

Final Project Evaluation Report

Your Details	
Full Name	Tumuhairwe Godfrey
Project Title	Overlapping habitats management in downstream of River Katonga Catchment Uganda
Application ID	26069-1
Grant Amount	£4994
Email Address	g7tumuhairwe@gmail.com
Date of this Report	07/15/2019

1. 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 harness silent conflicts occurring between direct natural resource dependent communities and government institutions involved in management				
To increase community role, participation, and explore new anthropogenic activities which were not identified in the Katonga Catchment Management Plan				
To establish the co-management committees of overlapping habitats				The resolution to merge and collapse National Forest Authority (NFA), National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Wetland Department Management (WDM). These were some of the department and agencies that their role were to be phased others merged within the Ministry of Environment. This failed the inter- and intra- agency engagement as well as efforts to establish fully functioning of co-management.

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

Some of the difficulties were cabinet resolution in September, 2018 to merge key stakeholder government institutions and agencies. Also the collapse of some that the project had identified during stakeholder mapping and interplay roles in the co-management of River Katonga catchment. This became a hindrance of the engagement among institutions on the roles in the co-management. However, the community engagement committees have committed to work with District

Environment Committees in coordinating, monitoring, and advising District Councils on all aspects of wetland resource management.

There were individuals who own land titles within the wetland boundaries and no buffer zone. The constitution of Uganda allows an individual to have rights and control over their land under Article 26 of the Ugandan 1995 Constitution. The environmental laws came in after the 1995 Constitution yet some individuals in the communities had their land titles in wetlands and were not cancelled under the new laws on environmental management which stipulates 10 m from the wetland (the buffer zone). However, communities have plantations of pine and eucalyptus.

The National Environment (Wetlands, River Banks and Lake Shores Management) Regulations, No. 3/2000, is one of the key legal instrument, the co-management is benchmarking. This regulation came into force in 2000, and under article 4 objectives section (c) ensure water catchment conservation and flood control; (d) ensure the sustainable use of wetlands for ecological and tourist purposes for the common good of all citizens; (e) ensure that wetlands are protected as habitats for species of fauna and flora;

The objectives resonate well with mandate given to the co-management committee and it will be important in operationalisation of the co-management committees.

The political influence from heavily government-supported boundary partners. These were identified and it was difficult to engage because they were not collaborative yet their causing significant impacts on the river catchment. These included sand mining, and rice growers who instruct their security to deny access even when you want to provide information on the best practices.

These investors are state funded and very strict on access to their areas including preferring charges such as trespass or theft in their premises. It was difficult but it will require lobbying from area members of parliament to discussed in the parliamentary natural resources committee and if need be visit the area and make recommendations to the central government at the Ministry level.

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

Establishment of grievance redress mechanism in which all partners will report socio-environmental challenges in improving overlapping habitats management.

Designing a gender sensitive community engagement councils from four local communities in Bugeye, Kitokolo, Bukungo, and Kiguli villages to oversee and manage the conflicting mandate.

Enhanced governance of dwindling natural resources through design and establishment overlap management teams at grassroots.

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

Firstly, the local leaders were identified and involved in the planning and acquired skills that will be integrated in the community engagement councils.

Secondly, a team of leaders from different communities was selected and participated in the mapping R. Katonga downstream hot spot in the area, and during hotspot mapping the community leaders came to appreciate the importance of the project and it will simplify the work of the community engagement council during monitoring and reporting the degraded areas and how to restore it.

Thirdly, communities in Bugeye, Kitokolo, Bukungo, and Kiguli were mobilised and sensitised on the best management practices, and their capacity built in understanding natural resource conflicts.

Fourthly, participation in the community awareness and training on habitat restoration, mainly wetlands which were the main hotspot in the overlapping habitat. Communities gained knowledge on the impact of existing exotic tree plantations within and on the wetland boundaries.

Participation in the sensitisation and educative local workshop about hotspots where they learnt socio-environment issues including conflicts between communities and their leaders. The communities came to realise that where institutions like Uganda Wildlife Authority, and National Forest Authority mandated their efforts, the catchments are not degraded, and where there is laxity in the mandates such wetland departments where there is lack of police to enforce, the catchment has been more degraded.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

One future plan is to work with the communities and boundary partners to establish Katonga wetlands as key biodiversity areas. Comprehensively hoped to important in the restoration and protection of R. Katonga catchment where communities and boundary partners will lease part of their land within the buffer, to allow regeneration and restoration within the boundaries.

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

Project results will continuously be shared within the districts local government where River Katonga traverses, that is Butambala, Mpigi, and Karungu. Results will also be shared with Wetlands department, NFA, UWA, and MWE. Previously, the project team shared the results in a 4-day training workshop organised by African Union of Conservationists (AUC) in Collaboration with IISER Pune and entire TROP ICSU project partners under the theme "*Trans-disciplinary Research Oriented Pedagogy for Improving Climate Studies and Understanding project*" (TROP:ICSU). The project was addressing climate change contemporary education, and it was a significant

opportunity where the team disseminated the project results to more than 200 participants with 160 participants from Uganda. The participants learnt about the values of water catchment protection and its long term impacts on climate change. Information materials such as brochures are being developed and will also be shared with the district natural resource offices and agencies.

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

The project was implemented within 11 month compared to the anticipated 12 months in the proposal.

8. Budget: 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. It is important that you retain the management accounts and all paid invoices relating to the project for at least 2 years as these may be required for inspection at our discretion.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Permits	82	82		
Community meetings	1024	1024		
Establishing co-management committees at the inter agencies	300	450	+150	There was continuous engagement as most of the Government Agencies could not commit on their to the co-management given the resolution from government to merge and collapse some institutions
Information collation, stationary, photocopying	417	380	-37	
Mapping R. Katonga downstream hot sport area	1136	852	-284	It was difficult to map state supported investment in the R. Katonga catchment such as sand mining, and Rice growing in Lwera, Karungu, thus affecting the number of trips
Establishing community engagement councils	255	340	85	There was an additional community engagement council from three that were budgeted. community engagement council

				(Bugeye, Kitokolo, Kiguli, Bukungo)
Field assistance	468	468		
Field subsistence	810	810		
Telephone and fax	50	62	+12	There was an increase on communication through mobile calls after introduction of Over The Tax (OTT) on air time by the Government.
Internet	72	120	+48	There was an increase in the purchase of megabits for internet after introducing Over The Tax (OTT) on re-charge.
Car hire	380	380		
Bank charges		26	+26	There are monthly bank charges/account maintenance of about £2.4 per month
Total	4994	4994		

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

- Community collaboration to relinquish part of their land for key biodiversity area expansion.
- Establishment of inter-state agency co-management committees to enhance the contribution of community engagement councils and also enhancing the engagement with the boundary partners involved in the utilisation of Katonga Catchment Management Plan.

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

RF is conserved a key partner enlisted by the AUC and Foundation's Logo was popularised in every communication on which there was a relationship e.g. PowerPoint presentation, posters, be participant's registers, brochures, and during the at the TROPIC ISCU training organised by African Union of Conservationists (AUC) and at Kolping Hotel in Kampala, Uganda last year in November. In addition on the AUC's website.

11. Please provide a full list of all the members of your team and briefly what was their role in the project.

Mr. Tumuhairwe Godfrey

He was the team leader and overall project manager. He was responsible for mapping out resource conflicting mandates.

Mapping out key government stakeholder agencies and carrying out engagements in establishing co-management committees at the inter agencies. He was responsible for updating the Funder on the project progress and compiling the progress reports. He was responsible for project results monitoring and evaluations.

Kamsiime Phionah

She was responsible for communication, mobilization, and designing and establishing Community Engagement Committees and district councils in management of overlapping habitats at all levels. She was responsible for community workshops organization.

Denis Lukato

He was responsible for identifying the Hotspot in the R. Katonga Catchments and assessment of key biodiversity areas. He was also responsible for training communities on the long term implications of exotic trees in the R' Katonga catchment and the how? Where to get the indigenous tree species?