

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	Sustaining Community Participation in Collaborative Forest Management in central Uganda
RSG reference	1111-C
Reporting period	2017 – 2018 (Completion Period)
Amount of grant	£14,995
Your email address	rkatebaka@afruc.org and katebakaraymond@yahoo.com Raymond.katebaka@gmail.com
Date of this report	9 th February, 2018

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 increase livelihood opportunities for communities involved in Collaborative Forest Management (CFM)				The project procured beehives, supported establishment of additional seedbeds, trained community members in tourist guiding around Mpanga CFR, for the communities. Some of these will generate livelihoods for communities in the long term. Some of the expected achievements were not realised in a period of one year. (It's a challenge that some implemented activities lead to new demands by communities). Any activity implemented to foster livelihood will meet complexities and thus will hardly be fully achieved as this always requires satisfaction of communities yet financial resources are limited.
To facilitate capacity building for stakeholders in Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)				More activities than those proposed were undertaken in project area, local government institutions and in the National Forest Authority (NFA). There is now no doubt that SFM is the best management practice and approach to safeguard forests and their biodiversity.
To promote forest biodiversity conservation through CFM best practices				This was fully achieved by having community acceptance to engage in multiple activities that involve biodiversity conservation such as beehives in the CFM components saves the highly threatened pollinator, protecting valuable plant species e.g. medicinal plants to mention a few. The result is that communities have taken over collaborative management with government agency.

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

The unforeseen difficulty was caused by involvement of forest agency officials at every level of implementing project activities. This also resulted in some activities not being completed on time. The project team responded by adjusting the budget proposed for items and made inclusions where it was observed necessary. It was also envisaged that the agency's official presence would make strong collaborative responses. Other unforeseen difficulties included;

- Difficulty in communication between project team and the agency yet progress required timely official responses. Whereas a number of requests, issues and concerns were made they took a long time to be considered. Meetings were held with agency field officers to tackle the difficulties.
- New community groups that were brought on board to join CFM associations and this introduced unexpected behaviour(s) of demanding financial support. Their expectations included to be given the project funds directly. Several negotiations and awareness raising events were organised to arrive at a mutual understanding.

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

There were several outcomes however the following were key:

- 1) The forest adjacent communities now implement forest enterprise activities that benefit them in terms of livelihoods such as more seedbeds nearby main highway are accessible by passers by and procure seedlings from community initiatives.
- 2) There are capacities now among the CFM association members and the entire community that depend on the forest resources for provisioning to negotiate their roles, rights and responsibilities to arrive at the expected returns from conservation efforts around the forest reserves.
- 3) Policy level involvement was another outstanding outcome that their engagement in the national dialogue proposed to prepare a policy brief. The draft policy brief has been prepared and sent for review in the related ministry and School of Forestry and Environment Studies, Makerere University.

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

The communities through their CFM associations were highly involved. First of all the project team was mainly involved in leadership, administration, training and advice. Most of other activities were left for communities to lead themselves which culminated into owning the results. The project team provided finances to the communities to procure tree seeds, facilitate meals during working days and maintenance of the seed bed subsequently. These eventuated into direct involvement in the project and increased a level of bio-rights hence beneficial to communities adjacent CFRs and the country as a whole. There were various

workshops involved in locally at the forest level with communities, their representatives travelled with the project team for strategic meetings with the District Local Government Committees. Hence the project contributed directly to raise local awareness on the importance of forest conservation. In addition, field activities involved extensive engagements by local villagers in the various tasks.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes. To foster continuity of the project a proposal "*Towards enhancing conservation efforts needed to create a better future of forests*" and additionally specific application to Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund titled "*Managing Forest Biodiversity Redlist Species in central Uganda*" have been prepared. Among the project team Godfrey Tumuhairwe and Phionah Kansiime may team up to start a new application with RSG.

At the time of compiling this project report one of the major output a CFM agreement was not yet signed. This was because the communities are still negotiating agreement conditions that will safeguard forests and their biodiversity in the region for sustainability purpose. Sustainability will require a strategic collaborative project that is being developed by AUC and School of Forestry at Makerere University to sustain the project.

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

The project "*Sustaining Community Participation in Collaborative Forest Management in central Uganda*" was voted the best implemented and presented project in Eastern Africa RSG conference organised in Uganda during January 2018. During this event, the project received a trophy from Grants Director of RSG Josh Cole. This is likely to increase on wide sharing on the RSG website respectively.

Throughout 2017 in numerous meetings where AUC was required to make a communication about forests and their biodiversity the project results were shared. They include dialogues, workshops, and conferences among others. These were in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar, France and Italy. There several publications made and others in preparation. Among these there will be a You Tube documentary under editorial currently that will be shared in related institutions including RSG once completed. Some reports have already been shared with RSG in the progress report during the project implementation period. Other forms of sharing included disseminating through AUC website (www.afruc.org) progressively.

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

The Rufford Foundation grant was used from 24th January 2017 – 28th January 2018. The anticipated time of the project would have been implemented over 2 years.

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
PRA workshops among CFM leaders	2272	3343	1071	There was an increase on the proposed activities that were caused by more demands in communities. For example for added communities that were brought on board for inclusion onto the CFM associations. These workshops were combined with raising awareness activities as well.
Raising awareness in communities and Local Government at District		N/A	N/A	More expenses were incurred which included procuring tree seeds from the National Seed Centre at NFA Namanve. Originally this was not budgeted for, securing personnel to train communities. However to achieve on this, the team agreed to increase the item budget and reduce on those that were not a priority for the CFM activities.
Biodiversity conservation demonstration sites in CFM	1671	1671	0	There was no variation
Building capacity of communities & CFM working groups establishment	2463	3463	999	Increase in the number of communities that were added and demands that increased costs as well.
CFRs boundary management & design of community conservation methods	236	-236	-236	It was merged with other items e.g. raising awareness workshops
CFM conference (meals, teas and refreshments)	2956	2956	0	No addition that was made on this item
Radio Talk-show	479	-479	-479	This was merged with administration
Learning centre establishment and CFM rewards	520	-520	-520	This was merged with administration

CFM Documentary	1456	1456	0	Still under production
Publications and distributions	680			This was merged with administration
Project administration	651	1427	776	Upon receiving the funds, a meeting was organised between the project team and NFA the agency for forests management in Uganda as it also provided for in the MoU between AUC. The budgets for some items were merged in order to include the unforeseeable support actions. Some of these included the engagement and support of activities at the forest range level.
Transport and subsistence	510	0	-510	This was merged with administration
Car Hire	266	0	-266	The vehicles were hired occasionally when the events for example to meet district leaders along with the NFA officials. In this case it was realised that scaling down on individual expenses was more feasible hence reducing the individual team member travel simultaneously.

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

It is now clear that the team leader is synonymous with forest conservation through CFM in central Uganda. The team leader identified forest biodiversity and their habitat change around the project area. There is need for more support to address critical threats which have advanced as proved by scientific research for guiding conservation action in Uganda. From the national dialogue, a project theme was designed "*Towards enhancing conservation efforts needed to create a better future of forests*". It is now imperative to foster conservation investments in that theme development. Efforts in AUC are focussed on continuing this initiative further afield.

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?

The Rufford Foundation logo was used in all related project communications and also has been posted on the www.afruc.org AUC website throughout to demonstrate a strong support received in the past 9 years. The materials included fliers, posters, PowerPoint presentations contain RSG logo. The t-shirts and caps were embroidered with the RSG logo. This practices currently and highly visible in the project area, the documentary once completed will acknowledge the RSG financial support.

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

Phionah Kansime: played a bigger role in bringing communities closer to the project areas, instigated meetings between project team and NFA officials whenever the need arise. She gathered project information needed to prepare other applications at all involvements.

Reuben Katwinomugisha: worked closed in training and educating the communities and raising awareness in activities related with legal frameworks and forest resources utilisation around Ggangu Central Forest Reserves. Worked with the team leader to prepare the policy brief.

Marceline Kabanzira: a communication's officer at AUC responsible for all projects effective communication and trained communities on the increasing threats on the land in Uganda.

Godfrey Tumuhairwe: integrated the land use regional development and amplified urban sprawl as the expanding threat to protected forests and their biodiversity in the project.

12. Any other comments?

It is imperative that RSG considers to put in place a unique form of continuity grant to former grantees. It could be named "Sustainability grant" to support unique and interested emerging issues beyond completion. Perhaps, that may not be addressed by other funders (in case one fails to secure a grant somewhere else from other foundations). This Sustainability Grant could be implemented in 2 years with the sealing of about £30,000. The grant could be achieved through support for 2 years whereby year one RSG gives 50% and year two also 50% accordingly. This way conservation of biodiversity and community involvement is feasible. Or put in place of an award whereby that is given to one applicant per block e.g. Africa has about four blocks Eastern Africa, SADC, ECOWAS in that order to save species through the work of and effort of conservation scientist.