

**Uganda Wildlife Society, Department of Research and Development**

**Annual Activity Report, 2013**

**Uganda Wildlife Society (UWS)**

Plot 1521 Mawanda Road, Kamwokya

P. O. Box 7422 Kampala, Uganda

Tel: +256414530891

Email: [uws@uws.or.ug](mailto:uws@uws.or.ug)

Website: [www.uws.or.ug](http://www.uws.or.ug)

**December 31<sup>st</sup> 2013**

## **Uganda Wildlife Society, Department of Research and Development**

### **Annual Activity Report, 2013**

#### **Authors Contributing**

Joel Buyinza., Teddy Namirimu., Suzan Owino., Louis Kyalingonza., and Ben Kazarwa

#### **Editor**

Priscilla Nyadoi

#### **Also involved in the production of this report**

Brighet Anne Ainembabazi., Christine Nabanakulya, Laster Stoney Ogola., Sharon Nabaasa., Teddy Nyangoma., Julius Ogeatum., Ivan Niwagaba., Phiona Adikin., Shakira Nabukenya., Didas Sande., Paul Siira., Javis Mutekanga, Wiclif Ayesiga., Gerald Bakonbeza, Daniel Kivumbi and Hillary Kodemu Junior.

#### **Society Partners**

Buliisa District Local Government (BDLG), CARITAS Hoima Diocese Caritas Development Association, Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Ecosystems Alliance Uganda Country Program Partners (NAPE and AFIEGO), Environment and Natural Resources Civil Society Network., Environmental Alert, Community Based Civil Society Organization Partners (Soft Power Education, Buliisa Initiative for Rural Development Organization, Buliisa Catholic Women Association, Kakindo Orphans Care and Kalolo Fish mongers and Fishermen Association) and, Tree Talk Foundation Uganda.

**COPYRIGHT** (C) 2013 Uganda Wildlife Society

Reproduction of this report for educational or non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited.

**Citation:** UWS 2013. Department of Research and Development annual activity report. UWS.



### **Waiver (Disclaimer)**

This report and the all the views expressed, the information and material presented and the geographical and geopolitical designations used in this product are exclusively from the Society Conservation works executed by her members, staff and executive committee and partners and do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Society Donors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents.....	Page
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	iv
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	v
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>CHAPTER TWO: THE 2013 WORKS</b> .....	7
The works.....	7
Research.....	7
Policy Dialogues and advocacy.....	7
Advocacy.....	8
Conservation initiatives.....	9
Publications in 2013.....	11
<b>CHAPTER THREE: EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS</b> .....	14
Experiences and Lessons.....	14
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: CHALLENGES</b> .....	16
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	18
<b>CHAPTER SIX: WHAT EXPERIENCES, LESSONS, CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS MEAN TO DIFFERENT STAKE HOLDERS</b> .....	20
Conservation NGOs.....	20
Conservation Agencies.....	20
Local governments.....	20
Ministries.....	21
Policy makers.....	21
Donors.....	21
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	22
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	23
Appendix I: Pictorial department activities in 2013.....	23

## SUMMARY

The Uganda Wildlife Society (UWS) department of Research and Development is largely responsible for developing and implementing activities towards the achievement of society objectives on knowledge generation, field projects demonstrating linkages between conservation and people's livelihoods as well as, advocacy and policy influence. This department of Research and Conservation annual activity report 2013 gives a brief background of the society, the works implemented by the department in 2013, the lessons and experiences learned, key challenges encountered and the recommendations. This report also highlights what the lessons, experiences, challenges and recommendation mean to conservation Non Government Organizations (NGOs), conservation agencies, local governments, government ministries, policy makers and the donors.

Overall, this report reveals that the department achieved 100% on set targets for the Society's advocacy and policy influence, research (100%) and about 61% on fundraising. On her conservation initiatives strategic programme, the department achieved 78% on set targets for capacity building trainings and technology supply. However, a below average performance (6%) was registered at landscape level impact targets, with only 40.5ha out of 717 hectares of privately owned land planted with trees. This is in part due to unforeseen natural factors like harsh climatic conditions in the project area and tree seed germination failure arising from low seed viability.

The key lessons emanating from the department works in 2013 include the need to building on existing traditional knowledge and innovations to satisfy local community expectations, identification of project partners and their roles, capacity building and integration of short and long term-impact interventions. Such lessons will be useful to stakeholders in the conservation field, for their day to day planning, policy formulation, programme development and implementation for sustainable natural resource use and management.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1. Background**

Uganda Wildlife Society (UWS) is a national, not for profit membership based nongovernmental conservation organization that was registered in 1998 after 38 years of operating as the East African Wild Life Society (EAWLS) Uganda Chapter. The driving force behind UWS formation was the need for the EAWLS Uganda members to get better organized in order to effectively engage with wildlife and environment management issues around the country. UWS operations are nationwide in Uganda and to an extent in the East African Region through collaboration with the Nairobi-based East African Wildlife Society. The Society has about 530 members now and these are from academia, private sector, civil society, students, policy makers, government and the general public. The Society secretariat is presently located on plot 1521, Mawanda Road, Kamwokya, Kampala, but opens and runs field offices in other regions of the country as when need arises, particularly for smooth implementation of field projects, with communities in remote rural areas.

#### *Uganda Wildlife Society - Organization Vision, Mission, Goal and Objectives*

The Uganda Wildlife Society vision is: *Wildlife and People living in Harmony*. And in that, UWS aspires to contribute towards a harmonious co-existence between wildlife and people in Uganda and beyond. The UWS mission is to: *promote the conservation of wildlife and the environment through advocacy, knowledge generation and field demonstrations*. This mission underpins UWS's existence as an advocate and facilitator of conservation, focusing on wildlife and the environment. The UWS goal is: *sustainable utilization of wildlife and other natural resources*, which underpins the long term objective for all society programmes and activities is sustainable use and management of natural resources. Unsustainable use of natural resources tends to be the main driver of most challenges facing conservation in the country today.

The Uganda Wildlife Society Objectives are threefold, namely;

1. To influence policy formulation for environmental management through providing forums for addressing, advocating and debating conservation issues.

2. To generate knowledge on wildlife and natural resources and to provide informed non-biased environmental information to the government, private sector and other Civil Society Organizations.
3. To promote the understanding of linkage of livelihoods and sustainable use of wildlife and natural resources through raising awareness about the environment among the people of Uganda.

Therefore the Uganda Wildlife Society core business includes,

- Carrying out advocacy and lobbying for harmonious co-existence between Wildlife and environment.
- Generating and disseminating knowledge and information about wildlife and environment subsectors.
- Field demonstration projects on wildlife and environmental conservation.
- Managing the UWS (Secretariat affairs and membership).
- Mobilizing resources for the UWS

#### *Uganda Wildlife Society -Governance and Structure*

The Uganda Wildlife Society Organogram comprise of the Annual General Assembly (AGM) of members. The society has about 480 members now and these are from the academia, policy makers, private sector, students, government and the general public, including people from outside Uganda. The Annual General Meeting (AGM) is the highest decision making organ of the Uganda Wildlife Society. The AGM among others, elects the Executive Committee, approves the annual work plan and budget, and receives audited financial reports of the society. Below the AGM is a 9 Member Executive Committee whose role is to offer strategic and policy oversight to the secretariat. The Executive Committee appoints and oversees the operations of the Secretariat. The Secretariat is the operational arm of UWS and it includes staff (both professional and support), responsible for development and implementation of the society strategic programmes activities.

### *Uganda Wildlife Society- Secretariat -Staff and Departments*

Headed by the Executive Secretary, the Secretariat currently has two departments with 9 staff on three year contracts, several volunteers and interns. The two departments at the UWS secretariat currently include the department of Research and Development, largely responsible for developing and implementing activities toward the achievement of society objectives on knowledge generation, field projects demonstrating linkages between conservation and people's livelihoods and, advocacy and policy influence. The other department is finance administration and human resource. In future the Society envisages growth whereby, each of its five strategic programmes (membership, conservation initiatives, research, advocacy and policy influence) becomes a department and as such a total of five departments functioning interrelated. The Society also engages student interns (mainly university students) and volunteer members to do tasks for the Society based on their expertise. From the Society Interns and Volunteers, there are always over ten personnel available on call to implement Society activities. Their engagements are based either on consultancy or voluntary participation in Society works.

### *Uganda Wildlife Society Strategic Programmes*

Uganda Wildlife Society has over the years implemented with success a number of field and national projects under its five strategic programmes. On-going now, the Society is implementing Ecosystem Alliance project in Buliisa, within the Uganda Country Programme and Consortium objectives that feed into the Global Ecosystem Alliance Programme. Global, the Ecosystems Alliance Programme focuses on interventions aimed at, (i) Restoring Ecosystems and People's Livelihoods (ii) Greening the Economy and (iii) People, Climate Change and REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation). Uganda Country Programme of the Ecosystems Alliance is funded by Netherlands – the Royal Dutch Government through the Ecosystems Alliance, a consortium of three international NGOs namely, IUCN-NL, BothEnds and Wetlands International.

In Uganda, UWS and its other Ecosystems Alliance Country Programme partners- African Institute for Energy Governance (AFIEGO) and the National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE) are implementing interventions (capacity building, supply of

technologies, policy influence and building networks/bridging gaps) with local communities and institutions including local government. The goal of the Uganda country programme is to empower Albertine Rift communities and institutions for sustainable use and management of natural resources. For her part, UWS field activities are in Buliisa.

The other ongoing project of UWS, which started towards the end of 2013 is a conservation initiative aimed at identifying, piloting and scaling up appropriate strategies for human-wildlife conflicts around protected areas in Uganda. This project also intends to spar the emergence of commercially beneficial conservation enterprises supporting protected areas adjacent communities' livelihoods and promoting wildlife conservation in landscapes outside the protected areas. Data collection for analysis to generate information to guide the detailed project design for the wildlife human conflict management project started in December 2013 in the Districts of Tororo, Busia, Bugiri/Namayingo, around the West Bugwe Forest Reserve and the Lake Victoria Shores. More data will be collected from Kasese, Hoima and Buliisa Districts around the Queen Elisabeth National Park, Kaiso Tonya, Lake Albert, Murchison Falls and the Bugungu Wildlife Reserve, in the first quarter of 2014.

Also supported by Ecosystems Alliance and in part by the Uganda Wildlife Authority, UWS is partnering with Uganda Wildlife Authority in the wildlife – human conflict management pilot initiatives. The long-term expected outputs of this project will include conservation models for adoption in policy and promotion for practice in the country, purposely for the attainment of a vision - wildlife and humans in mutually beneficial co-existence/harmony.

In 2013, Uganda Wildlife Society entered into a collaboration engagement with Caritas Hoima Catholic Diocese Development Association and modalities are being followed for long term joint engagements in conservation works of mutual interest to the parties. The collaboration kick started with a joint research investigating the tenure system most Ugandans would want for land resources in the country.

Over the last 10 years, the society has implemented a number of projects in different geographical locations in Uganda. Some of the projects that UWS implemented in the recent past are as shown in *Table 1* below.

**Table 1: Current and accomplished projects managed by UWS in the period 2003-2015**

Period	Project	Geographical location	Funder/Donor	Level of funding (UGX)	Duration
2011-2015	Ecosystems Alliance (EA)	Buliisa District, Western Uganda	The Netherlands government through IUCN-NL, Both ENDS and Wetlands International	606,345,384	3.5 years
2008-2013	Community Based Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity (COBWEB)	Isingiro and Rakai districts South Western Uganda	GEF/UNDP & GOU	198,865,494	5 years
2011-2012	The Nakasongola district Climate Change Pilot project	Nakasongola district, Central Uganda	Rufford Foundation	6,239,000	12 months
2005-2008 2011-2012	Conserving biodiversity in the modernized farmed landscapes of Uganda	In the Banana coffee zones of Uganda (districts in Central Uganda)	Cambridge Conservation Initiative through the British Trust for Ornithology	114,612,211 29,899,770	4.5 years
Mar – Sept 2006	Promoting equitable & fair distribution of resources from wildlife, forestry and mineral sectors in Uganda	Albertine Region	WRI (UNEP GRID ARENDAL)	36,400,000	7 months
Mar –Dec 2009	Enhancing appreciation for communication of Environmental issues in Uganda’s legislature	Uganda Parliament	UNEP GRID ARENDAL	43,383,528	9 months
Mar 2009- Jan 2010	Supporting a regional Civil Society coalition on advocating for good governance in mining and extraction	The entire country	Ecosystems Grant Programme (EGP)	113,859,900	10 months
2011-2012	Uganda Forest Working Group (UFWG-IYF)	Central Uganda	Environmental Alert	13,446,000	5 months
2010-2011	Oil and Gas for Development	Kampala	WWF	8,700,000	1 year
April-Aug 2010	Adapting to climate change in Kanungu District	Kanungu	APE	12,000,000	5 months
<b>Total</b>				<b>1,183,751,287</b>	

## **The UWS Department of Research and Development**

The department of Research and Development is largely responsible for developing and implementing activities towards the achievement of society objectives on knowledge generation, field projects demonstrating linkages between conservation and people's livelihoods as well as, advocacy and policy influence. The department has 3 departmental units, namely:

1. Research and Conservation
2. Policy and advocacy, and
3. Community development and social works

The objectives of the department of Research and Development feeding into the UWS 2013-2018 Strategic Plan include:

1. Mobilize fund for and Undertake research, document lessons and experiences on conservation on environment and wildlife resources management and use policies and or conservation practices in Uganda
2. Synthesize and share information from UWS and other experts to elicit debate and create awareness and influence environment and wildlife resources management and use policies and or conservation practices in Uganda.
3. Based on knowledge, lessons and experience from UWS research on environment and wildlife resources management and use policies and or conservation practices in Uganda, design and implement community initiatives that demonstrate the linkages between conservation and livelihoods.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **THE 2013 WORKS**

#### **2.1 The works**

This section of the report highlights the works implemented under the UWS Department of Research and Development in research, policy dialogues and advocacy work, conservation initiatives (trainings and technology transfer) and publications between January and December 2013.

#### **Research**

A total of three (3) researches were conducted covering natural resources use and management issues on forests, wildlife, fisheries, oil, land and wetlands. The department attained the targeted for the year under this strategic programme. More data is still available for analysis and publication on parks, fisheries, oil, land and wetlands.

The research focused on;

1. Status and governance of natural resources, a case study in Buliisa district in the Albertine Rift Region
2. Elucidating the tenure systems most Ugandans would want for land resources
3. Understanding and Piloting strategies for community participation in management of wildlife outside Protected Areas in Eastern Uganda.

The research generated knowledge that the Society used to design and implement strategies for her advocacy, policy influence and conservation initiatives.

#### **Policy Dialogues and advocacy**

Five policy dialogues were convened internally and four external dialogues through collaboration. Overall, the Society achieved fully its target on policy dialogues in 2013 and with meaningful advocacy impacts. These dialogues were key platforms for sharing research findings and information from on-going conservation initiatives to over 1200 stakeholders coming from the private sector, the academia policy makers, government conservation agencies, local

governments, ministries and the general public. The stakeholders were engaged in debates while analyzing, criticizing and suggesting views for a range of conservation policies and practices now in prevalent in the Country. Focus was made on Forestry, Wildlife, Wetlands, Biodiversity Conservation in Landscapes outside Protected Areas and Waste Management and in all these policy dialogues, the Society advocated for strategies that will enable sustainable use and management of Uganda's Natural Resources. The dialogue themes covered in 2013 included;

- i. How Best Can Uganda's Wildlife and Communities Adjacent to Protected Areas Co-Exist in Harmony?" This was held at Hotel Africana on the 20<sup>th</sup> of February 2013.
- ii. Community Perceptions; the Status of Forests and Forest Governance in Buliisa District" was held in Buliisa on the 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013.
- iii. Human activities in wetlands are possible without degradation" was held at St. Lawrence Crown city campus on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2013.
- iv. Status of Forests and Forest Governance in Uganda" was held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2013 at Makerere University School of Forestry.
- v. Waste dumping in forests around the country

The following dialogues were convened in 2013 through UWS external collaboration and engagements with other stakeholders;

- i. National High Level Conference on Oil Issues in Uganda and the Great Lakes Region. The conference was held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2013, at Hotel Africana The conference was organized by AFIEGO & the Parliamentary Forum on Oil and Gas (PFOG) in partnership with NAPE, UWS, GRA, ECO, CCG and WVU.
- ii. The Ministry of Water and Environment Annual Joint Sector Review 2013
- iii. The CSCO Policy and Advocacy Engagements on Oil Issues in 2013 20
- iv. The ENR CSOs Network and NEMA climate Change Workshop in 2013

## **Advocacy**

The department achieved two resource access Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) and one evidence-based advocacy engagement in the year 2013. The Society facilitated the successful

signing of two resource access MoUs through which local communities obtained resource access rights. The MoUs signed were;

1. Between Fisher folk and the Beach Management Units (BMUs), capturing regulated fishing, protection of fish breeding grounds and promoting the use of legal fishing gears by the fishing communities in Lake Albert.
2. Memorandum of Understanding between Can Uwodha and Bubwe United Bee Keepers' Groups, and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) for regulated access to Bugungu wildlife reserve to carry out apiary.

The evidence-based advocacy the society facilitated was on Forest Governance, – the Role of Civil Society and the Academia on the occasion of the International Year of Forests Celebration in March 2013.

Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Pastoralists and crop farmers and MoU between Oil Companies and Oil dependent/affected communities are still being negotiated with the Government offices; Oil companies asked for the Ministry of Energy to approve the MoUs before they can sign and UWS is still negotiating with the Ministry for the Purpose. The Ministry Fears that the Oil Companies will seek to recover any costs they incur in their engagement with the communities, from the Government. Crop farmers and pastoralists have signed their MoU but the district (the CAO, the CDO and the Livestock Officers) are yet to append their signatures to complete the processes.

### **Conservation initiatives**

Under conservation initiatives, in 2013 the department planned to implement at least 9 capacity building and technology supply/demonstrations/interventions with at least 1,206 households and in 717 hectares of privately owned land. The interventions were all aimed at enhancing capacity for sustainable use and management of natural resources. Overall, seven of the nine target conservation initiatives interventions (an achievement at the level of 77.8%) were implemented in 2013. However, the department performed below average in terms of landscape coverage, where only 40.5 hectares were planted with trees out of the 717 hectares of privately owned land

targeted (achievement 6% level). In general, the results here indicate that, while the Society performed well on the number of capacity building trainings, technology supply and the landscape impact were minimal and consequently effort will be made in 2014 to attain the Society conservation initiatives outreach targets to beneficiaries and impact at landscape level originally planned for.

*a) Technology transfer and supply*

In bid to demonstrate the linkage between conservation and livelihoods, UWS, through the department of Research and Development supplied and transferred 3 technologies to local communities in 2013. These included;

About 17,258 seedlings have been planted by households, large private land owners and schools from Buliisa. Only 40.5 hectares were planted with trees out of the 717 hectares of privately owned land targeted (6% achievement level). This was due to germination failures of seeds planted to raise the tree seedlings for planting in the first season of the year- at the beginning of the Society interventions in the operation areas. In particular the Society needs to raise about 93,000 tree seedlings in the first half of 2014 to plant in the remaining hectares of privately owned lands and among over 350 households who registered for technology adoption under Society Conservation initiatives.

Eight Beach Management Units (BMUs), including Kabolwa, Karakaba, Bugoigo, Piida A, Piida B, Walukuba, Nyamukunta and Kalolo each supplied with legal fishing gears including 51 pieces of fishing nets and 20 spools. UWS introduced the Saving – Revolving fund among the fisher folks, which is emerging from the Beach Management Units that received Nets from UWS, this is a promising sustainability strategy for the fisher folk to continue buying and using standard nets when the ones supplied by the Society get worn out.

Beekeeping equipments were supplies to the Can uwodha group. They equipments included; a smoker, 2 KTB- hives, 1 Overall bee suit and 1 air tight bucket for demonstrations.

### *b) Trainings*

Beneficiary outreach target for the capacity building trainings and technology supply was average, the society managed to deliver to only 435 out of the targeted 830 households (an achievement at 52% level). Four capacity building trainings were conducted among local communities. They included;

1. Thirty two (32) members of Can uwodha and Bubwe United bee keeping groups, were trained on basic bee keeping techniques.
2. Thirty five (35) Livestock farmers were trained on forage conservation, milk handling and pasture improvement
3. REDD+ Capacity building training conducted among Five CSOs in Buliisa together with 25 change agents and given extensions manuals on the same. On, REDD Capacity Building trainings and linkages; the five CSOs (Soft Power Education, Buliisa Initiative for Rural Development Organization, Kalolo Fisher Men and Fish Mongers Association, Kakindo Orphans Care, Buliisa Catholic Women's Association ) together with 25 change agents (five of each representing the Fisher folk, crop farmers, pastoralists, oil dependent and or affected communities and Wildlife resource dependent households) and the district technical officials (Environment, forestry, natural resources, livestock, production, community development, the Chief administrative officer, the local council five chairperson and others) were trained on REDD and given extensions manuals on the same. The Society also engaged the trainees and they developed the Buliisa REDD strategy. The trained team was also linked to the National REDD focal Point and will be engaged in the National REDD processes when the country starts implementing it's REDD activities.
4. Awareness raising on waste disposal in Mabira

### **Publications in 2013**

The Society aimed to realize at least seven publications from her experiences, lessons and knowledge generated from research, advocacy, policy dialogues and conservation initiatives in

2013. Overall, eight publications were realized, an achievement at the level 100% of the target. The publications include one research report, three extension manuals, one policy brief, two lessons learned publications and Newsletter (4 Issues). The publications are under external review now and include the following;

**Priscilla Nyadoi.**, Moses Murungi., Balikenda Naphtali., Suzan Owino., Laster Stoney Ogolla., Teddy Namirimu., Joel Buyinza and Charles Walaga, 2013. Community Perceptions, the Status of Forests and Forest Governance in Buliisa District.

**Rashid Mubiru** ., Teddy Namirimu., Louis Kyalingonza., Suzan Owino., Priscilla Nyadoi and Joel Buyinza. 2013. From Extensive to Semi-intensive Livestock Production Systems in Uganda's Albertine Rift: Practical Interventions Manual. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 3, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

**Teddy Namirumu**, Suzan Owino., Anne B. Ainembabazi., Lastor Stoney Ogola., Joel Buyinza and, Priscilla Nyadoi 2013. Protected Areas and Conservation Concerns in Uganda, Reviews, Stakeholders' Perspectives and Recommendations for Policy. Uganda Wildlife Society Policy Brief 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

**Alex B. Muhweezi**, Joel Buyinza and Priscilla Nyadoi, 2013. Enabling Albertine Rift Communities Understand and Benefit from Uganda's REDD PROCESS, a Strategy for Sustainable Natural Resource Use and Management. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 1, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

**Alex B. Muhweezi**, Joel Buyinza and Priscilla Nyadoi, 2013. Enabling Albertine Rift Communities and Institutions Understand and Benefit from Uganda's REDD Process. Strategy for Engagement with Government Led REDD+ Process, the Case of Buliisa District. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 2, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

**Joel Buyinza.**, Suzan Owino, Louis Kyalingonza., Priscilla Nyadoi and Teddy Namirimu, 2013. Empowering Communities for Sustainable Use and Management of Natural Resources; Experiences and Lessons from Buliisa District in the Albertine Rift Region, Uganda. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 4, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

**UWS** 2013. Promoting Sustainable Use and Management of Uganda's Wildlife and Environment, Lessons and Experiences from Uganda Wildlife Society Conservation Works in 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Documentary 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS**

#### **3.1 Experiences and Lessons**

The following lessons and experiences were drawn from the departmental works on research, conservation initiatives and policy dialogues and advocacy programmes of the Society;

- UWS interventions have raised sensitivity/environmental awareness among stakeholders and communities, now over 10 CSOs are collaborating with UWS on a number of environmental activities. These include; Buliisa Environmental and Private Forest Owners Association, Buliisa Community Integrated Development Organisation, Buliisa Environmental and Humanity Organisation, Kabolwa Agro-Environmental Protection Group, Albertine Nature Conservation Network and others
- Local community participation and coordination is desirable. Creating opportunities for local community participation enables them to understand that the interventions are for the good of the communities and not the implementing NGO.
- Building on existing traditional knowledge and innovations satisfies local community expectations and provides the basis for addressing emerging challenges. Local communities always have their own locally developed strategies for overcoming the challenges they encounter.
- Identification of project partners and their roles facilitates stakeholder participation. It is important to define the roles and responsibilities of project partners at the start of the project.
- Trainings empower communities to demand for their rights. Local communities obtain relevant knowledge through capacity building trainings.
- An integration of short and long term-impact interventions is desirable. Local communities are usually more interested in short-term impact project interventions in their area.

- It is important to deeply engage local communities in identifying their needs and solutions to their needs even when the issues are environmental in nature.
- Having and involving as many stakeholders as possible in project interventions is important for sustainability and success. In conservation it is vital to bring all relevant stakeholders on board and once this has been done right at the initial stages of environmental programmes development, it is generally easy to gain consensus, identify and implement solutions fast enough to minimize conflicts and, achieve environmental well being and livelihoods benefits.
- People generally willingly accept and adopt technologies to protect the environment and attain sustainable use and management of natural resources once, sufficient knowledge of the conservation concerns have been shared with them, and they have been deeply involved in identifying solutions to the concerns.

## **CHAPER FOUR**

### **CHALLENGES**

#### **4.1 The Challenges**

##### **1) Community expectation of handouts**

Local communities expected to receive hand outs from the project, a common practice of most NGOs that have worked in Buliisa. However, local communities were sensitized on the best approach to project implementation. Uganda Wildlife Society (UWS) implements her projects through meaningful stakeholder participation and project demonstrations that trigger local communities to appreciate and adopt technologies and practices.

##### **2) Land tenure and livestock grazing system**

The EA-project involves setting up demonstrations but the current communal land tenure system coupled with the extensive free range raring of livestock in Buliisa are a big hindrance to project demonstrations. Land belongs to everyone and therefore one can graze from anywhere they wish to. In a bid to control the challenge, UWS works with communal land associations and local leaders to ensure safety of demonstration sites.

##### **3) Cross border natural resource use and management**

The Albert Nile is shared between Uganda and DR Congo and this has compromised EA-Project interventions among fishing communities. For example the fishing communities in Uganda would want to have fishing holidays which the fishers in DR Congo may not adhere to. This will frustrate the Ugandan fishing communities. As a starting point, UWS has conducted trainings that have been attended by some fishermen from DR Congo along Piida B Booma landing site. The assumption is that these fishermen will initiate similar interventions on the DR Congo side of the Nile.

##### **4) National processes**

The slow national processes such as the National REDD process affected UWS REDD+ advancement with the five CSOs and change agents trained to engage in the National process and

promote the same among communities in the district. However, local communities are willing to plant trees for other purposes, other than for REDD+. They are also willing to offer demonstration sites in case the National process materialises. The REDD+ concept was only introduced to local communities and farther engagements await the progress of the national REDD+ strategy.

#### **5) The Bureaucratic approach of oil companies**

The project has encountered significant hindrances to approach and establish working relations with oil companies, who are key stakeholders to the project. This has been in part due to lack of knowledge on the companies procedures. UWS is now in touch with the Petroleum Exploration and Production Department (PEPD), the leading government agency of all the oil companies operating in Uganda under the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development.

#### **6) Harsh climatic conditions and low viability of seeds**

UWS raised fewer tree seedlings than it had planned due to the poor quality seeds procured in the first batch of the purchase and unfavorable climatic conditions in the Society operational areas. However the batch that followed achieved an 80% viability and survival rate. UWS had anticipated raising at least 30,000 tree seedlings, but was able to raise only 17,000 seedlings in 2013.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Recommendations**

- Capacity building processes should integrate all stakeholders, ranging from local government technical and political officials and other relevant stakeholders, particularly the beneficiaries (local communities). These should be informed by systematically conducted capacity needs assessments such as self-evaluations to establish capacity gaps.
  
- The project implementing institutions can always enter into revenue sharing agreements with communities and resource managers, as a financial sustainability strategy for the institution. An example is revenue sharing with local communities and Uganda Wildlife Authority in community tourism enterprises.
  
- Conservation NGOs should always scale down the extent of initial project demonstrations in the field to facilitate learning and adoption of the technologies before scaling up. The demonstrations should only act as a trigger for local communities, conservation agencies and other stakeholders to learn from and these can then scale up the demonstrations. Other interventions, such as REDD+, that are hindered by national processes should be carried out on a small scale as the project awaits completion of such a national process.
  
- To address forest governance problems, meaningful community participation in the resource management and use is paramount. There is need for implementation of an outreach programme aimed at educating communities about existing fora, guidelines and, policy and legal framework/provisions for resource access, benefit from and participation in forest management. The outreach programme to be employed must have a well designed strategy that will meet the capacity building needs for both the educated and none educated members of the communities.
  
- Extensive wetland depletion can be controlled through massive sensitization on the importance of wetlands to all stakeholders as provided for by the Uganda National

Wetlands Policy, 1995. School clubs such as the Wildlife clubs of Uganda can be a good avenue for sensitizing masses in schools. Provision of alternative sources of livelihood options instead of relying on wetlands alone, for example through community tourism. Swamps must be allowed to re-grow naturally. The government should strengthen the legislation against swamps and wetland reclamation. There should be detailed Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Monitoring for all proposed modifications and restorations of any wetland.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **WHAT EXPERIENCES, LESSONS, CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **MEAN TO DIFFERENT STAKE HOLDERS**

##### **6.1 What the experiences, lessons, challenges and recommendations mean to;**

###### **Conservation NGOs**

Policy influence and advocacy should be evidence-based backed by well researched scientific information to inform policy makers. Additionally, capacity building processes should integrate all stakeholders, ranging from local government technical and political officials and other relevant stakeholders, particularly the beneficiaries (local communities). These should be informed by systematically conducted capacity needs assessments such as self-evaluations to establish capacity gaps.

###### **Conservation Agencies**

In conservation it is vital to bring all relevant stakeholders on board and once this has been done right at the initial stages of environmental programmes development, it is generally easy to gain consensus, identify and implement solutions fast enough to minimize conflicts and, achieve environmental well being and livelihoods benefits. People generally willingly accept and adopt technologies to protect the environment once sufficient knowledge of the conservation concerns have been shared with them, and have been deeply involved in identifying solutions to the concerns.

###### **Local governments**

Local governments usually introduce new technologies and practices among local communities without extensive capacity building and integration of existing traditional knowledge in government programmes. Building on existing traditional knowledge and innovations satisfies local community expectations and provides the basis for addressing emerging challenges. Local communities always have their own locally developed strategies for overcoming the challenges they encounter.

## **Ministries**

Ministries need to recognize the role of the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in empowering local communities and the benefits of meaningful partnerships and collaboration with the private sector for sustainable natural resource use and management. Conservation NGOs usually set up project demonstrations in the field to only facilitate learning and adoption of the technologies. Such demonstrations should only act as a trigger for local communities, conservation agencies and other stakeholders to learn from and these can then scale up the demonstrations.

## **Policy makers**

Conservation programmes and policies need be designed only after sufficient information have been available to all the relevant stakeholders, the stakeholders have been exhaustively involved in problem analysis and identification of solutions using scientific approaches and the designed programmes and policies must have room for all the relevant stakeholders continuous involvement in implementation and benefit sharing.

## **Donors**

The donors should be flexible with their terms and conditions attached to grants to Civil Society Organizations. There are cases that warrant change of project design and or focus to suit the prevailing local conditions and community priority interventions. Community priority interventions usually emanate from the initial needs assessment which most times takes place after signing project contracts with strict terms and conditions.

## REFERENCES

- Alex B. Muhweezi, Joel Buyinza and Priscilla Nyadoi, 2013. Enabling Albertine Rift Communities Understand and Benefit from Uganda's REDD PROCESS, a Strategy for Sustainable Natural Resource Use and Management. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 1, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.
- Alex B. Muhweezi, Joel Buyinza and Priscilla Nyadoi, 2013. Enabling Albertine Rift Communities and Institutions Understand and Benefit from Uganda's REDD Process. Strategy for Engagement with Government Led REDD+ Process, the Case of Buliisa District. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 2, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.
- Joel Buyinza., Suzan Owino, Louis Kyalingonza., Priscilla Nyadoi and Teddy Namirimu, 2013. Empowering Communities for Sustainable Use and Management of Natural Resources; Experiences and Lessons from Buliisa District in the Albertine Rift Region, Uganda. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 4, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.
- Priscilla Nyadoi., Moses Murungi., Balikenda Naphtali., Suzan Owino., Laster Stoney Ogolla., Teddy Namirimu., Joel Buyinza and Charles Walaga, 2013. Community Perceptions, the Status of Forests and Forest Governance in Buliisa District.
- Rashid Mubiru ., Teddy Namirimu., Louis Kyalingonza., Suzan Owino., Priscilla Nyadoi and Joel Buyinza. 2013. From Extensive to Semi-intensive Livestock Production Systems in Uganda's Albertine Rift: Practical Interventions Manual. Uganda Wildlife Society Technical Series Number 3, 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.
- Teddy Namirumu, Suzan Owino., Anne B. Ainembabazi., Lastor Stoney Ogola., Joel Buyinza and, Priscilla Nyadoi 2013. Protected Areas and Conservation Concerns in Uganda, Reviews, Stakeholders' Perspectives and Recommendations for Policy. Uganda Wildlife Society Policy Brief 2013. Uganda Wildlife Society, Kampala Uganda.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix I: Pictorial department activities in 2013

#### a) Policy dialogues



Left is Dr. John Makombo, Director of Conservation, Uganda Wildlife Authority giving his presentation at the Uganda Wildlife Society Public Policy Dialogue held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2013 at Hotel Africana. Right is Mr. Joel Buyinza, Project Officer – validating UWS findings during Uganda Wildlife Society Public Policy Dialogue held on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September 2013 in Buliisa Community Hall.

#### b) Advocacy



On the left, Chairperson Karakaba BMU signing the MoU after revision between the BMU and fisher folk; On the right, Walukuba fisher group receiving a set of legal fishing nets plus spools from UWS, as a way of implementing article 5 (on the use of legal fishing gears and methods) of the signed MoU.

c) *Technology transfer and supply*



*Left:* Kawiabanda Communal Land Association members - One of the 16 beneficiaries under the 750Ha large privately owned land UWS is demonstrating technologies for sustainable water and land resource use and management. *Right:* UWS staff Ms.Teddy Namirimu handing over bee keeping equipments to Can Uwodha bee keepers group at Bugungu Wildlife Reserve camp.

d) *Trainings*



*Left:* Mr. Moses Tusabe demonstrating to bee keepers basic techniques in bee keeping. This was during a capacity building training for Bubwe and Can Uwodha bee keeping groups conducted in Bubwe Apiary located at the buffer zone of Bugungu Wildlife Reserve. *Right:* Dr. Rashid Mubiru training Buliisa livestock farmers forage conservation and other technologies to enable them shift from extensive to semi intensive livestock production system



A section of the change agents (*Left*) and other participants (*Right*) attending the REDD training in the community hall, Buliisa Town Council on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2013