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PREAMBLE

The Community Wildlife Scout and Enterprise Groups Forum jointly organized as one of the activities under the Implementing park action plans for community engagement to tackle IWT project jointly implemented by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Village Enterprises (VE), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). The forum was jointly coordinated by VE and WCS on behalf of the project consortium. It took place on 17th March 2020 at Green Pearl Motel located in Kichwabugingo, Bweyale Town Council, Kiryandongo District and brought together 180 community wildlife scouts and village enterprise groups in Kichwabugingo and Kyandende parishes in Kiryandongo Sub-county, Kiryandongo District.

UWA was represented by the Acting Warden in Charge Karuma Wildlife Reserve (KWR) and community conservation rangers. Kiryandongo District Local Government was represented by the Community Development Officer (CDO), District Agriculture Officer (DAO) and Chairperson Natural Resources Committee while Kiryandongo Sub-county was represented by the Sub county chief and Counsellors. Others present were representatives from Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Village Enterprises (VE), Fauna & Flora International (FFI).

The Community Wildlife Scout and Enterprise Groups forum is funded by the UK Government through the Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund.

OPENING SESSION

The forum began at 10:08 am with a word of prayer from one of the community wildlife scouts. The Master of Ceremony (MC), Mr. John Francis Omusolo from VE, welcomed the participants to the forum. He recognized the presence of representatives from local government, UWA, WCS and VE. He went on to inform the participants that Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) in partnership with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and Village Enterprises (VE) are implementing a project funded by the UK Government aimed at community engagements in preventing wildlife crime around Murchison Falls Conservation Area. He said that combating wildlife crime was a collective responsibility and that wildlife scouts have been playing a key role in the project. He further stated that the reason for the forum was to share lessons learned from the scout and enterprise groups to inform partners and other stakeholders and come up with strategies to carry forward in combatting wildlife crime for the benefit of all.

Introductions were made by the participants of the forum.
Opening Remarks

Geoffrey Mwedde, Projects Manager IWT (WCS)

Mr. Mwedde welcomed the participants to the forum and stated that he has been working with the community wildlife scouts since the project was initiated. He further stated that the purpose of the forum was to share lessons learned from the project since the project has been under implementation for about 2 years. He believed that the scouts have learnt a lot from the project with both good and bad experiences and that this was their time to share their experiences. He noted that the project was a model meant to learn how incorporation of village-based enterprises in community wildlife scout programmes would encourage communities to work together to fight Human Wildlife Conflict and wildlife crime. He stressed the importance of the meeting saying that its outcomes will inform partners on the next steps, that is, whether to promote this model and encourage other development actors to take it on or to abandon it altogether. He encouraged the scouts to be very open and share their genuine experiences without fear or reservation.

Winnie Babra Auma, Country Director (Village Enterprises)

Ms. Auma thanked the enterprise groups, wildlife Scouts, project partners, district leaders and the community leaders for being part of the project. She stated that without all working together the forum wouldn’t have taken place. She noted that most times people only talk about the good things of a project to impress the partners and yet as community it’s less about the people that give the money but about the community and the future of Uganda. She paused a question to the participants: “whom are you lying to? It is to you, your family, community, village and Uganda”, Winnie said. She asked members of the forum to be authentic and give feedback that is true so that partners aren’t misled to replicate the project model and having it fail. She encouraged all to share their perspectives from all lenses, both men and women and emphasized that all contributions matter.

Goretti Kiyai, Warden Community Conservation, Karuma Wildlife Reserve (UWA)

Ms. Goretti Kiyai, the Community Conservation Warden who was also acting as Warden in Charge KWR thanked the community wildlife scouts and the community members for their efforts in combatting human wildlife conflict and wildlife crime. She noted a drop in the number of wildlife scouts that were initially recruited and thus thanked the present wildlife scouts for persevering and doing their work well. She stated that conservation is for all, and wild animals belong to all. Tourism is the number one income earner in the country and this benefits all through improvement in infrastructure such as roads, hospital etc. She informed the participants about the stricter punishments in the new Uganda Wildlife Act 2019 and
strongly advised people to desist from committing wildlife crimes. Concerning the issue of compensation, she stated that even though compensation is mentioned in the Uganda Wildlife Act 2019, the compensation structures aren’t yet in place to handle it. She called upon the community members to refute rumors that ODK information collected by the wildlife scouts is used by Uganda Wildlife Authority for compensation.

**Mr. Geoffrey Dabanja, Community Development Officer Kiryandongo District**

Mr. Dabanja stated that the forum is important because it is about conservation which is important. He referenced to years back when there were many wildlife resources in the community such as medicinal trees and are now extinct in the communities but are being preserved in the national park. He requested the scouts to plant such trees and fruits that are beneficial in their communities. He thanked the scouts for their cooperation with Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). He urged the participants to work together as a team to conserve the resources in the national park. He mentioned that communities are benefiting from the gate fees into the park (revenue sharing money). He also encouraged participants to be involved in trench maintenance and learn how to rear domestic animals so as to remove pressure on the animals in the park. He concluded with thanking the organizers of the forum and urged the scouts to take seriously the objectives of the forum.
FORUM DISCUSSIONS

Lessons & Experiences

This session of the forum was facilitated by Ms. Winnie Auma (VE) and Mr. Geoffrey Mwedde (WCS). Leaders of the different scout groups and enterprise groups were called to the front to present their views on the different project components in regards to the following questions;

1) What worked well and why?
2) What did not work well and why?

The responses are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>1) What worked well and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING</strong> Village Enterprise (VE), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)</td>
<td>VE and WCS trainings taught members how to work cohesively in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First aid training equipped scouts with knowledge to handle fractures and sprains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VE training taught members how to save which has helped members buy livestock like goats, poultry etc. Members are continuing to save and borrow money from their associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VE training taught members how to handle small retail businesses which they are running well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WCS scouts training taught members skills in controlling wild animals that stray from the park with different interventions such as organic repellent, vuvuzelas. This has helped to improve community relations with UWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in data collection using ODK Collect helped improve scouts interaction with technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife Scouts were taught on behaviours of wild animals which knowledge was transferred to the community members. This has helped improve the tactics of communities in chasing away the animals without causing them harm thus decreasing conflicts and accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training with VE has helped to integrate wildlife scouts with other community members through enterprises which has helped to improve their relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training also exposed members to different places that they had never been such as other districts which widened their understanding of conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VE and WCS trainings taught members how to work cohesively in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS, ENTERPRISES, SAVINGS GROUPS</strong></td>
<td>Enterprises have improved member livelihoods. Members have acquired solar lights and are buying more household items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loans from VSLA are used for growing businesses and paying school fees for children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VSLAs have brought community members together and improved relations.

Profits made by members were used to open retail shops, buy domestic livestock which improved on their diet

Reduction in poachers and improved relations with communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>2) What did not work well and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING</td>
<td>Trainings sometimes started late due to bad weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS, ENTERPRISES, SAVINGS GROUPS</td>
<td>Grant was small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor germination of seeds creating losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organic repellent materials costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prices of crops dropped causing drop in anticipated revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piggery as an enterprise did not do well because of swine fever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Challenges raised by the participants

- After receipt of grant, problem of price fluctuation after harvest.
- No relief from government or other stakeholders from destruction of crops by elephants.
- Elephants are now getting used to the scare tactics and areas that don’t have trenches have resulted in elephants crossing from non-trenchless points.
- The wildlife community scouts are living in fear of being poisoned or killed by poachers specifically when poachers are captured in the park.
- Equipment required for scaring wild animals are only in the hands of the scouts making it difficult for community members to support the scouts effectively.
- Women feeling left out. There is need more training and equipment (catapults) especially for women (this was raised by a community member who was interested in getting equipment to protect her crops).
- False information about crop compensation. Some community members were thinking that UWA is using information collected by scouts through the ODK to compensate the people.
- Diseases that affect domestic livestock such as swine fever affecting pigs.
- Supply of inputs to be done on time so as not to affect crop production.
- Unpredictable weather patterns affect growth.
- Inadequate or little incentive for scouts that can motivate them. If the UWA rangers are paid, why not them?
- Purchase of bad seeds. Some of the seeds given out did not germinate thus causing losses.
Ranking of Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Methods Used

Participants were asked to rank the human wildlife conflict methods they used which they felt were effective. Rank 1 represents the most effective method and Rank 5 represents the least effective method. These were ranked as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>HWC Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trenches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bangers, torches, vuvuzelas, whistles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catapult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chilli bricks, burnt oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organic repellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trenches were ranked as the most effective HWC method followed by noise making equipment which includes the bangers, vuvuzelas and whistles. The organic repellent was voted as the least preferred because its raw materials are costly so members cannot afford to make it.

Ranking of Enterprises

Participants were asked to rank the different enterprises provided by the project. All the participants that grew sunflower agreed that sunflower was the most lucrative enterprise because it is not eaten by wild animals, has a ready market and stable prices. When other participants (who did not grow sunflower) were asked whether they would like to grow sunflower, a large number of them raised their hands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>ENTERPRISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piggery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Piggery was voted the second lucrative enterprise after sunflower although they faced challenges with swine fever. Other enterprises that were provided in the project include onions, cabbages and sim sim.

CLOSING SESSION

Forum Evaluation

In the closing session, participants were asked to assess how the forum was conducted in line with the items outlined in the table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge gain</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General organisation (including venue)</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Remarks by Project Partners and Key Stakeholders

Ms. Winnie Auma (VE) concluded that the feedback obtained from the participants will be used to design future programs and also advise the project going forward. She encouraged the participants where possible to do something about the different challenges mentioned as individuals and families. She asked the members to go back to their groups and discuss.

Mr. Geoffrey Mwedde (WCS) thanked the participant for their patience, activeness and their commitment toward the project. He reiterated the importance of the forum and stated that whatever was discussed gives picture on what can be addressed and replicated to other places. He said that the lesson learned will be taken into consideration as the project will run until March 2021.

Mr. Ben Ogwang, Councillor at Kiryandongo Sub-county stated that domestic violence had reduced as a result of the project. He appealed to Uganda Wildlife Authority and the project partners to continue being in contact with communities together with local government in support of the project.

Closing Remarks by Chairperson of the Natural Resources Committee

Mr. Zziwa thanked the moderators and the organizers of the forum. He thanked the participants for attending the forum and for their patience and activeness. He continued to thank the partners for empowering the communities especially in enterprise development. He advised the project partners and scouts to carry out cost-benefit analysis on their different projects in order to ascertain whether profits/losses are being made. He paused a question to the participants. When the project phases out what is being done in terms of sustainability? He mentioned supervision as another important issue. In relation to the Uganda Wildlife Act 2019, He humbly requested UWA to take communities through Act so that they are informed and aware of its content. On the issue of compensation, he further requested that UWA expedite the process of having structure for the compensation. He concluded that people need to live with wild animals because they are ours.

Mr. Fred Zziwa officially closed the forum.
ANNEX 1: PHOTOS

Figure 1: Mr. John Francis Omusolo (MC) welcoming participants to the forum.

Figure 2: Opening speech by District community development officer, Mr Geoffrey Dabanja
Figure 3: Leaders of community scout and enterprise groups seated at the front during plenary session facilitated by Winnie Auma and Interpreter.

Figure 4: Winnie Auma (VE) facilitating the plenary sessions of the forum
Figure 5: Community scout expressing his views while other participants look on.

Figure 6: Participants responding to questions asked by show of hands.
ANNEX 2: FORUM AGENDA

COMMUNITY WILDLIFE SCOUT FORUM

VENUE: GREEN PEARL MOTEL, BWEYALE

DATE: 17TH MARCH 2020

AGENDA

8:00 – 9:00 hrs: Arrival and registration
9:00 – 9:15hrs: Aims and objectives of the workshop
9:15 – 10:00 hrs: Official opening speeches (District Community Development Officer, UWA, LG.)
10:00 – 10:30hrs: Speeches by Project Partners (WCS, VE)

10:30 – 11:00hrs: Tea break

11:00hrs – 13:00 hrs: Lessons and experiences – presentations by scouts and enterprise groups
   1) What has worked well and why, and 2) What has not worked well and why

13:00 – 14:00hrs: Lunch break

14:00 – 15:00hrs: Plenary – Feedback and reactions from delegates
   1) What has worked well and why, and 2) What has not worked well and why - reflect how the lessons are useful other projects

15:00 – 15:30hrs: Health Break

15:30 – 16:00hrs: Closing remarks by government (Chairperson Natural Resources Committee) and project partners

16:00 – 16:30hrs: Logistics and departure

ABOUT THE FUNDER

This forum has been organized with funding support from the Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund though the UK government. However, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the UK Government.
ANNEX 3: RESULTS OF SAPA AT MURCHISON FALLS

In 2019, FFI in partnership with IIED and UWA concluded SAPA (Social Assessment for Protected Areas) at Murchison Falls National Park to understand the positive impacts and the negative impacts of the protected area on people’s wellbeing.

Rogers Niwmanya from FFI Uganda attended the Murchison Falls Forum to share the results of the assessment with local stakeholders.

Mr Niwmanya’s presentation summarised the SAPA methodology used, the results of the assessment including the general impact of the park on people’s wellbeing, and the key negative and positive social impacts. He additionally summarised some of the key governance quality issues experienced at the park and stakeholders’ (community members, government and NGO) ideas of action.

The main issues discussed included human wildlife conflict, benefit sharing (enterprises, employment and livelihoods) and male school drop-out due to poaching.

The slides presented follow in this Annex.
SAPA HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

• Surveys conducted from 19th November to 7th December 2020

• 429 randomly selected households

• 4 Districts: Buliisa, Kirayandongo, Masindi and Nwoya

• Respondents from 40 villages in 15 Parishes
OVERALL SOCIAL IMPACT

Overall Social Impact of MFNP (%)

- 16% reduces our wellbeing
- 34% no impact
- 50% increases our wellbeing
HUMAN WILDLIFE CONFLICT

BENEFIT SHARING - WATER

POSITIVE IMPACTS

Positive Impacts of MFNP - overall (% ranked high)

- fertile soils near MFNP
- climatic modification by MFNP
- access to natural resources in MFNP
- good relationship with UWA staff
- revenue sharing projects
- fencing water points
- income from tourism
- employment (casuals & rangers)
- livelihood projects (not revenue sharing...)

Percentage chart showing:
- Livelihood projects (not revenue sharing) at 22.8%
Have your crops been damaged by wild animals in the past year?

- **Nwoya**: 6% yes, 94% no
- **Masindi**: 20% yes, 80% no
- **Kiryandongo**: 29% yes, 71% no
- **Buliisa**: 11% yes, 89% no

### Main Animal Causing HWC - District (%)

- **Elephant**: Buliisa 92%, Masindi 63%
- **Antelope**: Kiryandongo 99%, Nwoya 22%
- **Baboon**: Masindi 30%
- **Buffalo**: Nwoya 2
- **Hippo**: Kiryandongo 2
- **Warthog**: Buliisa 33%, Masindi 14
- **Wild Pig**: Kiryandongo 5, Nwoya 10
### HWC Negative Impacts

#### Negative Impacts of MFNP - overall (% ranked high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFNP attracts high rainfall</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human wildlife conflicts</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No compensation HWC</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife road accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male school drop outs linked to poaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park entry fee too high for local people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased distribution of MFNP benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased selection of MFNP casual staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HWC Negative Impacts - Wellbeing Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human wildlife conflicts</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No compensation HWC</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife road accidents</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*higher wb %  lower wb %
HWC governance

**UWA collect info on HWC (ranger + volunteers)**

- **Agree**: 52%
- **Disagree**: 27%
- **Don't know**: 17%
- **No comment**: 4%

**MFNP trenches work to reduce HWC**

- **Agree**: 58%
- **Disagree**: 26%
- **Don't know**: 13%
- **No comment**: 3%
HWC GOVERNANCE

UWA respond within an hour to HWC

- no comment: 4%
- don't know: 13%
- disagree: 53%
- agree: 31%

BENEFIT SHARING - LIVELIHOODS, ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT
**Benefit Sharing – RS Scheme**

**Positive Impacts**

Positive Impacts of MFNP - overall (% ranked high)

- fertile soils near MFNP: 9.3%
- climatic modification by MFNP: 16.8%
- access to natural resources in MFNP: 21.7%
- good relationship with UWA staff: 23.3%
- revenue sharing projects: 0%
- fencing water points: 10%
- income from tourism: 20%
- employment (casuals & rangers): 30%
- livelihood projects (not revenue sharing funded): 40%
- 0 10 20 30 40 50

**Negative Impacts**

Negative Impacts of MFNP - overall (% ranked high)

- MFNP attracts high rainfall: 0%
- human wildlife conflicts: 5%
- no compensation HWC: 10%
- wildlife road accidents: 15%
- male school drop outs linked to poaching: 20%
- park entry fee to high for local people: 25%
- biased distribution of MFNP benefits: 30%
- biased selection of MFNP casual staff: 35%
OTHER RELEVANT NEGATIVE IMPACTS

HWC NEGATIVE IMPACTS

Negative Impacts of MFNP - overall (% ranked high)

- MFNP attracts high rainfall
- human wildlife conflicts
- no compensation HWC
- wildlife road accidents
- male school drop outs linked to poaching
- park entry fee to high for local people
- biased distribution of MFNP benefits
- biased selection of MFNP casual staff

20
LAW ENFORCEMENT
ADDITIONAL SITE QUESTIONS

Rangers use an appropriate level of force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges that need Action

• Some Human Wildlife Conflict Mitigation measures are not feasible all around MFNP
• No Compensation for HWCs
• Revenue sharing funds only benefit front line Villages
• Low Capacity for community committees to implement RS guidelines
• Increased need for legal resource harvesting
• Rangers handling community members in inappropriate ways
Challenges Contd.

• Lack of Knowledge on the content of the new Wildlife act on Criminals – Penalties
• Lack of information to the public on crime levels at Park level
• No major eco-tourism activities to benefit communities outside the park
• Limited employment opportunities for park adjacent community members
• Lack of capacity by community members to engage in other IGAs