

The Rufford Small Grants Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details

Your name	Raymond Katebaka
Project title	Enhancing community participation to conserve fragmented forests in Central Uganda
RSG reference	11431-2
Reporting period	April 2012-May 2013
Amount of grant	£5968
Your email address	katebakaraymond@yahoo.com , rkatebaka@afruc.org , Raymond.katebaka@gmail.com
Date of this report	17 th May 2013

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
To encourage community participation to conserve fragmented forests in central Uganda			√	The project enhanced the understanding of general environmental concerns and specifically to forests and deforestation impacts in the communities adjacent and interact with of 20 forest fragments in eight districts found in the central region of Uganda. The community leaders selected members to participate in trainings and later were allowed to go and sensitise fellow community members to encourage them to maintain the integrity of remaining forest fragments in central Uganda.
To empower communities to perpetuate forest resources in their localities through education and awareness creation on the importance of forests and its biodiversity		√		Despite identification of free areas or individual persons to provide plots where the highlighted resources could be established and managed. An agro-forester was invited to some village workshops and demonstrated the establishment of the perpetuated forest resources and their contribution to the forest biodiversity. Although 30% of all communities did not welcome the initiative propagation. At least communities in P. Alexander, Mpanga CFR, Gangu, Koko, and Kasonke accepted and currently they are practising propagation and agroforestry in the established nursery. In other sites the practices was rejected since the efficiency of the resources were perceived to remain in their natural ecosystems
To strengthen environmental education among village environmental committees and the local leaders by developing collaborative forest management (CFM)			√	At least a minimum of six and maximum of 15 environmental committee members per forest fragment were trained on CFM. A total of 420 were trained. The impact was highly felt and the demand for more training in environmental education is increasing. The training included some contemporary forest safeguards, mechanisms such as REDD+, CDM, SFM, among others. This material was much appreciated by the REDD coordinator at National Forest Authority (NFA).The activity linked with existing programmes.
To improve on communication among forest conservationists stakeholders			√	A communication half-day workshop was conducted involving stakeholders from National Forest Authority (NFA), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) African Integrated Development Initiative

				(AIDI), Nature Palace,
To monitor birds used as indicator taxa as they are diverse, easy to survey and better known than other organisms.			√	A total of 21 forest fragments sites were surveyed. Sites were surveyed twice. A total of 137 birds species were recorded as the most common species.

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

During the project design it was estimated to have a minimum of eight members at least per forest fragment. However every workshop registered an enormous number with a minimum of 15 and above. The approach of selecting environment committee that were trained to train others community members excited the rest and the number increased than it was planned. This caused a big challenge particularly in facilitation. The pooling of resources was sought by the project team and we informed the AUC secretariat and this was accepted that project priorities be set. The priority was agreed upon and some activities were proposed to come later in the project and others were dropped. The cause of the challenges was high inflation at the time project started and continued to date. We expected that communities will easily perceive the propagation of the forest resources collected that are the main drivers of deforestation in their land. This was rejected by the participants everywhere in the project area from the start. It was perceived as something that would promote land grabbing. We therefore reduced the risk by continuing the activities preferred by the communities in the project.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

Enhanced understanding of the forest values:- After understanding the impacts of deforestation communities have vowed to work with the government to manage the forests. This was basically dependent on the communication material packages distributed during the workshops. There were a number of demonstrations made indicating the impact of loss of forests in the era of climate change. This was connected with biodiversity, food security and management.

Trained local leaders in natural resource management:- A total of 420 trained individuals in collaborative forest management (CFM) central Uganda. These members of forest communities will have a great impact in seven districts where the project was operating. The training manual was prepared and will be used by other related projects in Uganda and Africa as a whole.

Increasing community engagement:- Communities proposed and established forest working groups that included voluntary forest security monitoring team, systems of resource collection, communities established woodlots and these will work together with the government to manage the forests. The project has linked the teams with the National Forest Authority (NFA) officials to report the illegal activities and changes taking place in their forest areas. This was because communities rejected the perception that they are main drivers of the deforestation parse because of poverty among others. They reported that poor governance is the main challenge which faces the forest in the region. Further they stated that given the mandate they will protect the forests from the politicians and government officials involved in illegal activities that have drastically cleared the forests in the region. They are sure that that despite the poverty, they have always protected their natural resources because it's them who need the forest than the learned group that lives in the urban areas and they have lived with the forests for as long as they lived. This disregards the information that is available in most parts of the world showing communities are engaged in deforestation activities due to poverty and failure of government services in the area. Thus the rich

are more destructive of the forests than the poor communities. The rich are the one currently engaged in transforming pristine forests into plantations.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

The project aimed at enhancing community participation to conserve fragmented forests in Central Uganda. Through encouraging the understanding and promotion of sustainable management of fragmented forests; through environmental education, village environmental committees were trained; training and awareness raising among the communities was conducted to strengthen the management of forest fragments in the communities and the central forest reserves (CFR). The communities include Bbale, Butugiro, Dimo, Gangu, Gulwe, Kabasanda, Kasonke, Koko, Kyengeza, Kizi-Kyeru, Mulubanga, Namugobo, Ssanya, Runga, Zika, Kyansozi, Kinyo, Park Alexander, Kitubulu, Kifu and Lukalu. Knowledge gained is the basis of forest fragments conservation success and sustainable use in the area. They did not know deeper dangers involved in the continuous loss of the forest cover, though these were realised thereafter. Nevertheless, the trained committees will take the work further to educate others.

The local community members who participated in the training realised the value of environmental education. The challenge was that the training was made short yet there is still a need as demanded to date by the communities. However what will still be missing is the sustainability of the knowledge as this may require continuous and follow up.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes the project will continue and currently in the community forests of in Park Alexander, Mpanga CFR, Gangu, Koko, and Kasonke, have continuously planted native trees that in the established woodlots some have forest resources such as medicinal herbs. All the sites were georeferenced for future follow up in line with the forest fragments changes. As result an analysis that evaluated the distribution of forest dependant birds in deforested areas of central Uganda was completed. This indicated that much as there is on-going deforestation there is a slight impact on distribution. However further research will be designed to simplify livelihood dependence of communities and technologies that still directly impact on the forest fragments. During the project a proposal was submitted for funding but rejected however more proposals will be developed to promote and strengthen the community work on forest conservation.

Forest conservation stakeholders and partners such as WWF-Uganda appreciated the project there are plans that a project is designed to counteract with high deforestation rate in central Uganda. NFA the government organisation has promised to address the issues of illegal logging that are rampant in the most contested political region which apparently is the main cause of the deforestation. It is its mandate with the counterpart Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD) to ensure that the area is one of the REDD+ areas.

African Union of Conservationists (AUC) wishes to continue strengthening the capacity of communities where possible in areas of sustainable friendly farming in order to safeguard the forest biodiversity. This is in line with the analysis of bird monitoring results in the forest fragments indicated that key hornbill species Black and White Casqued Hornbill have a stable population which are indicators of forest change. Although other taxa will be identified to expand on the understanding and innovations of best forest fragments conservation practices in central Uganda.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

The sharing of information began at the PAOC conference in Arusha October 2012. This has continuously taken place in other local meetings with Ministry of Water and Environment, FSSD and NFA in Uganda. All visitors visiting AUC secretariat receive copies of leaflets about the project. I have been invited to offer a talk at a workshop on “Harnessing Ecosystem based Approaches for Food security & Adaptation to Climate Change Conference, August 20-21, 2013, UN Complex Nairobi, Kenya. The results of the project have formed 70% of my presentation on “Strengthening the capability of communities to conserve *Ficus natalensis* and mitigating effects of climate change through friendly farming in central Uganda”.

The training manual contains the details of the project and will be distributed to partners and stakeholders.

The communities continue to share information among them about the project. AUC annual report included highlights of the project in 2012 and will continue to report about the project in the annual report to the NGO board by July 2013 and 2013 end of the year report. Other information will be used by the staff during the presentations in other fora.

7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The 2nd phase of Rufford project was implemented from May 2012 to May 2013. Thus the RSG has been used in a 1-year period however the activities continue beyond the fund timeframe. The project is anticipated that at least in the next 5 years there is a considerable reduction of deforestation with the capacity enhancement of communities in central Uganda. However we envisage a rapid increase of population and demand for energy and arrival of new communities due to migrations that come along with new practices. These may include some changes that either there will be positive or negative changes.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Transport to 20 sites located in different areas of central Uganda. Place of origin was Kampala capital city of Uganda. In some areas. 5000km is an estimated distance travelled.	1368	1620	-252	The rate of dollar was very expensive since most products and services were compared with the cost of the dollar. The Ugandan shilling was very weak at the time of exchange. Fuel cost increased than I had planned during budgeting for the proposed activities.
Field subsistence (for two project team members)	1320	1320	0	There were more days in the field than were proposed. These include mobilisation, training of environment committees and

				forest bird monitoring. For that reason as a team we agreed to have one person going in areas that could require individual accomplishment assigned where necessary. For example mobilisation was done by one person. This to prepare the project area to be aware of the coming on “Enhancing community participation to conserve fragmented forests in Central Uganda”.
Mobilisation for the village workshops	100	100	0	The facilitation of village leaders to coordinate all participants in the proposed village workshops. This did not change from the original budget
Community workshops	1500	2000	-500	Community workshops were facilitated with lunches and transport refunds. This was observed as the most important of the project upon completing the first workshop held at Park Alexander. We expected fewer participants but the number grew tremendously and demanded for activities that were not budgeted for such as increasing on refreshments. This happened in virtually all community workshops. On this section we agreed to forego the radio talk shows, and touched on the materials budget and strengthening and engaging more in interaction with the communities physically.
Internet and telephone	50	50	50	The amount contributed to the internet, telephone and communication charges in the office. Further facilitated on the communication made by the local organising of the village meetings through mobile telephone calls.
Project materials e.g. stationery, data sheet for bird monitoring and information	1000	630+30=660	-370	About 1000 leaflets have been printed. On this activity we pulled resources from the information budget. A meeting was organised and participants included, National Forest Authority (NFA), Environmental Alert, Straight Talk Foundation, CARE-Uganda, and WWF-Uganda. This meeting discussed on the communication material as concerning the loss of forests in central Uganda.
Training manual preparation	470	248	-248	The balance of the project is planned to print the training manual that will be circulated to the project village environment committees, and other stakeholders.
TOTAL	5808	5968		(-160)AUC covered the extra charges as part of the project that was on community energy enhancement under WWF/UNDP application

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

While appreciating the project in its short timeframe, the impact on the lives of communities in the area has been felt. There is high demand currently that the environmental education continues to every community close to the forests including those under local government, central government or community management. During the project time an application was submitted to FAO/FLEGT/EU call for proposals and it was rejected. This aimed to continue with the environmental education, information sharing and community certification of forest products. However, AUC has put in place a mechanism to work with the indigenous communities through their existing community based organisations. Although the project team plans to scale down the size of the project area and focus the attention on to the forest biodiversity and community interaction management regimes in regards to livelihoods improvement.

The communities demanded from the workshops that the forest management should be returned to them quoting that since the transition of institutions managing the forests from the forest department (FD) to the (NFA) a lot of forest cover has been lost through transformation in the region. For this reason the next step with the team is to design mechanisms to engage all stakeholders in the collaborative forests management that is apparently is the best practice in consultation with the indigenous communities.

The REDD-Readiness office of Uganda recognised the project for having engaged the communities leadership more effectively by enhancing their capacity and asked the team to submit the concept during the REDD first phase and be supported. The concept is being developed and will be shared as an update with Rufford as a progress of the project continuation.

10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Yes. Immediately after the award of the contract with Rufford a logo was posted on AUC's website, in July 2012 I was invited in China by the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS) General Assembly where I offered a talk about conservation challenges in Africa, I indicated Rufford as one of AUC's partners, in the AUC projects. October 2012, I participated in 13th Pan African Ornithological Congress (PAOC-Africa) and offered a talk on the "Correlation of forest hornbills with ecosystem services in degraded forests of central Uganda, whereby the Rufford logo was indicated on each slide among other presentations that acknowledged the support. The paper was prepared from the first phase work and Rufford was highly acknowledged and will be published as a selected article in the Ostrich Journal of African Ornithology. The prepared leaflets bare the same logo that was sent to me at the beginning of the contract.

11. Any other comments?

The project "Enhancing community participation to conserve fragmented forests in Central Uganda" was preferred and highly appreciated that has been the only one in the region to build the capacity of the local leadership in natural resource management and separation of resource rights. It is against this view that in the next projects supported by Rufford could be allowed to engage on livelihood and biodiversity and natural resources management.