



Research to Policy Year 3 Planning Workshop

March 2014

Developing a Theory of Change for Improved Integrated Conservation and Development at Bwindi

Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (U-PCLG) met on 27-28th March 2014 to agree the Theory of Change activities that they will take forward during the final year of the project *Research to Policy: building capacity for conservation through poverty alleviation*. This report outlines their discussions and plans.

Research to Policy: building capacity for conservation through poverty alleviation is a three-year project (2012 to 2015) funded by the UK Government's Darwin Initiative with co-funding from UKaid from the UK Government. However, the views expressed do not necessary reflect those of the UK Government.



Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Workshop process.....	4
3. Summary	4
4. Discussion by outcome.....	5
4.1 More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities ..	5
4.2 Levels of Unresolved Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Reduced	7
4.3 More Jobs Filled by Local People.....	10
4.4 Better Access to Sustainable Resource Use Based on Needs.....	11
5. Work-plan	12
6. Support from ACODE	13
6.1 Advocacy skills training	13
6.2 Supporting U-PCLG members during their advocacy activities	13
Annex 1: Workshop Participants	16
Annex 2: R2P Work-plan April 2014 – March 2015	17

1. Introduction

Research to Policy: Conservation Through Poverty Alleviation (R2P) is a 3-year research and advocacy project funded by the UK Darwin Initiative and the UK Department for International Development (UKaid). The main project partners are the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Jane Goodall Institute Uganda (JGI), the Institute for Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC) and Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE). Using Bwindi Impenetrable National Park as a case study, the project entails a combined programme of research and capacity development of members of the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (U-PCLG) in order to impact policy and practice in the following areas:

- Improved research capabilities for evaluating success and limitations of Integrated Conservation and Development (ICD) interventions in linking conservation with poverty alleviation;
- Improved targeting of ICD interventions for more significant development impacts and more effective conservation;
- Improved resource allocation for conservation and development priorities;
- Improved national and local policy on protected area management and poverty links.

The research phase of the project concluded in September 2013 with the 2-day 'Final Research Phase Workshop' in Kampala.¹ The workshop was convened by U-PCLG and involved the project team, Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and key policy-makers with an interest in ICD. Workshop participants developed a Theory of Change for improved ICD at Bwindi, which was based on the research findings and focussed on the perspective of local people. The Theory of Change comprised five outcomes (Box 1), each with indicators and activities that could potentially be pursued by U-PCLG, either as a group or by individual members, in the final year of R2P. The next step for U-PCLG members was to meet to discuss the indicators and activities, prioritise those they consider are achievable within the final year of the R2P project (April 2014 – March 2015), identify capacity building needs, and agree a programme of capacity building that will be led by ACODE.

Box 1. Outcomes of the Theory of Change for improved ICD at Bwindi focusing on the perspective of local people

- More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities
- More Jobs Filled by Local People
- Levels of Unresolved Human Wildlife Conflict Reduced
- Better Access to Sustainable Resource Use Based on Needs
- Improved Access to Social Services and Infrastructure

Given time and resource constraints the planning workshop reported here focused on the first four of these outcomes as being the outcomes of greatest relevance to a range of PCLG members.

¹ IIED (2013) Final Research Phase Workshop. 17-18th September 2013, Kampala, Uganda. Event Report <http://pubs.iied.org/G03708>

2. Workshop process

The U-PCLG convened a R2P Planning Workshop in Kampala, Uganda, on 27-28th March 2014. The aims were for U-PCLG members to agree the Theory of Change activities that U-PCLG (either as a group or individual members) will take forward during the final year of R2P, and to identify the associated training needs for ACODE's capacity building programme. The meeting was facilitated by IIED and attended by a substantial number of U-PCLG members including the Chief Warden of Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (see Annex 1).

The Planning Workshop started with an overview of the key R2P research findings and the four outcomes of the Theory of Change. The overview emphasised that ICD is not a generalised poverty alleviation programme but rather a series of interventions targeted to specific community groups in a way that achieves conservation, maximises conservation-development synergies and contributes towards poverty alleviation.

Over the course of the workshop, participants divided into four groups (one group per outcome of the Theory of Change) to discuss the following: the most relevant R2P research findings; lessons learnt from elsewhere in Uganda and Africa; strengths and weaknesses of existing interventions; whether indicators identified at the Final Research Phase Workshop were relevant; and, whether new indicators should be added. When a final list of indicators had been agreed, participants voted on the indicators that they wished to pursue during the final year of R2P. Voting was based on indicators that could be achieved within the final year and those that would have a conservation impact by contributing towards poverty alleviation in target communities. The last stage of the workshop was for participants to agree on a work plan to achieve each indicator, which included responsibilities, timeframes and capacity-building needs.

This report first presents a summary of the workshop output (section 3). In section 4 this report then documents discussions on strengths and weaknesses of existing approaches and all indicators that U-PCLG members identified for the Theory of Change. Finally, the work plans that U-PCLG members developed are presented in Section 5.

3. Summary

At the end of the R2P Planning Workshop, U-PCLG members had selected the specific indicators to pursue during the final year of R2P in order to best achieve the outcomes of the R2P Theory of Change (see Table 1).

It is important to note the close relationship between the strategies (and thus indicators) for the first and second outcomes. In essence the discussion of human-wildlife conflict concluded that the best way to address this conflict (and broader issues of resentment to which this conflict contributes) within the timeframe of this project is to more effectively target revenue sharing benefits to the people most affected by wildlife crop damage rather than direct efforts to reduce crop damage.

Table 1. Outcomes and indicators of the Theory of Change for improved ICD at Bwindi selected by U-PCLG members

Outcome	More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities
Indicators	<p>Increased community share of the gorilla permit fees</p> <p>Increased, more inclusive (involving Batwa, other marginalised groups) household-level participation in identification of priority projects to be funded by revenue share</p> <p>Community-based monitoring of revenue sharing is revived and with necessary information on funds available, funding criteria etc</p>
Outcome	Levels of Unresolved Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Reduced
Indicators	An established monitoring mechanism on the extent that Revenue Sharing reduces HWC that is formally endorsed by UWA, local government and local communities
Outcome	More Jobs Filled by Local People
Indicators	<p>A clear understanding among key stakeholders (PCLG, UWA, private sector, communities, Local Government, local civil society) of the local employment situation at Bwindi</p> <p>A platform for local civil society to dialogue and engage with NRM/conservation stakeholders (employers and potential employees) to advocate for local employment opportunities and higher quality of tourism products and services</p>
Outcome	Better Access to Sustainable Resource Use Based on Needs
Indicators	Increased harvest quota and frequency of existing resources that local people can sustainably harvest under MUP

4. Discussion by outcome

4.1 More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities

The R2P research revealed that resentment by local people over the way in which revenue sharing is implemented is an important driver of unauthorised resource use. This resentment arises from local people's perceptions of the mismanagement of funds and the inequity of funding distribution: local people reported that most revenue sharing funds are 'lost' when passing through government and that people suffering from crop raiding never receive benefits from revenue sharing.

A lessons learnt review of revenue sharing at Bwindi illustrated the change in the types of projects funded from community-based projects (e.g. schools) to individual household projects (e.g. tree planting), which was undertaken in response to feedback from local communities and to make closer links between revenue sharing and national park conservation. The review also illustrated challenges to implementation, which included the limited involvement by local communities in the decision-making process, delays in the disbursement of funds and ensuring that frontline communities benefit from revenue sharing. Discussion on these challenges highlighted that key weaknesses of revenue sharing included elite capture, a lack of transparency on the tendering process and distribution of funds, and a lack of monitoring and evaluation (see Box 2). Following the discussion, U-PCLG members identified nine indicators to achieve the outcome 'More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities'. They then selected three indicators to pursue during the next year of the R2P project (Box 3).

Box 2: Weaknesses of existing revenue sharing interventions and UWA's new revenue sharing strategy

- Coordination challenges that may come with working with several stakeholders – on overall coordination mechanism
- Lack of information at community level including criteria to ensure conservation and development impact
- UWA does not hold local government accountable for use of funds its UWA'S money
- Lack of monitoring – UWA should ask local government for monitoring information. UWA has no funds for monitoring
- Linking revenue sharing to conservation performance eg levels of illegal activities
- Law – constraint that all RS funds must go through local government (now is the time to work on the law)
- Project selection decision-making process at village level:
Elite capture and exclusion of the poor - 1/3 of community structures should be women; but insist that they have to be able read and write English
Batwa will miss out as guidelines do not make explicit targeting of such groups
Political entrepreneurship like to resurface as the entry point are LCs
- Lack of clear and appropriate project selection criteria at village level – park specific operational guidelines

Box 3: Indicators for 'More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities

Indicators selected by U-PCLG members to pursue

- Increased community share of the gorilla permit fee
- Increased, more inclusive (involving Batwa, other marginalised groups) household-level participation in identification of priority projects to be funded by revenue share
- Community-based monitoring of RS is reviewed and with necessary information on funds available, funding criteria etc

Other indicators identified by U-PCLG members

- Community share of park entrance fees increases
- Increased local procurement by tourism operators
- Villages are well informed on what RS funds have been released, objectives etc
- RS monitoring mechanism in place and operational in local governments of Bwindi
- Mechanism for making RS more conservation performance based
- Increased transparency in project selection at community level

4.2 Levels of Unresolved Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Reduced

There were two key R2P research findings that are most relevant to HWC. First, resentment by local people over HWC is a primary driver of unauthorised resource use. Local people's resentment arises from a lack of support to prevent crop raiding by wild animals, poor targeting of revenue sharing funds (because those suffering from crop raiding were not benefitting from revenue sharing), and the mismanagement of revenue sharing funds (as most of the funding does not reach the village level). Second, local people reported that crop raiding by wild animals exacerbated the poverty issues that they face, which in turn results in more people seeking resources from the national park for subsistence needs and livelihood security. Lessons learnt from interventions to address HWC in Uganda revealed differences between national parks in problem animals (Table 2) and the variety of interventions that have been implemented to address problem animals, which included the buffalo wall at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park and the elephant trench at Queen Elizabeth National Park.

Table 2. Summary of problem animals at national parks of Uganda

National Park	Problem Animals
Semuliki	Buffaloes raiding at night cause most damage but damage is localised; baboons are also a major problem as they raid frequently all around the Park; elephant raiding is localised but uncommon
Kibale	Baboons & redtail monkeys cause most damage; elephants cause severe damage but this is localised; chimp raids are in villages near to habituated chimps
Ruwenzori	Kasese district: bushpigs & monkeys Kabarole district: bushpigs & chimps Bundibugyo district: monkeys cause most damage but some by bushpigs
Queen Elizabeth	Elephants are the major problem; occasional raids by buffaloes; others problem animals include crocodiles, lions, leopards (occasional death / injury to people), baboons
Bwindi	HWC varies with location Elephants: south (dry season) southwest (wet season) Baboons: north Bush-pigs: southwest Gorillas: south & southwest
Mgahinga Gorilla	Overall buffalo causes most damage although porcupines & birds are problem animals on eastern side; elephant raids are rare (come from DRC)

Discussions on the strengths and weaknesses of interventions to address HWC at Uganda's national parks revealed that successes have been recorded, for example the buffalo wall at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park. However, interventions tend to be implemented on a piece-meal basis, have substantial start-up and on-going costs, and are not a priority of local governments (Table 3).

Table 3. Strengthens and weakness of existing interventions and new proposals to address HWC in Uganda

Strengths	Weaknesses
Uganda has a policy framework for addressing HWC; all these have provisions for HWC: Wildlife Policy 2004 Wildlife Act Cap 200 of 2000 Local Government Act 1997 Revenue sharing policy	No compensation policy. At Bwindi tourists paid \$\$\$ to see Mt gorillas who were raiding the crops of a local farmer yet the farmer was not compensated for his losses. No study on possibilities for compensation to address to HWC to be able to evaluate its potential effectiveness.
The revised Wildlife Policy includes capacity building of local government to handle vermin animals (Baboons, bush-pigs)	Start-up costs e.g. digging trenches.
The new revenue sharing guidelines include a focus on addressing HWC for frontline local people	Maintenance costs and requirement to maintain (who is responsible?).
At Bwindi, the mountain gorilla levy established in 2006 included that some of this money is to be used to address HWC	Introduction of interventions to address HWC is often piece-meal / fragmented with no overarching strategy, which limits the long-term effectiveness of the interventions. No single intervention is a stand-alone solution. There is also no follow-up monitoring to fully assess the effectiveness of interventions.
Some interventions have been successful: Trenches e.g. QENP Wall e.g. Mgahinga Live fence e.g. Bwindi Beehives and chilli e.g. Kibale Vermin guards e.g. QENP Trapping e.g. Bwindi Inedible crops e.g. tea around Bwindi Voluntary community groups e.g. HUGO at Bwindi Buffer zones e.g. Bwindi Metal fencing e.g. QENP Mixed approaches especially successful	Independent studies exist on social and economic impacts of HWC on local people, but there is a lack of consistent data for a comprehensive assessment of the true extent of HWC impacts – this would provide an evidence-base for local government to take action. There is also a lack of research on the long-term impacts of HWC e.g. increasing landlessness of local people.
UWA is developing and implementing guidelines on problem animal control	HWC is a constantly evolving and changing problem that requires adaptive management to be effective, e.g. chimps are increasing the range of crops that they raid.
National Forestry Authority has also had success in addressing HWC e.g. Karinzu Forest	Revenue sharing funds are allocated to address HWC yet funds do not reach local people because of mis-management.
Inner buffer zone at Bwindi is now establishing as a forest – potential for local community to benefit from harvesting the timber	Lack of local government capacity e.g. one vermin officer in Masindi but this was NGO funded. Regular staff changes within local government means that regular training / capacity building is required.

Weaknesses of interventions to address HWC in Uganda cont.

HWC is not high on the agenda of local government; their offices are far from the national park and their attention focuses on immediate needs of social and economic infrastructure. There is little / no coordination between local government and UWA to address HWC. UWA and local government must mainstream HWC but political challenges to do so.

The Payment for Ecosystem Services approach is not utilised – RS funds could be used to enter into contracts with local farmers to maintain and monitor HWC interventions.

Local people lack capacity to address HWC. Most HWC interventions have limited local people ownership, as local people consider that problem animals are the responsibility of UWA.

HW interventions are implemented with limited understanding of organisation and structure of the local community involved, e.g. engaging with the stretcher groups of Bwindi would ensure local community involvement as the stretcher groups would organise local community members.

U-PCLG members identified seven indicators as part of a Theory of Change to reduce levels of unresolved HWC and voted to pursue two of the indicators (Box 4). When the work plan was developed, activities to achieve the indicator '*increased proportion of revenue sharing funds delivering effective HWC interventions*' required fairly extensive organisation and expenses, for example meetings with local communities and Sub-County & Parish Development Committees of Bwindi. While all activities to achieve this indicator were identified, no timeframes were set because U-PCLG members decided that their efforts were best focused to achieve *an established monitoring mechanism on the transparency of Revenue Sharing that is formally endorsed by UWA, local government and local communities*.

The revenue sharing monitoring system that is to be established must aim to monitor the success of the revenue sharing in terms of reducing resentment towards the park as well as the governance aspects (access to information, participation, efficiency) that are proposed under the previous outcome.

Box 4. Indicators for 'Levels of Unresolved Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Reduced'

Indicators selected by U-PCLG members to pursue

- An established monitoring mechanism on the extent that Revenue Sharing reduces HWC that is formally endorsed by UWA, local government and local communities

Other indicators identified by U-PCLG members

- Increased proportion of Revenue Sharing funds delivering effective human wildlife conflict interventions
- Recognised procedure for dealing with HWC established [including roles of UWA, local govt and self-help]
- Increase budget for UWA to address community conservation focusing on HWC
- Increased local government capacity to address vermin control
- Evaluating the effectiveness of a compensation strategy to reduce HWC
- Increased local community empowerment to address HWC (example HUGO)IIED box bulleted list

4.3 More Jobs Filled by Local People

The R2P research revealed that resentment by local people over the local employment situation at Bwindi is also an important driver of unauthorised resource use. Local people reported that jobs at the national park were given to people living far from the Park and that communities living near to Bwindi do not benefit from employment opportunities. The R2P research also revealed that employment by the Park was the most commonly reported reason by local people for an improvement in their quality of life.

Personal experience from U-PCLG members of the local employment situation at Bwindi reveal that local employment is promoted as a principle of ecotourism and, although no data existed on jobs filled by local people, it appears that approximately 80% of jobs with tour operators, UWA and ITFC are filled by local people. However, there is no definition of what local means in the context of Bwindi (i.e. at the district, parish or frontline village level) and consequently, no understanding of what percentage of Park-related jobs are filled by people within these three categories and to what extent frontline villages and parishes should be favoured through affirmative action policies. There is also no formal approach to employing local (with a definition of 'local') people in Park-related jobs and several challenges that must be overcome to improve the current situation. These challenges include dependency on a fragile tourism industry, a lack of linkages between park employment and conservation, and limited training opportunities for local people to secure higher-level jobs (Table 4).

Table 4. Strengthens and weakness of employment for local people at Bwindi

Strengths	Weaknesses
Potential certification scheme providing incentives for local employment	Youth lack ambition
Indigenous knowledge can be utilised more	Over-relying on gorilla tourism – should not try to expand gorilla tourist numbers
Diversify tourism product	Limited opportunities in general (compared with employment before gazettement)
New private sector led opportunities e.g. tea	Limited opportunities in core institutions e.g. UWA given PA management needs
Possibility of more local government investment in planning and support for park adjacent parishes (countering tendency to leave these communities because they have support from RS and BMCT)	Employability of locals – their skills and willingness of employers to invest in them
	Need to look beyond paper qualifications to increase employment of local people
	Lack of standards for quality of tourism products/services of local people
	Local civil society is weak in influencing government
	Lack of clear picture of employment situation in and around Bwindi

U-PCLG members identified five indicators as part of a Theory of Change to increase the number of jobs filled by local people and voted to pursue two of the indicators (Box 4).

Box 4. Indicators for ‘More Jobs for Local People’

Indicators selected by U-PCLG members to pursue

- A clear understanding among key stakeholders of the employment situation around Bwindi (PCLG, UWA, private sector, communities, Local Government, local civil society) of the local employment situation at Bwindi
- A platform for local civil society to dialogue and engage with NRM/conservation stakeholders (employers and potential employees) to advocate for local employment opportunities and higher quality of tourism products and services

Other indicators identified by U-PCLG members

- Internship scheme established with potential employers with at least two internships with priority for villages touching the park
- Fairer distribution of jobs to include more marginalised/poor communities/better gender balance
- Increase in number of jobs (UWA, tourism lodges, NGOs) filled by the local people (from park adjacent parishes and villages)

4.4 Better Access to Sustainable Resource Use Based on Needs

This output focussed on the Multiple Use Programme (MUP) at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park as an ICD intervention to enable sustainable use of natural resources within protected areas by local people. The key R2P research findings illustrate that poorer members of local communities were unable to benefit from MUP because they had not been issued with identity cards, but also that there was no evidence that MUP had led to a substantial increase in unauthorised resource use. Discussions on the strengths and weaknesses of MUP revealed the disconnect between the original design of MUP for subsistence use and the current expectations by local people that MUP will generate income, and the governance issues that limit the effectiveness of MUP (Table 5).

Table 5. Strengthens and weakness of the MUP at Bwindi

Strengths	Weaknesses
When MUP was first introduced, there were concerns that it would lead to an increase in unauthorised resource use. Based on evidence from the R2P research, these concerns appear unfounded.	MUP was designed and implemented in response to a specific situation at the time of national park gazettelement. Now 20 years afterwards, the context of the national park and the expectations of local people are different (local people expect to make an income from MUP yet MUP was designed for subsistence resource use). This disconnect has not been addressed.
Research by ITFC illustrate that MUP harvesting has had no negative impacts on the MUP species that are harvested.	The R2P Research identified that poorer members of local communities were unable to benefit from MUP because they had not been issued with identity cards, highlighting the logistical and management challenges of MUP.
MUP supports the wellbeing of local people.	MUP involves restricted access to resources and a restricted number of resources that can be harvested. The R2P research findings revealed that many local people considered that the harvesting quotas and number of resources they could harvest to be insufficient for their needs.
	Harvesting natural resources that are in high demand by local people is prohibited; does MUP lead to local views that they should be able to harvest these resources?

MUP supports wellbeing but is not a poverty alleviation scheme and not an alternative to other poverty alleviation schemes.

Batwa cultural values and other non-tangible benefits are not considered.

Governance: local people do not know they are on MUP committees; lack of local capacity for local meetings; the UWA-community relationship is founded on mistrust.

U-PCLG members identified six indicators as part of a Theory of Change to achieve 'better access to sustainable resource use based on needs'. Given the level of involvement required to achieve some of the indicators and the indicators that U-PCLG members could most likely achieve within the final year of R2P, U-PCLG members voted to pursue '*increased harvest quota and frequency of existing resources that local people can sustainably harvest under MUP*' (Box 5).

Box 5. Indicators for 'Better Access to Sustainable Resource Use Based on Needs'

Indicators selected by U-PCLG members to pursue

- Increased harvest quota and frequency of existing resources that local people can sustainably harvest under MUP

Other indicators identified by U-PCLG members

- Increased number of stretcher groups involved with MUP
- Increased ownership of MUP by local communities
- Increased number of resources that local people can sustainably access under MUP (harvest and cultural access e.g. Batwa)
- Increased participation of the Batwa in MUP

5. Work-plan

Refer to Annex 2: R2P advocacy work-plan April 2014 – March 2015.

6. Support from ACODE

When developing the work-plan, U-PCLG members identified their capacity needs for undertaking the advocacy activities in the work-plan that could be addressed by ACODE. This support from ACODE can be divided into two themes:

- Advocacy skills training
- Supporting U-PCLG members during their advocacy activities

6.1 Advocacy skills training

Training by ACODE for U-PCLG members in the following advocacy skills was identified from the work plans:

- Effective stakeholder engagement:
- Working with the media:

This training is to provide U-PCLG members with foundational knowledge and skills that they can then apply to progress the advocacy activities in the work-plan. It is also for ACODE to use activities in the R2P work-plan as 'real' examples, which ACODE can discuss and plan with U-PCLG members in order to establish an agenda for U-PCLG members to take forward. The training materials to be produced by ACODE include the production of a biodiversity media information kit, for which IIED and ACODE will develop a detailed specification for (Table 6). It is currently envisaged that this training will be held at the R2P Update Meeting in June 2014.

Table 6. R2P advocacy training to be provided by ACODE

Training by ACODE	R2P Work plan activities to be covered
Effective stakeholder engagement	Increasing community share of the gorilla permit fee; endorsement by Bwindi stakeholders for the RS monitoring mechanism; lobbying potential employers for more jobs for local people; increase MUP harvesting quotas
Working with the media	Press releases and radio coverage of: increased community share of the gorilla permit fee; endorsement by Bwindi stakeholders for the RS monitoring mechanism; successful lobbying of potential employers for more jobs for local people; increased MUP harvesting quotas

6.2 Supporting U-PCLG members during their advocacy activities

The work plans contained several activities where 'support from ACODE' was listed as a requirement. The next step is to define what that support will be. Some of this support will be covered by the key advocacy skill training listed above for all U-PCLG members. For other activities, ACODE's support will be to guide U-PCLG members through the actual advocacy process. This will include providing advice and technical input on documentation (for example reviewing and providing feedback on policy memos and press releases) and supporting preparations for and the undertaking of stakeholder engagement activities (for example when and how to follow-up policy decision-makers when a policy memo has been submitted) (Table 7). ACODE's support to U-PCLG members is also to assist with the coordination of advocacy activities, particularly to ensure appropriate timing of advocacy activities within each individual work plan and to combine and streamline the advocacy activities and stakeholder engagement where possible.

Table 7. ACODE's support to guide U-PCLG members through the advocacy process

Outcome	Indicator	'Support by ACODE' in the work plan	Timeframe	ACODE's Support for U-PCLG members
More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities	Community-based monitoring of RS is revived and with necessary information on funds available, criteria etc Increased community share of the gorilla permit fees	Produce a report & fact / information sheet	Feb 2015	Provide advice and technical input into the production of the report & fact / information sheet
		Develop a brief or information sheet	April 2014	Provide advice and technical input into the brief or information sheet
		Follow-up strategic meetings with key stakeholders	April – Sept 2014	Support preparations for and the undertaking of the follow-up meetings
Levels of unresolved human wildlife conflict reduced	An effective monitoring mechanism on the transparency of revenue sharing that is formally endorsed by UWA and local government	A gap analysis of the existing monitoring system (UWA's forum) to identify 'gaps'	April to May 2014	Provide advice and technical input into the gap analysis
		Develop a proposal for the monitoring mechanism	June 2014	Provide advice and technical input into the proposal
		Stakeholder engagement and sensitization (UWA, local govt and local communities)	July – Dec 2014	Support preparations for and the undertaking of the stakeholder engagement and sensitization
		Formal endorsement at Bwindi stakeholder workshop	Jan 2015	Support preparations for and the undertaking of the formal endorsement process
		Issue local and national press release of formal endorsement at Bwindi stakeholder workshop; radio coverage where possible	Jan 2015	Provide advice and technical input into the press releases and securing radio coverage
More Jobs Filled By Local People	A clear understanding among key stakeholders (PCLG, UWA, private sector, communities, Local Government, local civil society etc) of the employment situation around Bwindi	Policy brief targeted at local level operational policy/practices	Oct – Nov 2014	Provide advice and technical input into the policy brief
		Lobby potential employers	Dec 2014 – March 2015	Support preparations for and the undertaking of the lobbying
		Radio programmes		Provide advice and technical input into securing the radio programmes

Better access to sustainable resource use based on needs	Increased harvest quota & frequency of existing resources that local people can harvesting sustainably under MUP	Develop and submit policy memo to UWA for increase incl adaptive management strategies	May 2014	Provide advice and technical input into the policy memo
		Follow-up presentations to UWA in a stakeholder meeting	June 2014	Support preparations for and the undertaking of the meeting
		Follow-up communications with UWA to advocate for the increase	July – Dec 2014	Support preparations for and the undertaking of the follow-up communications including the timing and means of communications
		After increase agreed by UWA, issue a joint UWA+U-PCLG national press release and secure radio interviews	Jan 2015	Provide advice and technical input into the press release

Annex 1: Workshop Participants

Name	Organisation / Institution	Email	Telephone Contact
Robert Bitariho	ITFC	bitariho@itfc.org	+256772480885
Amumpiire Anna	ACODE	aamumpiire@acode-u.org	+256782527626
Wako M. Joel	NatureUganda	Wakojoel123@gmail.com	+256781771160
Alessandra Guiliani	IIED	Alessandra.guiliani@iied.org	+4407910382309
Ndibaisa Dylis	A Rocha Uganda	Ndibaisa.dylis@arocha.org	+256782736418
Panta Kasoma	JGI	panta@janegoodallug.org	+2567725872847
Medard Twinamasiko	ITFC	twinamatsikomedard@yahoo.com	+256751892953
Pontious Ezuma	BMCA	pontiosezuma@ugandawildlife.org	+256772438323
Lawrence Mugisha	CEHA	mugishalaw@gmail.com	+256772566551
Edith Katusiime	CARE	Ekabesiime@co.care.org	+256759491189
Stephen Asuma	IGCP	sasuma@igcp.org	+256785138799
Carolyn Gift Kirabo	Environmental Alert	giftcarolyn@gmail.com	+256774441031
Paul Hatanga	Chimpazee Trust Uganda	conservation@ngambaisland.org	+256758221540
Mwine David	BMCT	Davidmwine@yahoo.com	+256772436075
Agrippinah Namara	RFGI	agripnamara@yahoo.com	+256772485996
Arthur Mugisha	FFI	Mugisha.arthur@gmail.com	+256776613987
Andy Plumptre	World Conservation Society	aplumtre@wcs.org	+256772509754
Muhanguzi Geoffrey	BCFS	Geoffre.muhanguzi@gmail.com	+256782532326
Joan Nimusiima	UWA	nimusiimajoan@yahoo.com	+256701413751
Beatrice Kabihogo	URP	kabihogob@hotmail.com	+256702585859
Gladys Kalema- Zikusoka	CTPA	Gladys@ctph.org	+256772330139
Onemus Mugenyi	ACODE	omugenyi@acode-u.org	
Phil Franks	IIED	Phil.franks@ieed.org	
Julia Baker	IIED	julia.baker@pbworld.com	
Bakuneeta Chris	Makerere University	cbakuneeta@zoology.mak.ac.ug	+256775526657
Judith Kyarisiima	ACODE	Judith.kyarisiima@acode-u.org	+256789412884

Annex 2: R2P Work-plan April 2014 – March 2015

Outcome	Indicator	Activity	Responsible	Support	Time												Notes	
					A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M		
More Revenue Shared More Fairly and Responding to Locally Agreed Priorities	Increased, more inclusive (involving Batwa, other marginalised groups) household-level participation in identification of priority projects to be funded by revenue share	Meeting of key organisations to develop sensitization plan	BMCT, CTPH, URP, FFI, NU, IGCP, UWA	ACODE													One day meeting in Kampala or Kabale	
		Sensitization of village leaders of park adjacent villages	To be determined at May meeting															to be confirmed at the meeting: who is the 'responsible' lead; whether any support is required and the timeframe for activities
		Sensitization of Batwa communities	To be determined at May meeting															to be confirmed at the meeting: who is the 'responsible' lead; whether any support is required and the timeframe for activities
	Community-based monitoring of RS is revived and with necessary information on funds available, funding criteria etc (starting in Kisoro with Kisoro NGO forum)	Awareness raising and support for Kisoro NGO forum	ITFC, URP, UWA	CARE														ITFC to work with URP and the Kisoro NGO Forum to revive the community-based monitoring of revenue sharing of the 3 parishes in Kisoro that are adjacent to the National Park; CARE to give technical advice to ITFC on community monitoring operations and protocols. ITFC to develop a budget for funding from R2P project
		Meeting at Kisoro with key stakeholders to share experiences	ITFC, URP, UWA	CARE														ITFC to organise the meeting with technical advice from CARE on stakeholders to attend and meeting agenda. ITFC to develop a budget for this for funding from R2P project
		Produce a report & fact/information sheet	ITFC, URP, UWA	ACODE														Report and information sheet will be an output from the meeting; ACODE to review information sheet and provide technical input to ensure it is an effective communication tool. ITFC to develop a budget for this for funding from R2P project
	Increased community	Develop a brief or information sheet	U-PCLG Chairman	ACODE, JB														ACODE to provide advice and technical input into the brief / information sheet

	A platform for local civil society to dialogue and engage with NRM/conservation stakeholders (employers and potential employees) to advocate for local employment opportunities and higher quality of tourism products and services	Map local civil society involved in NRM and related livelihood activities related to Bwindi	CARE (if possible) BMCT or ITFC	U-PCLG members															<p><u>There is currently no funding available for these activities.</u> Suggest that U-PCLG reviews this at the proposed one day progress veiw meeting in June to see if any PCLG has funds to cover this. If not then suggest we postpone this to a follow on project if it is still appropriate/relevant</p>	
		Workshop for local civil society to streamline collaboration on employment in relation to Bwindi (immediately after workshop above)	U-PCLG	IIED, U-PCLG members																
		Meetings with potential employers to lobby for local employment opportunities and higher quality of tourism products and services	CARE (if possible) BMCT or ITFC	U-PCLG members																
		Outreach with potential employees including radio programmes		ACODE																
Better access to sustainable resource use based on needs	Increased harvest quota & frequency of existing resources that local people can harvesting sustainably under MUP	Compile and collate the research evidence to justify the increase	ITFC	JB															The research has been undertaken (Robert's PhD and R2P research) so it is a matter of compiling the relevant information into one document; this will be undertaken by ITFC and issued to U-PCLG by end April 2014.	
		Develop and submit a policy memo to UWA for the increase including adaptive management strategies	U-PCLG Chairman with support from ITFC	ACODE															The policy memo will be developed based on ITFC's research document with technical input from ACODE and then U-PCLG Chairman to submit to UWA. BUT timing depends on all other policy advocacy activities in order not to overload UWA with too many memos and letters (an idea is to meet UWA to discuss all issues). ACODE to provide advice on the timing of its submission	
		Follow-up presentations to UWA Management meeting	U-PCLG Chairman with support from ITFC & members	ACODE																After the policy memo has been submitted, U-PCLG Chairman with support from ITFC and ACODE to arrange a meeting with UWA Management during May 2014 for ITFC to present the research evidence to UWA and all to discuss the proposed increase. <i>Or could be in</i>

