

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 | Promoting Collaborative Forest Management in Degraded Forests of Central Uganda (PCFM). |
| RSG reference | 13983-B |
| Reporting period | January 2014-February 2015 |
| Amount of grant | £11,970 |
| Your email address | katebakaraymond@yahoo.com , rkatebaka@fruc.org |
| Date of this report | 13 th February 2015 |

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 promote Collaborative Forest Management in degraded forests of central Uganda. | | | √ | Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) is being promoted in three Central Forest Reserves (CFRs) of central Uganda. The CFRs are located in the Districts of Mpigi and Masaka. CFM is an approach between adjacent forest communities and forest management agencies working together to safeguard forest integrity. This has been achieved by collectively working with National Forest Authority (NFA) and Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD) in Ministry of Water and Environment. The promotion is gradually reducing forest community conflicts. |
| To increase benefits from user rights of the CFRs | | √ | | The project identified a number of benefits ranging from community tourism, ecotourism, beekeeping and sustainable harvest of forest resources. MoUs have been established. |
| To raise awareness among the environment committees in local leadership of the neighbouring communities | | | √ | The awareness raising workshops were conducted; environmental committees were trained on the CFM processes and required implementation procedures by use of CFM Guidelines of 2003. |

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

- Establishing partnership with the National Forest Authority (NFA) that led to the putting in place an MoU was considerably difficult as it delayed some activities to take-off in the field. This challenge was tackled by working with the Public Relations Officer (PRO) of NFA and later the delays were addressed.
- There were disagreements among the forest communities that were unforeseen. Getting spatial forest communities together to agree on the actions that were to be considered in the future MoUs with the NFA was also another difficulty. This was later dealt with through their local leadership, environmental and development committees. These committees convinced the communities later to begin agreeing on the priority actions despite the project being relocated.
- Further, the interpretation of CFM by communities to the extent that some felt that NFA would de-gazette sections of the forests and be given to them. It was through raising awareness that ran continuously which later proposed to have MoUs before reaching

another level of CFM agreements. Local leaders were continuously engaged which shaped the direction of progress in other local community activities.

- The issue of Returns as part of 4Rs (*Roles, Responsibilities Rights and Returns*) from CFM practice as outlined by the Guidelines for Implementation 2003, was unforeseen. It was observed that communities felt that all the generated returns didn't belong to them but rather to the NFA. There is indirect and little return envisaged in the allowable forest resource collections. This was addressed by undertaking consultations with the individuals and institutions that formerly implemented projects related to CFM in the region.
- The fluctuation rate of local currency exchange affected project budget. The difference was caused by the drop from £1 – 4,030.57UGX to £1- 3,820UGX at the time of the grant approval. The project team met and deliberated on the priorities. This led to some of the items in the budget to be postponed.

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

- The project had two pronged effect: for example the project impacted on both vertical and horizontal governance in forest management. The project led African Union of Conservationists (AUC) to establish and sign a MoU with NFA. Also enhancing the relationship of forest adjacent communities in the three CFRs that include: Mpanga CFR, Ggangu CFR and Kasonke CFR. This level influenced policy recommendations by involving and engaging participation of the line ministries and private sector. At least 400 individual members from forest communities are currently involved in the CFM activities. The MoUs are basically aimed to prepare communities transit from the Community Forest Associations (CFAs) that were proposed during the project design.
- There are currently seven MoUs under preparation in the communities of Mpanga as a step taken that will eventuate into CFM agreements. Communities MoUs focussed on the interest presented by each community and selection of the action to be implemented in the CFR.
- Forest biodiversity value in the three degraded CFRs integrity was understood and thus the project was benchmarked in various conservation institutions, working on forest conservation in Uganda.

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

The project initially targeted local communities. The project considered 80% involvement in the implementation. The project used bottom-top approach. Grassroot communities were approached first to tackle their concerns, views and issues that were later discussed with the NFA and FSSD at national level. Community at the local leadership level decided where local meetings, workshops, took place during mobilisation. Choices and decisions made were entirely based on communities' involvement to address their forest management needs. The choices include promoting community tourism around the forest; provision of catering services and camping management as a way of earning livelihoods to tourists; and boundary maintenance was also sought by the communities as it was during the Forest Department (FD) management regime. The project helped these communities to identify business enterprises and coordinating centres in their forest regions that will work as community markets as soon as a makeover by the local governments in the project districts. Community approaches to work with NFA and interested to participate in the institutional activities such as tree planting (forest restoration) and operating nursery beds were made simpler. This was highly fronted by local women from the forest adjacent communities. The men preferred to take on

the boundary maintenance role. This led to requesting a responsibility in the NFA management for reporting of illegal activities on-going in the forests which increase deforestation.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. The project established a 5-year MoU with NFA and MWE to promote effective forest conservation and management in Uganda. During the project implementation, efforts were made to further fundraise for the continuation of the project to MacArthur Foundation but without success. Further applications were made to Waterloo Foundation and the response required that the project should cover a large spatial area of implementation. Thus the proposed “Enhancing Collaborative Forest Management in Degraded of Areas Lake Victoria Basin, Uganda” or “Enhancing Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) for Restoration of Degraded Forest Landscapes in the Lake Victoria Basin of Uganda” is the future need of the action; to continue with this work. This concern comes at a time when Uganda has scaled up her development needs recorded as one of the first 10 fast growing economies in Africa that require multitude use of natural resources thus resulting into deforestation. Therefore, the proposed work will contribute to safeguarding the Lake Victoria biodiversity from the rapid development needs.

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

Since the project began, the results of the previous work were assimilated into the Booster Grant support and sharing of integrated results was prioritised. FSSD was the first government institution that received progress of the project. A workshop was organised with support of the project funds at the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) which brought a diversity of stakeholders in the CFM practitioners. During the workshop, the project progress was shared at the policy level, present included Hon. Flavia Munaaba, State Minister of Environment, Ag. Commissioner for FSSD, Director of Natural Forest Resources in NFA, Ms Fiona Driciru CFM National Coordinator in NFA, Dr Evelyn Lutalo of NEMA; WWF-UCO representative, CARE-UCO representative, IUCN representative, Sawlog Production Grant Scheme (SPGS), and CSO representatives (30) in number. Their presence guided a number concerns that were being raised by the participants from different conservation and development arena.

Information education and communication materials were disseminated and they included stickers, t-shirts, writing pads, banners, and posters. These were published containing the developed theme “*Collaborating with the People to Conserve the Forest*”. There are still available materials such as stickers recorded in various public places and to others on their laptop computers. Further, continuous analysis of previous data that is on-going, a talk about and a scientific paper “Analysing persistence of bird population in deforested areas in central Uganda” is underway. The talk was made at “The 6th Symposium of Integrative Zoology: Outlook and Prospective of Integrative Zoology & Celebrating of 125 Years of the International Congress of Zoology and 10 Years of the International Society of Zoological Sciences was held on 24th–25th November 2014, at the Institute of Zoology (IOZ), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing, China. “2nd International Training Course on Frontier in Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology: New Trends and Methodology in Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology”.

AUC website has been updated to be more user-friendly and summaries of the project are posted under environment conservation programme.

Local communities' representatives who were the beneficiaries of the project participated in the exchange visit, to learn about the best practices in western Uganda. This way they learned unique approaches that will be integrated once they sign CFM agreements in central Uganda.

Rufford website links provide most recent updates that have been provided.

AUC will carry on with the dissemination of results through the various visitors visiting the secretariat and other foras where it's invited to participate.

A detailed CFM results report that will detail facts and figures in Uganda will be completed and disseminated to different stakeholders interested in the practices.

This project also is a basis for local forest adjacent communities to start participating in REDD+ carbon programmes. Thus a partnership agreement is being developed with the FSSD to continue dissemination of best practices in CFM integration with the REDD+.

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

The 1st Booster Grant of Rufford project was implemented from February 2014 to February 2015. The 1-year period despite the on-going activities that are beyond the fund timeframe will continue. African Union of Conservationists (AUC) currently operates on a 5-year Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with National Forest Authority (NFA) to promote forest management practices as more effective in terms of participation. It is anticipated that at least in the next 5 years forest communities will considerably benefit directly from CFM practices while conserving forest biodiversity in Uganda.

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 project area and exchange visit | £2,200 | £2,700 | 500 | The project team frequented the project site on numerous times. It was agreed that the per diem of the project team be reduced and the difference was pulled out from the project team field (per diems) to supplement accommodation and meals for a CFM learning visit in western Uganda. |
| 25 Community training workshops (venue hire and meals) | £4,860 | £4,860 | 0 | This covered all workshops both organised locally at the village level and in urban areas. For example meetings were organised in Kasonke |

| | | | | |
|--|--------|----------------|--------|--|
| | | | | CFR, Masaka District Local Government, Gangu CFR and Mpanga CFR in Mpigi District. The CFM process required continuous meetings with local government leaders at the district level. Thus each selected communities required a minimum of four independent meetings with the district leadership councils. Although in other communities more than four meetings were conducted. |
| Communication materials e.g. T-shirts, banners, stickers, writing pads | £1,000 | £1,000 | 0 | T-shirts were printed and distributed among the local leaders in the project area; environmental committees that participated in the exchange visit in western Uganda; national CFM workshop. Banners that carry a long lasting information communication, stickers and writing (pads) notebooks, |
| AUC-NFA engagements and project review | 0 | £1,650 | £1,650 | This was not formerly included in the budget. However upon establishing MoU this was agreed to be supported by the project fund. |
| Field team per diem | £1,450 | £950 | £950 | In order for the project to cause impact, the team agreed to always send one or few individuals to the field at ago. Where necessary all of us would go at once for the purpose of learning from each other. |
| Stationery | £200 | £200 | 0 | The project provided writing materials during the raising awareness workshops, and district meetings including the printing. |
| Telephone, internet | £250 | £200 | £50 | The team agreed to reduce internet expenses. The difference was allocated to the workshops. |
| Reporting | £250 | £410 | £160 | The project allocated funds for the project technical report books (15 pages in 200 copies) that will be printed and disseminated to all stakeholders. This will entail information about CFM practice, facts and figures, Community CFM, Joint Forest Management, Analysis, Conclusions and Emerging issues in Uganda, |
| TOTAL | | £11,970 | | |

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

Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) approaches are fast at delivering benefits to forest adjacent communities and at the same time very participatory and thrives on informed consent principles. The next step is considering promotion of signing CFM agreements since there was none signed in the project implementation period though currently the communities are aware of the process. CFM agreements require a complex procedure with local government involvement engagements. Once this is done, it will allow community access to forest resources as well as the responsibility of supporting the proper collaborative management of the forest and receive the returns as the most preferred focus.

A new perspective that will be incorporated is the valuation of the forest resources in the project area though this requires a large fund. Resource assessment and CFM negotiation stages of CFM process shall quantify forest benefits that shall be shared as per CFM agreement and plan in order to enhance community involvement in forest biodiversity conservation which is the main target of AUC. The CFM agreement period normally depends on the CFR management plan which is always 10 years with periodic reviews in 2nd year, 5th year and renewal after 10 years of successfully implementation. The proposed next step will be “Enhancing Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) for Restoration of Degraded Forest Landscapes in the Lake Victoria Basin of Uganda”.

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. All the materials used in the project contained the RSG logo. It was agreed in the MoU that this should go along with the government of Uganda’s “Court of Arms” as was a high recognition. The use of the logo attracted the government officials and other participants in meetings locally and internationally. This was appreciated by how small grant help to achieve bigger results.

The banners, t-shirts, writing pads, stickers, and all PowerPoint presentations in Uganda and China contained the logo. The logo has been on the AUC’s website which has made a wide publicity about the Rufford Foundation. All the subsequent publications will continue to acknowledge the Rufford support.

11. Any other comments?

The just completed project “Promoting Collaborative Forest Management in Degraded Forests of Central Uganda (PCFM)” opened a platform for stakeholders in CFM practice in Uganda. It was been recommended that the Rufford supported programme could carry on to reinstate the association of CFM to curb deforestation in Uganda.