

The Rufford Foundation Final Report

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

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. 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. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. 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	Strengthening Collaborative Forest Management in Central Uganda
RSG reference	17648-D
Reporting period	July 2016
Amount of grant	£9989
Your email address	rkatebaka@afruc.org katebakaraymond@yahoo.com
Date of this report	4 th July, 2016

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 strengthen collaborative forest management (CFM) in central Uganda			√	<p>Several institutions played a big role through their involvement in forest restoration by tree planting; targeting to build the capacity of CFM in central Uganda. To date the range and sector managers in National Forest Authority (NFA) received two CFM applications from the communities of the project area.</p> <p>The process of CFM was recorded and clearly understood by the participating communities.</p>
To raise awareness on fragmentation and degradation of indigenous forests and reduce the increasing pressure from local adjacent communities in the districts of Mpigi and Masaka		√		<p>A number of local communities close to the forests formally not targeted expressed the need to participate in order to gain CFM knowledge and hence raising awareness activities that were conducted. Apparently, the degradation and deforestation of forests are caused by linkages of ecosystem services provided by public resource such as a single CFR in an area. Thus the drivers of degradation and deforestation are caused by those that come from outside these communities that were not reached by this project.</p>
To enhance on conservation management of CFRs by community involvement and supporting their		√		<p>Communities of Mpanga and Kasonke CFRs were compliant with the strengthening of CFM implementation while the Ggangu communities' demands have dragged behind to move along with the rest in the project</p>

needs such as ecosystem services, biodiversity, ecotourism, and energy use				area. The communities of Ggangu feel that NFA neglected them in forest management activities. These activities included tree planting, boundary management and employment.
--	--	--	--	--

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

- Working with government agencies processes were not thought about during the project design. For example, upon submission of the CFM applications, there were back and forth sending of the applications to communities for revision and incorporation of missing components. These took a lot of time till to-date there were incomplete activities which include approval of CFM agreements. Thus this affected the proposed activity budgets to be merged and activities carried co-currently wherever possible and concentrated on the targeted achievements.
- During the project implementation, the country (Uganda) conducted presidential and parliamentary among other elections which ultimately caused some social and economic complications in the local communities (from October 2015 – May 2016). Consequently this culminated into community political divide along parties. For example some local politicians who were contesting for different structural positions, politicised CFM programme in their communities. This divided community members and impacted on the progress that had been achieved by the CFM committees and the project team. On the other hand they anticipated the project could support their political activities in the area. Other local leaders who would lead project activities preferred to attend political rallies hence affecting CFM activities eventually. It was later realised that strategic political rallies were providing incentives for the attending crowds. Whereas some leaders lost in the local leadership, this led to demotivation among the leaders of area and eventuated into financial demands from the project activities. The project communities started demanding some incentives in order to be engaged in the project activities. First the team designed most activities to be conducted by the CAP officer with the CFM committees in the communities. Secondly the team agreed that a modest facilitation be provided to the participating members on the day of CFM activities.

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

- The project activities around Mpanga CFR, led delineation of CFM area for community projects. An area of 2 ha was surveyed for community CFM projects in Lwanga degraded forest area that borders Lwanga Local Council leadership located in the north east of Mpanga CFR. The area was a former forest station characterised by invasive plants. The communities will use the area for the CFM beneficial programmes.
- There were two CFM applications submitted to National Forest Authority (NFA) for CFM agreement signing. This was upon fulfilling required CFM procedures by the communities such as registering CFM groups as Community Based Organisation (CBO) with the District. This resulted into registering two CBOs with Mpigi District. The applications were submitted by communities of Nakiggude, Mpambire, Kaligwa, Nduggu, Kalagala, Lwanga and Kafumu adjacent Mpanga CFR in Mpigi Town Council. The applications target to implement projects of nursery bed preparations, beekeeping, drum making and forest community camp site. The communities also planned alongside other proposed projects adjacent Mpanga CFR include community tourism development, poultry keeping, piggery, and hand crafts.
- Communities adjacent to the three project CFRs were empowered with CFM knowledge and skills that include: CFM application preparation, CFM reporting, nursery bed establishment and management; beekeeping; biomass energy management and interaction with NFA officials enhanced communities and authority relationships.
- As one of the anticipated forest participatory activity, the communities of Mpanga CFR prior to CFM agreement maintained boundaries in Kafumu area.

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

The project used a community-led planning and decision making approach through Community Action Programme (CAP). A number of community workshops were organised with the help of CAP officer and conducted locally on furthering the CFM. This way communities gained more knowledge and were empowered with skills of forest conservation and management. CFM benefits included the 2 ha of land for community in Mpanga CFR. The area will be used to establish a campsite, hand crafts market, community CFM offices among others facilities that will be accepted by NFA. Communities anticipate an income to be earned will go to the community development programmes. Mpanga Community CFM leaders were selected to be trained farming conservation organised by AUC in partnership with National Committee of International Year of Family Farmers (IYFF) of Uganda while in

Kasonke, communities benefitted by understanding their rights on forest conservation. To date the Ggangu communities started claiming the original role they played in Ggangu CFR forest management.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. A proposal has been prepared aimed at “*Sustaining Community Participation in Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) of central Uganda*” to be submitted for continuation and completion. The sustainability will build on the understanding, enhancement, promotion and strengthening of CFM processes that were established since RSG funding in 2009 – 2016 among the forest adjacent communities. The plans to continue will engage communities in forest conservation and sustainable resource use since there will be CFM agreements for community engagements with NFA. It will further targets to benefit communities through their Roles, Rights, Responsibilities and Returns (4Rs) from CFM schemes such as tree planting for forest biodiversity recovery; timely collection of ‘low impact’ resources such as firewood; herbal medicine extraction from collected native plants; access and user rights of water; encouragement of beekeeping along forest buffer zones to improve on biodiversity conservation and regulated charcoal burning in CFRs. The communities will continue to demonstrate the capacity to deliver high quality CFM best practices in central Uganda.

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

In CFM practices, results are shared as soon as they are available among all stakeholders. Over 300 CFM fliers were published and distributed to different families in project area. These have been shared through NFA and Forest Support Sector Department (FSSD). A technical CFM handbook in Central Uganda, was prepared and is currently undergoing editorial for ISSN publication thereafter it will be distributed to stakeholders and related institutions and put at AUC and Rufford website for wider readership and citation.

The CFM practices were shared for ecosystem services modelling at African Institute of Mathematical Sciences (AIMS) in South Africa on 2nd – 6th May 2016.

The project team leader has been invited by International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS) in the forthcoming CBD plenary session at Cancun (December 1-3, 2016) to give strategic key note address on “Biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services - past, present and future”. The keynote address will focus on how CFM approaches and programmes in conservation would safeguard biodiversity.

Other results will be disseminated at international, regional and national meetings and conferences or related events as they will emerge globally.

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

One year (2nd July 2015 – 4th July 2016). The project requires extensive funding to be implemented for over 3 years accordingly. This is because every proposed intervention generated among communities results into other interests which bring other complications that may not be solved in stipulated time.

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 site	1035	1106	71	There was a necessity to transport CFM leaders who were not planned for in the budget. We also included interns who travelled sometimes with the team leader or CAP officer. Sometimes the CFM leaders travelled alone. Therefore this needed us to establish the facilitation from the proposed budget.
CFM process	1089	470	122	The difference and the balance that couldn't be spent on the agreement (£619) was realigned into other priorities that were made by the CFM committees.
Meetings/workshops	1881	2003	31	There were other communities that had not been included in the original budget and sought for the project team to reach out to them with CFM knowledge
Exchange visit	675	706	31	A 10 member team were facilitated to participate in Uganda Forrest Working Group workshops where they were empowered with ecosystem services

				knowledge thus causing budget increment.
Project team field	1080	1161	35	This included vehicle hiring but mainly public transport was used to reduce on the team expenses.
Boundary clearance	2340	2340	0	The communities in Mpanga participated in boundary maintenance
Nursery bed establishment	1200	1300	100	There were two nursery beds established in Mpanga community and one in Ggangu CFRs communities
Materials (briefs, craft designs)	100	200	100	Mpanga communities were better placed and were taken to Kampala City craft markets to train with the entrepreneurs in tourism business.
A camera	290	395	105	A camera was placed on the priorities and purchased from USA and a camera was bought at an increased price than what was budgeted.
Internet & communication	299	354	55	For efficient internet the project opted for a service provider
Total	9989	9989	-619	The debt was compensated by incorporating the balance from CFM agreement signing to cover up the gap.

NB: Upon realising there were unexpected emerging activities proposed by the CFM leadership, the team leader invited the project team members and CFM leaders' to realign budgets. Some of the budgets were reduced while others were increased based on the difference that occurred. For example along the implementation timeframe, it was observed that with delays in the NFA response towards CFM application, signing of agreement should be postponed and was eventually dropped.

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

The legacy and sustainability of CFM projects depend entirely on communities that are located adjacent to CFRs. For example the will and zeal of communities can only be carried forward if CFM promoters incentivise the expected benefits. Thus planting trees with short rotation period along buffer zones, establishment of woodlots for energy provision in the rapid developing urban areas of central

Uganda is needed. Therefore availability of incentives from forest activities requires to be strengthened in the next step.

Sustainability needs to be achieved by strengthening, empowering and continuous capacity building among forest managers that interact with adjacent communities. This will lessen forestry conflicts between the managers and communities. Therefore putting in place forest conservation business based on forest establishment and management should be the next step. This may include forest tourism among other programmes. There is a need to integrate community social workers in CFM programmes. These will simplify foresters' communication and communities to comply with the enabling environment in the forest conservation such as the ecosystem services.

There is a need for production of a manual for forest extension workers detailing community forest management approaches that integrate land use and productivity and biodiversity conservation.

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

All project events and outputs contained Rufford Foundation logo and acknowledged RSGF funding. Presentations in Uganda and elsewhere AUC web site to - date bear a Rufford Foundation logo and including a link to the Rufford internet site, the AUC computers, t-shirts, news bulletins and posters.

11. Any other comments?

This project recommends that future RSGF funding should support integration of conservation science modelling and community interaction through research. In addition consideration of establishing an after continuation fund for community natural resource conflicts mechanism would further biodiversity conservation enhancement.