry of Infrastructural Development (Aménagement du Territoire)
- The Ministry of the Interior and Security
- The Ministry of Industry and Small- and Medium-scale Enterprises
- The Ministry of Public Health and Social Affairs
- The Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
- The Ministry of Pre-University and Professional Training
- The Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and the Environment

Each of these ministries is organized into directorates, divisions, and services, some of which are responsible for environmental activities within their specific sector. Most of the sector-based institutions remain highly centralized and, therefore, far removed from their clientele. Communications with the MNREE is very poor. The sectoral agencies that have environmental responsibilities do not have the capacity to fulfill the assigned responsibilities. There is a serious lack of qualified personnel at all levels and in all sectors and a lack of financial and material resources. At the local levels the situation is even more serious.

1.2. Issues

One issue concerning the sectoral agencies is whether they have the staff capacity and are properly structured to exercise their important environmental protection roles. **Would it not facilitate their environmental work if sector agencies had environmental officers?** Then each such agency would have one or two staff members with training in the preparation of EIAs, EISs, and EAs; with a knowledge of pertinent environmental laws, regulations, and standards; and a familiarity with environmental issues of both a sector-related and general nature. These individuals could exercise responsibility for liaison with the trans-sectoral management agency and could serve as expert resource persons responsible for helping their

agencies succeed in the environmental protection and resource conservation aspects of their programs. Perhaps most sector agencies should have two such individuals located in a unit in the office of the national director.

Another question for consideration is whether sector agencies' issues and concerns receive the attention and action they deserve at the trans-sectoral management and coordination levels.

Two other issues will be discussed on the third day of the conference. One is whether they have the mandates (and the staff structure) they need to work with decentralized structures at the prefectural, sub-prefectural, and local levels. The other concerns problems arising from overlapping responsibilities in their operating mandates. These questions should be avoided in this session.

2. Trans-Sectoral Management Level

2.1. Discussion

Some functions are common to the sectoral agencies and need to be exercised on a consistent basis and, therefore, coordinated by a trans-sectoral management agency. Also, some important functions, as a practical matter, can be handled effectively and efficiently only by a trans-sectoral management body. Here we consider what kind of trans-sectoral management body is needed.

At present there are two bodies with overlapping responsibilities for trans-sectoral management of environmental protection and natural resource conservation matters. Both are in the Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and the Environment. This ministry has responsibility over the mining, energy, and water resources sectors as well as the environment. These are managed by five directorates responsible for the following subjects: mining, hydraulics, energy, geology, and the environment.

The National Environmental Directorate (DNA) has some 56 staff members. It is not fully effective for several reasons: critical shortages of material and human resources; serious budgetary constraints result from competition with other priorities within MRNEE; it is on the same administrative level as the other directorates and, therefore, hampered in asserting priority over them; in general, its staff are under-qualified for the tasks they have been assigned and almost none have benefitted from pre- or in-service training in their fields of responsibility; job descriptions are unclear as are their roles vis a vis other agencies; and the responsibilities of technical services and departments have not been spelled out.

In 1993, a new unit called the Office of the National Council for the Environment (the Ministerial level trans-sectoral coordination body) was established. It has a staff of 13 members and is headed by a coordinator. The establishment of this second body, more or less at the same level and with functions that overlap with those of the DNA, seems to have complicated and hindered the exercise of the trans-sectoral management function.

There are three trans-sectoral management models that have been used in other countries. They are: (a) a separate ministry for the environment, (b) creating or strengthening a separate environment department within a sectoral ministry, and (c) a semi-autonomous environment management authority. Attachment A is a set of guiding principles recommended by Michael Furst, an international consultant, as applicable to the choice of a mechanism for Guinea. Attachment B contains the same consultant's assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches. Attachment C lays out Mr. Furst's recommendations concerning the internal organization of a proposed semi-autonomous trans-sectoral management authority.

2.2. Issues

- Is there any utility in having two environmental bodies in the MNREE as opposed to combining them into a single entity with a single management structure?
- How should Guinea's trans-sectoral management agency be organizationally structured to best exercise its functions without duplicating the functions of other agencies?
 - Should it have its own sector-oriented divisions or should it be organized on a strictly functional basis?
 - How should the management agency exert its influence, mainly by operational co-involvement in sectoral work or mainly by engaging in documented, formal (and, therefore, transparent) dialogue (including EIAs, EAs, and EISs) with operational agencies?
 - Should the agency be (a) at the level of a National Directorate, as at present, or, given its responsibility for coordinating environmental functions of numerous sectoral national directorates; or (b) at the level of a semi-autonomous office or commissariat general?
 - What kind of independent representation and capability, if any, should the trans-sectoral agency have at the regional, prefectural, and sub-prefectural levels?
- What location within the central government structure would be most conducive to the effective and efficient exercise of a trans-sectoral environmental management agency's unique functions and responsibilities? This is a difficult and sensitive question to which there may well be no single answer that is clearly superior to all the others. If the working group cannot formulate a single recommendation, then it would be useful for the group to formulate options and rank them in order of preference. In that case, it would be useful for the group to suggest a mechanism or process by which the question could be best analyzed and decided as part of the NEAP implementation process.

3. Trans-sectoral Policy Coordination Level

3.1. Discussion

Here we address the part of the institutional framework that has to do with policy development and policy-level coordination of the environmental management functions of government. Presently that role is played by the inter-ministerial Conseil National de l'Environnement. Established under the Guinean Environmental Code in 1987, it is composed of representatives of 10 departments and ministries concerned with the environment and natural resources plus the Ministry of Plan and Finance. Its meetings are chaired by the Minister of MNREE. The CNE has met infrequently and has not been active.

If a semi-autonomous independent environmental management agency is recommended, there will be a need for a board of directors (conseil d'administration) to review periodically its management plans and operating policies. This is a different function from that presently assigned to the Conseil National de l'Environnement.

It is noteworthy that at present there is no provision for organizations and groups outside the central government to be represented in trans-sectoral environmental management and policy coordination. Yet important environmental management roles are presently or potentially exercised outside of government and at other level of government. Nonrepresented are NGOs, the private commercial sector, university institutions, decentralized government bodies, and local governments.

3.2. Issues

- What changes in the structure and responsibilities of the CNE might help to make it more active and useful?
- If the trans-sectoral management agency becomes a semi-autonomous body, how should it be structured?
- What changes in or additions to the structures at the trans-sectoral policy coordination level are required, if any, to extend participation to presently unrepresented elements?