

December 2014

Forest Governance Learning Group

Uganda

Narrative report for the Social Justice in
Forestry project

Author information

This report was written by the Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment on behalf of FGLG Uganda

About the project

For more information about this report, or the Forest Governance Learning Group and the Social Justice in Forestry project, visit <http://iied.org/forest-governance-learning-group>, or contact: James Mayers, James.Mayers@iied.org.

IIED is a policy and action research organisation. We promote sustainable development to improve livelihoods and protect the environments on which these livelihoods are built. We specialise in linking local priorities to global challenges. IIED is based in London and works in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and the Pacific, with some of the world's most vulnerable people. We work with them to strengthen their voice in the decision-making arenas that affect them — from village councils to international conventions.

Published by IIED, December 2014

International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
email: info@iied.org
www.iied.org

 @iied
 www.facebook.com/thelIED

Download more publications at www.iied.org/pubs



Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Targets, team, tactics and main actions	3
2.1. Key issues in social justice in forestry that the team sought to address	3
2.2. Structure of the team and wider consultative groupings	3
2.3. Main tactics used	4
2.4. Main actions taken over the five years and key outputs and outcomes	4
3. The changing context of forest governance	6
3.1. The main issues in forest governance in 2009 and what has changed over the five years	6
3.2. Forest governance challenges	6
4. Stories of change	8
4.1. The Save Mabira Forest campaign	8
4.2. Advocacy on the development of the national Climate Change Policy and the policy implementation strategy	9
4.3. Advocating for reforms in the forestry sector and fighting illegalities	9
5. Looking ahead	11
5.1. Key needs for related work in the immediate or longer term	11

1. Introduction

This is the final narrative report for the Uganda Forest Governance Learning Group. The project, titled 'Social Justice in Forestry', covered the period between 1 October 2009 and 30 September 2013. The project was implemented by the Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) – **the convenor** – under the guidance of the Uganda Forest Governance Learning Group (UFGLG) – the **country team**. ACODE is an independent public policy research and advocacy think tank registered in Uganda with operations in the Eastern Africa sub-region. The project was funded by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). The project activity plans over the project period provided for a number of activities that related to research and analysis, outreach and advocacy, and capacity-building through learning events.

2. Targets, team, tactics and main actions

2.1. Key issues in social justice in forestry that the team sought to address

The UFGLG team sought to address the following key concerns in social justice in forestry: promoting forest rights and small forest enterprises; improving the legality of forest products; promoting pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation; and promoting trans-national learning and preparedness. These major issues were addressed by UFGLG through the following activities:

- Research and advocacy targeting the review of forestry policy, forestry laws, forestry plans, the finalisation of forestry regulations and the development of climate change policy. ACODE participated fully in the review of the National Forest Plan and Forest Regulations and the development of climate change policy.
- Studies and advocacy campaigns on forest governance issues. Research and advocacy activities covered: irregularities in the forestry management sector; illegal extraction of forest products; enhanced involvement of local communities in decision making; encroachment on forest reserves; strengthening of forestry institutions; inadequate funding in the environment and natural resources (ENR) sector; and benefit sharing in the forestry sector.
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation. This involved the implementation of Reducing Emissions for Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) in Uganda; providing input into ongoing REDD readiness preparation processes; fast-tracking the formulation of the REDD readiness strategy; and advocating for a transparent and inclusive legal regime for REDD+ and other forest-linked climate change strategies/initiatives, including the UNFCCC Conferences of the Parties (COPs). ACODE/UFGLG, in partnership with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), developed the conflicts and grievances management strategy which was presented to the REDD+ working group for discussion and was finally adopted by the REDD Steering Committee. The strategy became part of the country's REDD readiness and REDD strategy development proposal to the World Bank.
- The creation of a dynamic country group that convenes regularly to discuss forest governance issues.

2.2. Structure of the team and wider consultative groupings

The country team. The country team, called the Uganda Forest Governance Learning Group (UFGLG), is composed of the following stakeholder categories: academia; the media; the private sector; members of parliament; NGOs; and representatives from the National Forestry Authority (NFA), the Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD), the Ministry of Water and Environment, the District Forestry Services (DFS) and the National Environment and Management Authority (NEMA).

UFGLG created partnerships with the South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA), the Governance of Africa's Resources Network (GARN), and the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (UPCLG). UFGLG is a member of the Uganda Forest Working Group (UFWG), the Environment and Natural Resources Network for civil societies in the ENR sector (ENR-CSO) – where ACODE/UFGLG leads the governance thematic working group – and is represented on the Good Governance Working Group hosted by the Ministry of Water and Environment. Annex 1 provides a list of all the members of the country team.

The convenor. The group is convened by the Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE). The convenor provides the secretariat to the group and is responsible for the coordination and management of the group and the project in Uganda. The convenor is responsible for reporting at both national and international events on forestry sector issues, and ensures follow up of the recommendations and proposals from the group.

2.3. Main tactics used

- **Research and analysis.** The team carried out research on governance challenges facing the forestry sector in Uganda. The team participated in an illegal timber trade study carried out by WWF, provided leadership in the process of producing the Uganda forestry governance report, and prepared policy briefs on COP 17 desired outcomes and the role of parliament in natural resource governance in Uganda. The team participated in the development of the Forest Regulations and the development of the national Climate Change Policy for Uganda.
- **Policy outreach and advocacy.** The group convened several dialogues and meetings on forest governance challenges, held strategic meetings with policymakers, provided policy memoranda on the key issues that should be covered by the Forest Regulations and the national Climate Change Policy. The group issued press releases aimed at influencing parliament on the deepening crisis in the ENR sector, and a statement of illegal forest degazettement in the Namanve Forest Reserve in 2011.
- **Capacity building workshops.** The group organised capacity building meetings involving journalists (to improve reporting on forestry issues), members of parliament and District Forest Officers.
- **Participation in government technical committee meetings and sector working groups.** The group sought membership of and participation in formal spaces such as the REDD+ Working group, the ENR Good Governance Working Group and the Land Policy Working Group.
- **UFGLG group meetings.** The group organised quarterly meetings to discuss forest sector governance issues, the coordination of the group and advocacy strategies. The group participated in both national and international learning events where new ideas were shared. In particular, UFGLG participated in an international learning event organised in Mozambique, training in Ghana on good forestry practices, training in Germany on climate change issues, and learning events in China.
- **Building partnerships to spread learning and influence policy.** The group formed partnership arrangements with the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group, Care International Uganda, the South African Institute for International Affairs and the Governance of Africa's Resources Network. These networks were instrumental in filling funding gaps and spreading learning.

2.4. Main actions taken over the five years and key outputs and outcomes

2.4.1. Enhancing forest rights and small forest enterprises

The Forestry Policy and laws provide for collaborative forest management (CFM) in which communities participate in forest management and forest benefit sharing. However, the implementation of these provisions has been sluggish. During the project period, the group carried out a study to inform the implementation of these provisions in which it was established that no tangible benefits were accruing to communities, and small tree-growing enterprises were also being undermined by lack of access for communities to forest land. The group carried out advocacy activities and the following developments have since occurred:

- Development of the Forest Benefits Policy has been commenced by the relevant ministry.
- The head of state halted the allocation of forest land until guidelines were developed that favoured frontline communities in accessing land in the reserves for small-scale tree planting.
- The degazettement of part of the Mabira Central Forest Reserve was halted. This would have undermined the CFM areas around the reserve who had established small-scale tree plantations.
- Legal aid and advice has been provided to the Batwa community over their land rights.

2.4.2. Promoting legitimate trade in forest products and managing forestry illegalities

The activities carried out in this respect were aimed at promoting the sustainability of forest products and minimising the illegal extraction of and trade in these products. The activities also aimed at minimising illegal alienation of forest land. The activities involved a study on illegalities in the forest sector, preparing and submitting a petition to parliament to carry out an investigation and make necessary recommendations, issuing press releases, meeting the president over the illegal degazettement of the Mabira Central Reserve, and organising the multi-stakeholder symposium on forestry governance organised in partnership with Care International Uganda.

The key outputs/outcomes of the research and advocacy activities to date include the following:

- The services of the Executive Director of the National Forest Authority (NFA) were terminated with a subsequent prosecution.
- A new Executive Director and NFA Board were appointed.
- The degazettement of the Mabira Central Forest Reserve was halted.
- A directive by the relevant government minister was issued to halt timber harvesting until all licences have been verified.
- Preparation of the Forest Regulations was revived and a stakeholders meeting held where UFGLG submitted its views on the regulations.

2.4.3. Climate change and mitigation

The climate change and mitigation activities aimed at informing the implementation of REDD in Uganda, developing the climate change policy and reviewing the financing mechanism. The activities undertaken included: the preparation of a REDD+ conflicts and grievances management strategy as part of the REDD+ proposal in partnership with IUCN country office, and participation in the formulation of climate change policy (the group prepared a civil society position paper and undertook a review of ENR governance). The key outputs/ outcomes include the following:

The national Climate Change Policy and an implementation strategy have been developed.

A REDD+ conflicts and grievances management strategy has been developed.

Government was able to finalise the proposal to the World Bank to develop REDD readiness strategy. The REDD+ conflicts and grievances management strategy was a required component for this proposal.

2.4.4. Transnational learning and preparedness

The activities under this sub-theme aimed at ensuring a rigorous and systematic learning process. The main activities involved a quarterly group meeting to discuss new and emerging issues, the expansion of the group to bring on board local governments, participation in international learning events and the organisation of exchange visits. The key outputs/outcomes include the following:

- A group exchange visit to Ghana and Germany took place to enhance knowledge on climate change and forest governance issues. New tactics were learnt and applied in the project implementation.
- The group was expanded and to bring on board District Forest Officers.
- Quarterly group meetings were organised and critical governance issues discussed and recommendations made to the ministry and the forestry agencies.
- The group participated in international learning events in Mozambique and China.
- Annex 2 of this report provides a list of all publications, films, media pieces and other products produced by or linked to the UFGLG team.

3. The changing context of forest governance

3.1. The main issues in forest governance in 2009 and what has changed over the five years

3.1.1. An out-dated forestry plan and absence of forestry regulations

The forestry sector in 2009 still had the out-dated National Forest Plan 2002, which did not address current demands on forestry resources by the growing population. This plan was reviewed and a new National Forest Plan 2011/12–2021/22 was formulated to address current issues in the forestry sector. This national planning framework has been changed from a ‘poverty eradication’ approach to a ‘national enterprise’ approach. The plan’s strategic objectives are to increase economic productivity and employment through forest production, processing and services industries; to raise incomes for households through forest-based initiatives; and to restore and improve ecosystem services derived from sustainably managed forest resources.

The Forestry Regulations formulation process was revamped, with stakeholders and UFGLG active in the consultation process. The process that commenced in 2004 had completely stalled, but it is expected that the regulations will be approved soon. These regulations are long overdue, since they were expected to operationalise the current National Forestry and Tree Planting Act 2003.

3.1.2. Illegal degazettement of forest reserves

The problem of illegal degazettement peaked in around 2009, with the government illegally degazetting the Butamira Central Forest Reserve with impunity. The campaign that was launched by UFGLG when the Mabira Central Forest Reserve was threatened has changed this trend. The campaign covered both the local and international players. Mabira survived illegal degazettement, and the subsequent degazettement of local forest reserves has followed the law and new areas have been allocated for tree growing.

3.1.3. The REDD+ readiness preparation process

The process of implementation of REDD in Uganda was sluggish due to a lack of financial resources and of a supportive policy and regulatory framework.

The government of Uganda had initiated the process of preparing a proposal to the World Bank to support the development of a REDD strategy, but this process had stalled. Uganda submitted REDD Preparation Identification Note in 2008 and a Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP), under the World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, was later submitted in 2011. However, this could not be approved without a conflicts and grievances strategy and a stakeholder participation plan. UFGLG was instrumental in preparing these documents in partnership with the IUCN country office. The proposal was finally submitted and approved.

A draft climate change policy has been completed that provides the necessary policy strategies for the management of climate change in Uganda.

3.2. Forest governance challenges

Uganda has one of the fastest growing populations in Africa. The current population is estimated to be over 35 million and has almost doubled over the last two decades. As Uganda is an agriculture-based economy, the growing population has exerted a great deal of pressure on the existing agricultural land, leading to encroachment on forest land. The number of forest land encroachers has been growing over the years and threatens the sector. The recent Transparency International corruption index ranked Uganda as one of the most corrupt countries in the world, and the forest sector has been no exception

to this vice. There are still incidents of illegal trade in forest products and illegal allocation of forest land to alternative uses.

The sector is also not well funded and the institutions mandated with forest management are unable to execute their mandate. Currently, the ENR sector is one of the lowest funded sectors in the economy.

4. Stories of change

4.1. The Save Mabira Forest campaign

Box 1

In March 2006, Sugar Corporation of Uganda Ltd. (SCOUL) requested the government of Uganda to allocate 7100 hectares of Mabira Central Forest Reserve to sugarcane plantation and sugar production. The subsequent attempt by the government to allocate one third of the forest met stiff public resistance with demonstrations that turned bloody. The process was halted.

In 2011, the Ugandan government revived the process to give away part of Mabira Central Forest Reserve to the sugar corporation, stating that this would be an opportunity to create new jobs and further alleviate the country's chronic sugar shortages. UFGLG and other members of the civil society fraternity decided to act to save the reserve. A team was formed under the umbrella of the 'Save Mabira Crusade', comprised of UFGLG members, academics, members of parliament and civil society organisations (CSOs). The team carried out a number of advocacy activities that included public mobilisation to resist the allocation. The team's strategy was evidence-based advocacy that was able to demonstrate that the value of conserving the forest was greater than that of converting it to sugar plantation.

The climax of the campaign was a meeting with the head of the state where evidence was provided regarding the illegality of the process, available alternative options for dealing with sugar shortages, and the implication of the decision for forest governance in Uganda. The following proposals were made:

- a) Government should provide more support and encourage sugarcane out-grower schemes as a means of increasing sugarcane production, which would enhance employment opportunities and boost household incomes.
- b) Sugar companies should be encouraged to invest in efficient and effective production and processing technologies to increase sugar production.
- c) Government should develop a comprehensive national sugar industry strategy to inform decision making and investments in the industry.
- d) Government should undertake sustainable economic activities that are compatible with forest conservations, such as apiary and ecotourism.
- e) SCOUL and other investors should seek alternative land for growing sugarcane outside gazetted forest reserves.
- f) Government should decline to grant SCOUL's request for 7,186 hectares of Mabira Forest Reserve and any other future request.

The president promised to study the evidence further and take an informed decision. The process has since been halted and subsequent allocations of forest land have followed a different trend. In the recent cases, the government has followed the law and new areas have been provided to compensate for the lost forest reserves.

This story points to the relevance of evidence-based advocacy and the relevance of groups working together to achieve a common goal. Evidence-based advocacy is critical for causing shifts in policy direction, and should therefore be promoted. This campaign has been used as a case study in various ENR networks (ENR-CSOs) to advocate for increased investment in ENR.

4.2. Advocacy on the development of the national Climate Change Policy and the policy implementation strategy

Box 2

Uganda has been grappling with issues relating to climate change. The country has been heavily involved in climate change negotiations and articulated issues of financing climate change. However, it has not had a climate change policy in place to provide a framework to govern climate change activities. The Social Justice in Forestry project provided the opportunity to influence the formulation of such a policy and the implementation strategy. Civil society advocacy activities to influence the policy gained momentum in 2010 with active involvement in shaping the country's negotiation processes. UFGLG worked with the Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change and organised a dialogue which was attended by the Ministry of Finance, parliamentarians, and the Ministry of Water and Environment. The resolutions for the meeting were a catalyst for the formulation of the policy. The Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change exerted pressure and the process of formulating the policy finally commenced.

In 2011 the UFGLG, working with other civil society groups, put together a position paper that informed the policy. In 2012, the final draft policy was presented to government for adoption, and the implementation action plan is also in advanced stages. The policy and its implementation strategy are intended to address climate change mitigation and adaptation in Uganda across all sectors and provide strategies to address the issues involved. UFGLG and other ENR-CSOs were instrumental in pushing for the formulation of a climate change policy. UFGLG continues to advocate the policy approval.

4.3. Advocating for reforms in the forestry sector and fighting illegalities

Box 3

The Social Justice in Forestry project supported a study on illegalities in the forestry sector. The study report was produced in 2009 and pointed out the illegalities in the sector, including illegal harvesting of timber, illegal allocation of forest land for other land uses, and failure to follow procurement and disposal procedures for forest products, among others.

Following the study, several newspaper articles were published that exposed the illegalities in the forest sector and the officers involved. The study was also used to prepare and submit a petition to parliament to carry out an investigation and make necessary recommendations. The study further provided a basis for several press releases, a statement to the president, and finally informed the organisation of a multi-stakeholder symposium on forestry governance, organised in partnership with Care International Uganda. The outcomes of the study and activities that followed include the following:

A government investigation of illegalities in the forestry sector. The chief executive officer of the forestry agency (the National Forestry Authority) was dismissed and prosecuted.

Issuance of a directive by the relevant government minister to halt timber harvesting until all licences have been verified.

Revival of the preparation of the Forest Regulations, and a stakeholders meeting where UFGLG submitted its views on the regulations.

A cabinet reshuffle and appointment of a new Minister of Water and Environment.

Formation of the Environment and Natural Resource Governance Working Group

5. Looking ahead

UFGLG maintains a strong presence in the sector. Discussions were held and it was agreed that the end of the project should not affect the continued existence of the group. The convenor has already secured seed funding from CARE International Uganda to maintain the groups' quarterly meetings. The convenor will continue to fundraise to ensure that the group advocacy agenda is maintained.

The group will continue to produce the Biennial Forest Governance Report and will continue to shape forest policy implementation in the country.

5.1. Key needs for related work in the immediate or longer term

UFGLG will definitely need more financial support to implement its activities and interventions, some of which are continuous in nature such as the report on the state of forestry in Uganda. Maintaining existing partnerships and creating new ones will be key for UFGLG's work in both the immediate and longer term. The existing partnerships with SAIIA, NFA, MWE and UPCLG have been instrumental in advancing UFGLG's work, for example through joint workshops and information sharing on forestry/ENR governance issues and how to address them.

Annex 1: UFGLG Members

	Name	Organisation
1	Hon. John Arimpa Kigyagi	ENR Presidential Advisor
2	Beatrice Anywar	Parliament of Uganda
3	Christine Nantongo	Consultant
4	Irene Sekyana	Program Coordinator Greenwatch
5	Achilles Byaruhanga	Executive Director Nature Uganda
6	Gaster Kiyingi	Executive Director, Tree Talk
7	Prof. John R Kaboggoza	Lecturer, Faculty of Forestry, Makerere University
8	Stephen Khaukha	Havilla Co Ltd. Nankulabye
9	Allan Amumpe	Saw Log Production Grant Scheme
10	Edward Mupadda	Havilla Co Ltd. Nankulabye
11	Gershom Onyango	Director Ministry of Water and Environment
12	Nalugo Mercy Kabanda	Daily Monitor reporter
13	Gerald Tenywa	Senior Environment Reporter, The New Vision
14	Cornelius Kazoora	Sustainable Development Centre
15	Pantaloons M B Kasoma	Executive Director Jane Goodall Institute Uganda
16	Madira Davidson	Natural Enterprises Development
17	Sophie Kutegeka	Program Officer IUCN
18	Robert Bakiika	Executive Director, Environment Management for Livelihoods Improvement (EMLI) , Bwaise Facility
19	Nankya Harriet	District Forestry Officer
20	Charles Walaga	Executive Director, Environmental Alert ED
21	Annet Kandole	FOREST Program Officer CARE Uganda
22	Dr. Robert Bitariho	Director Institute Of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC)
23	Prof. Manson Tweheyo	Dean, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Makerere University

24	Steve Nsita	Havilla Co Ltd.
25	Bill Farmer	Director Uganda Carbon Bureau
26	Alex Muhweezi	Executive Director Future Dialogues International
27	Maganda Moses	District Environment Officer Jinja
28	Nakimbugwe Ann	District Forestry Officer Mukono
29	Nsimire William	District Environment Officer Masindi
30	Rukwago Severino	DNRO Rukungiri
31	Robert Nabanyumya	Consultant
32	Hon Margaret komuhangi	Natural Resource Committee
33	Bazira Henry	Water Governance Institute ED
34	Hon. Ekwau Ibi Florence	Natural Resource Committee
35	Francis Ogwal	Management Specialist NEMA Natural Resource
36	Michael Mugisa	NFA ED
37	Arthur Mugisha	Flora and Fauna International ED
38	Adata Margaret	FSSD Assistant Commissioner
39	Asiku Micah	Community Development and Conservation Agency (CODECA) ED
40	Asiimwe Martin	WWF Project Manager Sustainable Forest Management & Forest Certification
41	Denis Kavuma	General Manager Uganda Timber Growers Association

Annex 2: List of all publications, films, media pieces and other products produced by or linked to UFGLG

Reports and publications

Kiyingi, G., Tenywa, G. 2009. Trouble in the forest: A review of evidence, issues and ways forward for forest concession in Uganda.

ACODE/FGLG and Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change (PFCC). 2011. Critical Issues and Desired COP 17 Outcomes for Uganda: A CSO/Parliamentarian Perspective. Briefing Paper.

Press release on the meeting with His Excellency Yoweri Kaguta Museveni and the Save Mabira team. 4 September 2011, Ntungamo. See

Tumushabe, G. 2011. A Political Economy Analysis of the Environment and Natural Resource in Uganda.

ACODE/FGLG. 2012. The Role of Parliament in Sustainable Management of Uganda's Natural Resources. Policy Brief.

Forest Governance Symposium Research Papers (2012):

Achievements, Challenges, and Opportunities in the Forestry Sector 2001 – 2011

Forest Sector Contributions to the National Economy; Energy, Financial, Timber, Herbal, Employment Generation and Carbon Trade Opportunities

A diagnostic review of corruption in the forestry sector

Making a business case for the forest sector in Uganda: successes, opportunities and challenges

Political and governance issues affecting the forestry sector: role and effectiveness of ENR Parliamentary Committee and other relevant governance structures

SAIJA and ACODE. 2012. The Role of Resources in Africa's Future: Towards a Vision for the Governance of Africa's Natural Resources. Seminar Report. See

http://www.saija.org.za/images/stories/research/garp/rpt_seminar_uganda_garn_13_march_2012.pdf

ACODE and EMLI. 2013. Brief on critical issues for pro poor climate change mitigation actions in Uganda. ENR-CSO.

<http://www.bwaisefacility.org/userfilesbf/file/Policy%20Brief.pdf>

Environment and Natural Resources Sector Good Governance Action Plan for 2012-2015.

Press Articles

6 February 2009, Daily Monitor, 'Mabira riots scared Shimon investor'

14 August 2011, Sunday Monitor, 'Museveni Remarks on Mabira Forest giveaway draw anger'

16 August 2011, New Vision, 'Government, NFA Officials disagree on Mabira Forest'

17 August 2011, New Vision, 'Uganda loses 86,000 hectares of Forest annually-NFA Report'

17 August 2011, Daily Monitor, 'MPs defy President on forest give-away'

18 August 2011, The Observer, 'Mabira sale won't solve sugar crisis'

21 August 2011, New Vision, 'MPs dare Museveni on Mabira Forest'

20 August 2011, New Vision, 'Will World Bank Allow Government to sell Mabira'

22 August 2011, Mongabay, USA, 'Uganda resurrects plan to hand over protected forest to sugar company', http://news.mongabay.com/2011/0822-hance_mabira.html

23 August 2011, Daily Monitor, 'NFA is sabotaging Museveni on Mabira'

23 August 2011, Daily Monitor, 'Environmentalists give ultimatum to Mehta on Mabira'

23 August 2011, Daily Monitor, 'Forest Degradation is not limited to deforestation'

5 September 2011, Daily Monitor, 'Museveni softens position on Mabira'

7 September 2011, New Vision, 'Civil Society demands referendum on mabira giveaway'

7 September 2011, New Vision, 'Lose Mabira, lose so much'

29 February 2012, The Independent, Uganda, 'We need effective forest governance',
http://www.independent.co.ug/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5325:we-need-effective-forest-governance&catid=86:opinion&Itemid=330

26 April 2012, Daily Monitor, 'Civil Society Statement on Durban Climate Change Negotiations, Conference Outcomes and Lessons for Future Climate Talks'

26 May 2012, Saturday Vision, 'Districts investing 1% of budget on environment'

26 May 2012, Saturday Vision, 'The role of Parliament in sustainable management of Uganda's natural resources'

27 June 2012, All Africa, 'Interplay between Gender and Climate Change',
<http://allafrica.com/stories/201206280341.html>

26 November 2012, New Vision, 'Recognise Forest Dependent Communities and their Rights',
<http://www.newvision.co.ug/news/635956-recognise-forest-dependent-communities-and-their-rights.html>

28 November 2012, Daily Monitor, 'Civil Society Statement to 7th Climate Change Forum and COP18/CMP8'

5 April 2013, All Africa, 'undervaluing a natural asset'
http://allafrica.com/stories/201304080226.html?goback=%2Egde_1958649_member_230144513

27 June 2013, New Vision, 'Let us support forest certification'
<http://www.newvision.co.ug/news/644423-let-us-support-forest-certification-in-uganda.html>

Annex 3: self-evaluation

Forest Governance Learning Group – Uganda, September 2013

Approach of FGLG initiative (in your own country)

1.1 What were the major forest governance issues and opportunities in your country since 2005? [list them]	<u>Major forest governance issues</u> Corruption, political interference, inadequate funding, non-compliance to the laws/policies
	<u>Opportunities</u> Engaging in on-going government processes and spaces Part of the development process of forestry regulations
	Working with new Executive Director National Forestry Authority under FGLG
1.2 What have been the most effective methodologies that FGLG has used since 2005? [describe as many as you wish. You could refer to the country level methods from page 23 of the project document]	Informed Advocacy; campaigns, media Outreach through meetings Research
1.3 What changes have there been in approach of FGLG in your country since the start of the initiative? Why have these changes taken place?	Involvement of more members to include; district forest officers, NFA officials, ministry of water and environment officials, research institutes, academicians and private tree farmers
	This was because of the importance of a wider stakeholder group to better influence policy change and information sharing
1.4 How effective has the team-based structure and approach of FGLG been? Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of this.	<u>Strengths</u> Strength in numbers for campaigns/advocacy Sharing of information within FGLG
	<u>Weaknesses</u> Weakness in effective communication amongst team

Performance and impact of FGLG (in your own country)

2.1 To what extent has FGLG has contributed to improved forest governance in your country [tick the best box and provide an explanation for your answer]	<input type="checkbox"/> No contribution at all <input type="checkbox"/> Minor contribution only <input type="checkbox"/> Significant contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Highly significant contribution
--	--

Explanation: the team contributed to the halt of the degazetttement of Mabira Central forest reserve by government, contributed to climate change policy formulation, contributed to formulation of forestry regulations, national forest plan, advocated for forest governance principles

2.2 For each of the 4 outputs of FGLG – how do you rate the performance of FGLG [give a score where: (1) = governance impacts have been widely achieved that have had wider impacts on the ground; (2) = governance impacts have been achieved that have had some impacts on the ground; (3) = some governance impacts have been achieved but with little actual impact on the ground; (4) = there have been only limited learning or governance impacts with no signs of tangible impacts on the ground]. Give an explanation for your assessment score

Output 1: Forest rights and small forest enterprise

Score = 2

Explanation for score given: The impacts are not easily achieved in the short term

Output 2: Legitimate forest products

Score = 3

Explanation for score given: Uganda in process of developing draft certification standards, more work is needed

Output 3: Pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry

Score = 2

Explanation for score given: climate change policy developed not yet approved. Sensitisation has been taking place. REDD+ in Uganda on going

Output 4: Trans-national learning and preparedness

Score = 2

Explanation for score given: gained from trainings in Ghana among others

2.3 What external factors (outside the control of FGLG) have affected the impacts that FGLG has had? [describe them]	The political environment in Uganda over the issue on natural resources like forests. The government disregards the law. Forestry sector institutions still incapacitated financially and administratively
2.4 Describe the performance of IIED as overall coordinator of FGLG in terms of (a) its capacity support and (b) overall management support for your in-country team and your team's actions.	IIED's performance is good
2.5 To what extent will partnerships and working approaches developed under FGLG continue after the end of the current phase? Comment on the sustainability of the FGLG initiative. What needs to happen for the effective approaches to continue?	To a large extent because the partnerships and working approaches are cross cutting in the ENR sector FGLG initiative is sustainable having created long term partnerships with government and non-government stakeholders in the ENR sector
2.6 Describe any changes in the relationship between government and civil society in your country as a result of FGLG?	No major changes in the relationship with government institutions and civil society
2.7 Has the FGLG had any unexpected impacts? Describe these.	The intervention of the President in the Save mabira campaign and meeting with him on this issue that eventually halted the degazettlement of mabira central forest reserve
2.8 What evidence is there to show that the various activities that you have carried out have had impacts on the ground (for target groups)? Describe this evidence – or list any documents/sources of evidence	Indicated in the UFGLG narrative reports

Lessons learnt from FGLG

3.1 Describe any innovative approaches that FGLG has followed in your country	Evidence based advocacy; advocating with research based findings to cause change
3.2 Describe (in bullets) any lessons from FGLG about effective ways of influencing forest policy and enhancing forest governance	Research Advocacy Outreach Partnerships with key government stakeholders

Other comments about FGLG

4.1 Do you have any other comments about the performance and lessons from FGLG? Please describe them here.	FGLG has influenced policy and governance issues in Uganda's forestry sector through research, advocacy and outreach.
--	---

The Forest Governance Learning Group is an informal alliance of in-country groups and international partners currently active in seven African and three Asian countries. We aim to connect those marginalised from forest governance to those controlling it, and to help both do things better.

This report gives an overview of the activities and achievements of the Uganda FGLG team between 2009 and 2013.



Project materials

Forests

Keywords:

Forestry, Forest Governance Learning Group, Natural resource management



International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
email: info@iied.org
www.iied.org

Funded by:



This research was part-funded by UK aid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the UK Government. This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of IIED and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.