



Report commissioned by  
DOF – BirdLife Denmark and *NatureUganda* – BirdLife Uganda



***Improved livelihoods through sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Central Forest Reserve, Uganda***

**External Review Report**



Conthur Environment

19<sup>th</sup> October 2014

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE OF THE REVIEW .....	2
3. KEY FINDINGS.....	3
3.1 Assessment of Project design and relevance.....	3
3.2 Effectiveness (Progress towards objectives and outputs) .....	5
3.2.1 Capacity Building Objective .....	6
3.2.2 Livelihood Improvement Objective.....	9
3.2.3 Echuya Forest Reserve Conservation Objective.....	12
3.3 Gender mainstreaming, equity issues .....	14
3.4 Project management, organisation and technical assistance.....	15
3.5 Efficiency .....	16
3.5.1 Project expenditures.....	16
3.5.2 Staffing .....	16
3.5.3 Financial management and operational planning .....	16
3.6 Monitoring & Evaluation.....	17
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	19

## Abbreviations

CFM	Collaborative Forest Management
CISU	Civilsamfund i Udvikling
DOF	Dansk Ornitoogisk Forening
ECFR	Echuya Central Forest Reserve
ECOTA	Echuya Conservation and Tourism Association
EOP	End of Project
ETR	External Review
FAC	Forest Adjacent Communities
FAO	Financial Administration Officer
GIS	Geographical Information System
IGA	Income Generating Activity
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices
LKM	Low Key Monitoring
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NBSAP	National Biodiversity strategy and Action Plan
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NFA	National Forestry Authority
NFP	National Forest Policy
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NTFP	Non Timber Forest Products
NU	Nature Uganda
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
SACCO	Savings and Credit Co-operative
SOA	Sustainable Organic Agriculture
SWOT	Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats
TOR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UOBDO	United Organization for Batwa Development in Uganda

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The project “Improved livelihoods through sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest” is a continuation of the DFID funded collaborative forest management project implemented by Nature Uganda with support from the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), the Birdlife International partner in the UK, which was implemented around the Echuya Central Forest Reserve (ECFR) from 2004-2009. The project was implemented to address the continued degradation of the important forest reserve, which ranked highly in terms of biodiversity and rarity of flora and fauna. The project applied the new national policy of Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) aiming at showing that that CFM could be implemented to conserve the resources, ecosystem services and biodiversity of the forest while at the same time reducing the poverty of forest adjacent communities (FAC).

Based on the success of the former project, and in consideration of the need to consolidate the achievements, Nature Uganda sought further assistance from DOF and Danida in order to continue the support to ECFR and to demonstrate the validity of the CFM process and to show that the successes can also be achieved in other national forests across the country. Likewise, it would enable the FAC and national institutions to (NFA and local government) to fulfil their obligations under the CFM agreements and thus contribute to the ecological integrity of the ECFR. The present project, which is the focus of this review, started in June 2011 and will terminate by June 2015. It has a budget of DKK 7.832.527, and is being implemented by Nature Uganda through a project office located in Kabale, near the Rwandan border. Nature Uganda has contracted a project team based in Kabale to implement the project, while additional technical assistance is hired as per the provisions in the project document and as otherwise needed. Nature Uganda oversees the finances through the head office in Kampala, while DOF has a supervisory role and provides limited technical assistance.

The project’s development objective is: *Forest adjacent communities (FACs) around Echuya Central Forest Reserve (ECFR) provide a national demonstration of how to develop a sustainable source of income through Collaborative Forest Management (CFM).*

The aim of the project is to demonstrate that the communities living adjacent to the Echuya Forest Reserve can improve their livelihoods, economically or otherwise, through CFM agreements with the forest authorities regarding the sustainable exploitation of the natural resources and through enhanced Income Generating Activities (IGA) as promoted by the project. The Project is working in 9 parishes around the Echuya Forest Reserve. Furthermore, the Project has an overarching ecosystem conservation goal. The Echuya forest is unique with several endemic species and at the same time provides important ecological functions as a water catchment area as well as supplying the local communities with non-timber forest products on which they depend to a high degree.

The project aims to achieve these goals through engaging in

- *capacity building* exercises of both the targeted communities and the local forest authorities and the staff of Nature Uganda, and through advocacy of livelihood approaches at national level.

- *livelihood improvement* through sustainable( income generating )activities and natural resources management.

- *Improved ecological integrity* of the Echuya forest through better conservation

This report highlights the ETR mission’s assessment of the project performance and the key issues to be addressed according to TOR (Annex 1).

## **2. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE OF THE REVIEW**

As indicated in TOR the purpose of the External Review is to provide DOF and partners with an assessment of:

“progress and challenges towards the project’s set indicators and efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability in its implementation as well as the feasibility of finalising the project within the planned timeframe (July 2011 – June 2015)”

As DOF is now engaged in a process of applying for a shift in funding of its development work from a project based application modality to funding as a so-called CISU-program (i.e. a programme implementation modality to replace the project based application modality), TOR is also specifically requesting recommendations on the following 3 aspects related to the future potential continuation under a programme modality (TOR p. 2):

- “which of the current major activities and outputs would make most sense to/should be continued into a 3-year CISU-program and in what way, to increase the sustainability and impact of interventions
- when and how to phase-in a new site (Kisyoha-Kitomi forest) into the 3-year CISU-program after first having secured the long term sustainability of the interventions in Echuya, captured the lessons learned on the Echuya project to inform the phasing-in of the new site (Kisyoha-Kitomi forest)
- the feasibility of applying for a no-cost extension of (some of) the current project activities in ample time before the planned finalisation of the project (end of June 2015 as per current project document) as part of the phasing-in of the Echuya component into the 3-year CISU-program.”

The main criteria used for the review process include project effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, coordination and management. The ETR focus areas relate to the three immediate objectives of the Project (capacity building, livelihood improvement and ecosystem integrity/protection). A set of specific questions related to these objectives are presented in TOR, which are sought answered by the ETR.

The ETR mission consisted of a Preparation Phase, a Field Work Phase, and a Reporting Phase, followed by commenting and Final Reporting, as described in the Inception Report. The

methodology used for data collection and analysis involved desk reviews, stakeholder interviews and group discussions. The main documents consulted are presented in Annex 6.

The Field Work Phase followed the program except for minor changes (see program in Annex 2). Initially meetings were held with NU in Kampala, followed by meetings with National Forest Authority with the Director of Corporate Affairs.

Once at the Project office in Kabale, presentations on Project progress were made by project management. The Project manager and financial controller were interviewed on a one to one basis. A series of sessions were also conducted with individual project staff responsible for the Project core areas (capacity building, IGA, CFM and conservation) and crosscutting themes. The Community Development Officer was not met, as she was on maternity leave. The ETR visited areas with ongoing project activities in Kabale and Kisoro districts and met with main stakeholders (communities around Echuya), and Project partners (District Natural Resources Officer, District and sub-county Chairman, and other local actors such as BMCT).

After concluding the field phase, a presentation of the initial findings and conclusions was made to the principal stakeholders in a wrap-up meeting at the project office on the 29th of September 2014, and at the U secretariat on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2014. A list of persons met is included as Annex 7.

### **3. KEY FINDINGS**

#### **3.1 Assessment of Project design and relevance**

In accordance with the TOR the review is based on applying the logical framework as the main basis for assessing progress towards the set objectives at various levels, specifically assessing the indicators presented in the project document. The ETR therefore focussed on *effectiveness* towards the actual purpose defined for the project and achievement of results under the specific components as measured based on evidence.

The Project Document (PD) which has guided implementation is generally well written and presents the major challenges and objectives to be achieved by the Project. It outlines the national context in which the Echuya Project is set, describes the demise and general decline of forest to the detriment of the Forest Adjacent Communities (FAC), as well as the opportunities for CFM to contribute to poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods. It also presents linkages to Uganda's National Development Plan, National Forest Policy and National Forest & Tree Planting act (2003) including the CFM Guidelines, as well as the National Biodiversity strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). In fact, the Project Document makes linkages to these plans and policies at the activity level, e.g. it indicates how many of the 11 areas targeted by the NFP that the Project will address. Thus it can be said that **the objectives of the ECFR Project are well in line with the policies of the forest sector.**

The justification for the project focused on the ECFR as being an important resource for poor communities, especially for bamboo; hosting rare or endemic species, among them the Grauer's Swamp Warbler; further work was required to strengthen the CFM process, to build capacity for the

partner and community institutions and to “secure” the environmental services and biodiversity of ECFR. This is obviously still very important especially for the FAC. Thus, the ETR considers that the Project **remains highly relevant for the main beneficiaries (farmers and their communities around Echuya forest , targeting potentially about 40,000 people<sup>1</sup>).**

The log-frame is commendable in the sense that it includes SMART indicators – however, it also contains indicators for activities, which is unusual. In a normally designed log-frame means and inputs only are listed for activities. The activity indicators are furthermore very detailed and described as result-targets, and in many cases defined as results to be obtained or achieved by target groups or other actors beyond the project influence. An example: activity 2.2.1 “Link CFM associations to other partners for supplementary support” has an indicator of “5 CFM associations are seeking /accessing development support services from other partners by EOP”. It is not clear exactly what activity is expected from the Project to carry out in order for the CFM associations to actually reach such a state (the indicator can be better perceived as an outcome which is beyond the control of the project).

Many of the activity-indicators listed in the log-frame can be questioned in the same manner. A few were highlighted by project staff: Activity 2.3.10 “Support FACs in bamboo domestication outside ECFR”. Activity indicator: “10000 bamboos domesticated by EOP”. Should planting 10000 bamboos be attributed to the Project? Is 10000 really desirable considering the intention to domesticate bamboo? What is really the desired end result of this activity?

“A common problem in project design is over-specification of project activities and inputs, combined with under-definition of objectives and outputs.  
Note that the project design should provide an overview of the main elements of the project at decision-making level, while the detailed planning should usually be done as a separate exercise.”  
NORAD, p.65

Perhaps due to this focus on activities with target-like indicators, the project has fallen into the trap of being **activity oriented** i.e. project achievement is monitored based only on the “achievement” of activities, thereby not focussing enough on the wider goals to be achieved. In this sense, the log-frame has become a strait-jacket for Project implementation rather than a tool. Project management has also recognised that there are many outputs with overlapping activities, which make planning and reporting more difficult.

Similar issues can be detected in the output-objective linkages. E.g. Output 2.1 “NFA supports FACs to equitably improve livelihoods and incomes through sustainable forest resource use within the forest reserve”. Indicator: “a. 50% of Batwa (150 HH) and 10% of other tribes (500 HH) increase their income from sustainable use of natural resources within the forest by 20% above a yr 1 baseline by EOP”. Can we say that if the target groups increase their income by 20% that this contributes to the output of NFA supporting the FACs? It seems that the output indicator is better perceived as an objective by itself. Thus it is clear **that linkages between the different levels of the log-frame are not clearly defined.**

---

<sup>1</sup> The number is an estimate

Difficulties in distinguishing between objectives and outputs cause a common type of mistake in project designs. Example:

- A project can guarantee that a number of smallholders are trained in the construction and operation of fish ponds, and provide them with an initial quantity of fingerlings. These are the concrete outputs of the project. However, the project cannot guarantee that:
- The smallholder's annual average production of fish is increased from X tons in 1990 to Y tons by 1995. This must be seen as an objective since it is the direct result of the smallholder's work, and outside the direct control of the project itself.

*NORAD, p.63*

While the goal (development objective) of the Project can be described as **to provide a national demonstration of how to develop sustainable incomes through CFM**, there is no clear vision of the expected end result, it is not clearly spelled out what that entails with regards e.g. to the FAC and their associations, the NFA and in terms of biodiversity conservation. What does it mean when we say that ECFR is a national demonstration site? What is required to reach such a situation?

The strategy to achieve the goal (development objective) is proposed in the Project document as follows:

- empower FACs to advocate for their own needs & rights, and put demands on local Gov't.
- Through "full participation and involvement", reduce conflict NFA vs. FAC
- Limited service delivery (training and materials)
- Deliberate effort to reduce inequality
- Project will promote self-help groups (particularly for women).
- Raise awareness (children, school education programme).

**The strategy presented is very general and does not provide clear guidance on exactly how the strategy elements are going to be implemented by the Project, other than through advocacy.**

While the advocacy role of the Project is difficult to reconcile with the rigours of a traditional log-frame, if using the LFA approach it should be clear who has responsibility for implementation and how can it be tracked. Perhaps by distinguishing explicitly between the parts of the project that concern advocacy activities and those which are concerned with direct implementation would provide the flexibility needed, while at the same time permitting proper monitoring of progress towards the goals.

The recommendation on design is that **the project document and log frame needs revision. A better description of the end goal and the strategy to reach it should be clearly spelled out. The objectives and outputs can be retained but revised according to strategy changes, and activities have to be aligned better with outputs to avoid overlaps. There should be no target indicators for activities, rather a stricter focus on means and inputs. The "activity indicators" could be construed as activities themselves as an initial guide to restructuring the logical framework.**

### **3.2 Effectiveness (Progress towards objectives and outputs)**

All objectives are expected to materialise during Project lifetime. The three objectives and their indicators (in parentheses) are:



1. Capacity of FAC, NFA and NU increased to manage NRM projects and to communicate and advocate for the developed CFM agreements, livelihood approaches and lessons learned at national level. ***(Indicator: 80% partners comply with CFM agreements by yr 3, NU staff engaging in wider audience in Yr 4 than Yr 1)***

2. Incomes and livelihoods of FACs equitably improved and social benefits they receive increased through training/ support in sustainable livelihood options and natural resource management. ***(Indicator: A minimum of 50 % of Batwa (150 HH) and 20 % of other tribes (1000 HH) in the project area increase their income by 30% above a Yr 1 baseline from project activities by EOP; At least 50% of FACs (150 Batwa HH and 2,500 HH of other tribes) receive support from CFM associations through training and awareness programmes by EOP).***

3. The ecological integrity of ECFR improved through securing the natural resources, environmental services and biodiversity in the long term. ***(Indicator: stable/increasing forest area by EOP, key forest indicator species stable/increasing by EOP).***

In total, there are 11 outputs and 63 activities under the objectives.

### **3.2.1 Capacity Building Objective**

This objective has four outputs concerning FAC training and development of FAC/NFA relationship through dialogue meetings, establishing a joint CFM monitoring system, organisation of CFM forums, exchange visits and awareness raising for FAC on the value of ECFR. It contains 4 outputs and 20 activities.

***FAC training (Output 1.1):*** 1 meeting for 4 CFM assoc. members and NFA staff held in monitoring forest resource and conflict resolution has been held.

1 event in cross border conflict resolution held. The meeting ended with action points, which are not necessarily followed up upon .(e.g. an issue in Muko arose between NFA and FAC, concerning expansion of an NFA seed stand affecting FAC land).

Forest patrolling has been institutionalised, but each individual participant receives 10000 UGS for members as allowance for patrolling (Project informs that members are still demanding more e.g. clothes etc. which raises sustainability concerns). A training workshop was held for NFA patrolmen, but the the Project indicates there are no more funds to continue with new patrolmen (frequent changes – patrolmen are not permanent NFA staff, but are hired on contractual basis at low salary levels). The funding issues arise from the fact that the Project budget is based on the activities and activity-indicators, and only one training was foreseen for this item.

1 event for assessment of CFM agreements (rights & roles) concerning the 4 CFM groups was held. (with 4 not 5 CFM associations as a Batwa group was attached to Kanaba CFM group.)

4 rounds public awareness campaign including Radio programmes tailored towards special issues, roles rights of FAC, CFM benefits and ecological values of forest. The Project pays for airtime plus transport of staff and Community members.

Exchange visits have not yet been done, but are planned for 2015.

Activity 1.1.2 specified “NFA and FAC to develop a joint participatory monitoring and evaluation system to monitor progress of CFM implementation”, supposed to be finalised with DOF input by Yr 2. This has not yet been initiated; however the NFA CFM coordinator is to work with CFM associations. TOR have been made for this, and the Project indicates that this activity should start by 4th quarter 14. At this stage, it is not likely that a system will be in place before EOP.

The Project is supposed to organise two CFM forums with the purpose to influence CFM guidelines & policies: this has not been done arguably due to limited budget, the Project indicates that if it is to host, then more funds are needed. It seems important in the context of demonstrating a model for CFM. The Project has thought of engaging the umbrella organisation Uganda National Network of Collaborative Forest Management Associations (UNETCOFA) but it is not active.

The Project participates in district and sub-county local government quarterly planning and annual planning meetings and CFM activities are appearing in sub-county work plans – however action on the ground is almost totally dependent on NU for funding. Most sub-counties are supportive and some, particularly Kanaba, are doing a great work in mobilizing people and always promoting Project activities in public meetings etc.

**NFA capacity building output (1.2):** the Project is expected to lobby NFA and local governments to mainstream CFM activities in development plans and budgets; review the CFM agreements; revise the national CFM legislations and guidelines and enhance awareness of field based staff.

Some action planning meetings (also considered training) were held to plan for revisions of CFM agreements. These meetings have produced inputs for the revision of the CFM agreements, but all activities pertaining to CFM agreements are dependent on NFA, and so far the revisions have not materialised.

Also, the Project is “building evidence” to lobby Government/NFA to improve CFM guidelines by EOP. One training has been done on raising awareness of field based NFA staff on CFM regulations, but funds are exhausted for this budget item.

**Output 1.4** concerns the facilitation of review & revision of CFM plans (“all 5 plans reviewed and updated by end Yr 2”), and work to bring together NFA and CFM groups in CFM association work-planning and institutionalising annual reporting. CFM agreements have been reviewed and issues presented for the final revision (the CFM agreements were made in first phase, but are now outdated /expired), but the revisions are still pending action by NFA.

The Project is convinced that awareness on CFM rules, regulations and roles and rights of partners has changed in target groups regarding CFM knowledge. (Activity indicator: “By EOP KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices) surveys of people in FACs show increased awareness compared to baseline (Yr1)”. The KAP study was combined with the Baseline Survey carried out in 2012, but the quality of the baseline survey indicators do not permit monitoring of any change from Yr1 to the present. The Project has reported<sup>2</sup> that it is “expected that so far 5 community sensitization meetings held under 1.1.8 together with awareness raised under 1.4.1 will contribute to improved FACs awareness by end of the project.”

**Capacity building of NU staff (Output 1.3):** This concerns organisational and managerial training in NRM project management, review of NU organisational plans and strategies, policy analysis, participation of NU staff in NRM forums).

---

<sup>2</sup> Quartely report April June 2014, p.7

NU Project staff participated in a training in Kenya “Toolkit for ecosystem services assessment” , which was tested in Echuya and other sites, for comparison.

The Nu secretariat informed that strategic planning is institutionalised in NU, and the reason that a review of the NU strategic plan is included here was the coincidence of the routine strategic plan review with Project activities, which presented an opportunity for this to be carried as part of Project activities.

Under this heading the Project also considers as training meetings and events for which NU has contracted a facilitator e.g. training events intended for target beneficiaries. NU staff also benefit from such events. A list of contracted “facilitations” and consultancies undertaken under the Project can be seen in Annex 3.

A **training needs assessment** has **not** been done on an individual basis for Project staff in order to determine the need and schedule targeted training. Whether policy analysis and advocacy should be the main themes as indicated in the log-frame is questionable. Perhaps focus should be more on community intervention strategies participatory processes and other themes more directly relevant for day to day work, such as M&E. This would also apply for the UOBDU, who are supposed to receive the same type of training in policy analysis and advocacy. An apparent need detected by the ETR seem to be: None of staff is competent in use of GIS and databases, which is needed for developing an M&E system. The FAO is supposed to do “Quickbooks” but not implementing due to lack of training.

Additionally staff would like to have opportunity for more study tours, and visits to other areas implementing CFM for sharing experiences.

The ETR finds that in general project activities have been mainstreamed in Local Government and to some extent in NFA work plans, such as patrolling, and that commitment to Project activities is in place, but converting commitment to timely action is limited due to limited resources, lack of capacity, or institutional constraints.

It is difficult to say if the training objective has been achieved at this time as the outputs aim at very different target groups with different aspirations. It seems clear at least that FAC are still not able to “advocate for the developed CFM agreements, livelihood approaches and lessons learned at national level”. There needs to be a clearer focus on what is exactly required by FAC, by NFA and by NU, and clearer indicators need to be in place in order to monitor the results. These indicators must come from a better articulated implementation strategy. The budget limitations in executing several activities stem from the fact that the Project budget activities and activity-indicators are too narrow – this issue should have been identified and resolved.

**There is a need to strengthen the training strategy for FAC by focussing on CFM associations, a change which should be based on assessments of training needs in all CFM associations and groups and concentrating and targeting the training differentiated according to needs. This means that the groups and their performance should be the prime focus of the Project, and progress should then be followed up closely and reported on by association/group.**

**There is a need for strengthening the training program for NU staff, based on a training needs assessment, in themes related to project implementation such as GIS, databases, community intervention strategies, M&E, and project management in general. The goal is not likely to be achieved within project time frame.**

### 3.2.2 Livelihood Improvement Objective

This objective has four outputs concerning: to equitably improve livelihoods and incomes through sustainable forest resource use *within* the forest reserve & *outside* of the ECFR; ecologically appropriate on-farm agro-forestry and tree-crop options promoted and implemented by FAC (including set up a monitoring system to monitor AF progress by yr 2), and FAC are more empowered to advocate and lobby for receiving increased services from other institutions.

Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 concern the improvement of livelihoods and incomes through sustainable forest resource use *within* the forest reserve & *outside* of the ECFR. Common to the activities have been the selection of appropriate IGAs and the promotion of appropriate technology. Early on the Project considered the opportunities for developing IGA and selected the ones most likely to be successfully applied and adopted by the FAC.

The process of introducing the IGAs and innovative livelihood options consist in training of the beneficiary person(s), then when skills are adequate, continued support is given as technical advice, then linkages to markets are sought improved. Once increases in incomes emerge, then the Project looks at connecting with or establishing collection centres. In some cases collective production is considered by groups but this is not the norm. The Project does not have a strategy for promoting IGAs per se, they say “it is embedded within project implementation “. However, the livelihood improvement activities are centred around the 4 CFM associations and sub-groups. The Project does not, however, report on a group wise basis but instead reports on each activity and its indicators, which makes it difficult to assess the magnitude of the implementation effort and makes monitoring of progress difficult for the Project implementers (all monitoring is activity based).

**Tree planting**, nurseries (pines, grevillea, fruit trees) is quite popular and seems to have good impact as it is taken up by farmers also outside of the direct beneficiaries, Seedling distribution is popular, about 200,000 have been produced this year in 3 Project nurseries. Initially the Project purchased seedlings up till 2012. The Project does not promote exotics like eucalypts, but is on the other hand not focussing on indigenous species either, rather the species selection is a trade-off between demand and ecological justifications. Tree planting is perhaps the most accepted and widely recognised activity also by local governments.

**Bamboo domestication** on farm land with FAC is seen as one of the main opportunities for reducing the pressure from the natural stands in the forest. Bamboo planting of rhizomes collected in the forest and planted on famers plots have high mortality in transplanting, and causes degradation in the ECFR source areas if large numbers are to be collected (10,000 is indicated in the log-frame). Alternative propagation methods have been tried, but without much success. The Project conservation officer is working on a report on progress with propagation trials including innovative methods e.g. “layering” where whole stem is placed under soil layers, which will then sprout from the nodes. Also cutting stem in pieces and planting directly has been tried in nursery, but mortality is high, “we haven’t learned much about bamboo, we are still learning to propagate”. **No results are likely before EOP, bamboo domestication still needs experimenting and more targeted research. It is however recommended to expand and scale up bamboo domestication, which is supported by**

**NFA. New forms of experimenting should be tried including applied research directly in farmers' fields as well as in the CFM areas inside the Echuya forest.**

***Agro-forestry, mushrooms, soil conservation, sustainable organic agriculture, beekeeping:***

Agro-forestry, soil conservation and Agroforestry (AF) is promoted with several farmers using *Vernonia* sp., calliandra, tree-tomatoes, and passion fruit primarily. Three IGAs i.e. mushroom growing, apiary and fruit growing are being supported in each of the 9 parishes around Echuya forest. Several AF sites were visited during the field visit which clearly showed the potential and constraints in promoting these techniques. Some of the constraints are attack by pests and diseases, especially passion fruit is prone. Perhaps for this reason sustainable organic agriculture has not really taken off. The project has supported training in fruit growing and management, mainly focusing on integrated pests and diseases management. The parish extension agents (PEAs) have participated in some of these trainings, with the idea that they could act as trainers of trainers.

The Project has also conducted training for mushroom growers and continues with refresher training. Mushroom growers are provided with spawn, driers, and other materials. About 500 have been trained in mushroom growing. The trained mushroom growing groups and individuals started growing mushrooms and according to the April-June 2014 quarterly report "by mid June 2014, a total of 186.5 kgs of fresh and 4kgs of dry mushrooms had been harvested realizing a total sum of UGX 1, 207,000 (USD 480)."

The project has supported the introduction of *beekeeping*, including training and support to installation both for individuals and groups, which seems to be catching on. However the technology especially in processing needs to be further developed. Recently a CFM association subgroup of Kacerere Bee Keepers Association was supported with 70 locally made hives that were handed over at a meeting held on the 21st of June 2014.

Soil conservation has been supported in 18 sites, promoting contour trenches and tree planting. The project also facilitated training in construction, utilisation and maintenance of energy cook stoves conducted by local trainers. 18 cook stoves were constructed in 18 households around Echuya.

Some progress has been made creating linkages with other potential support services such as NAADS to provide advisory and technical guidance, and some meetings with other local partners have been conducted to request for support in terms of extension services and inclusion of the project activities in the sub-county and district plans. The project had further planned deliberate dialogue meetings with stakeholders to promote linking CFM associations to other development partners/programmes for supplementary support. At this stage progress in this regard seems incipient.

The Project is of the opinion that they could have achieved more with regards to IGA promotion but have been hampered by the late Project start-up (the Project did not start until early 2012). They also indicate that the final selection of the type of IGA to support was not decided on definitively until after the market survey report (prepared in Dec. 2013), after which they felt confident to promote further the prioritised IGAs. The market survey presented economic justifications of all proposed IGAs and confirmed the validity of the IGA selection.

In terms of the technical approach, the ETR finds that focus could be more on integral farm planning, rather than just introducing single IGA.

Microfinance is considered under this output. In this respect, the Project works with forming “self help groups”. Of the 4 CFM associations, 5 sub-groups have been formed, with one recognised as SACCO (composed of CFM members, the entry point is to support CFM members), The Project has produced an excellent report on microfinance assessment in CFM associations, which gives a precise status of the progress, constraints and opportunities (produced by the Community Development officer). Two of the microfinance groups are highlighted as performing well while others are lagging behind.

A training on financial management and group dynamics for selected supported micro-credit groups around Echuya Central Forest Reserves was carried out in February 2014 in response to realization by Project management that some supported micro-credit groups still had limited knowledge and competencies in financial management including group lending methodology to acquire micro-loans for poverty reduction. 5 groups participated and produced action plans. The resulting report is commendable, and has excellent recommendations for follow-up on group basis.

There is however, **no Project strategy for how to pursue microfinance further. Support is still needed for business planning, tying this with income generating activities, including NTFPs, skills in agro-forestry based microenterprise development, and microfinance.**

***Eco-tourism planning:*** A facilitator has been engaged by Nature Uganda to review the district tourism plans of Kisoro and Kabale with the aim of incorporating CFM elements, and at the same time come up with a specific eco-tourism development plan for Echuya forest. The inputs for district tourism plans and Echuya ecotourism plan now in draft form, seem in good progress for incorporating in district tourism plans, and for preparing the Echuya plan also show good prospects. The Echuya plan development includes

- the formation of Echuya Conservation and Tourism Association (ECOTA) an umbrella body for CFM associations and is supported by Nature Uganda to run ecotourism activities, from which its members will benefit, in line with other IGA. Currently the group has 68 members.
- land has been secured in ECFR (two locations, one on each side of the forest).
- ECOTA ecotourism business plan is just about ready (comments and output & need also MOU with NFA)
- costumes for drama, cultural dances at campsites is in pipeline
- support to establishing bird watching trail, plus training local bird guides is on drawing board.

The prospects are good that that ecotourism facilities are functional by the end of project. The facilities will be established after the ecotourism plan is finalized, since the ecotourism plan will also serve as a project brief for the proposed development as required by National Environment Management Authority regulations. However, the plan assumes approval (and inclusion into) the general Echuya forest management plan (has not happened yet). **If ecotourism is *not* included in the**

**general management plan, there should be an MOU (covering forest restoration also) which would make it possible for ecotourism to be implemented in the same manner as the local CFM plans.**

In terms of economic prospects for beneficiaries, according to the ecotourism facilitator, **not much revenue can be expected from tourism activities, people had higher expectations, but the plan will be important for conservation of the forest.**

As a conclusion to this section, the result of Project efforts concerning the IGA objective are promising, but not yet self-supporting or expanding. The numbers of beneficiaries participating is quite low and thus the impact is limited, except perhaps for tree planting. Judging by the “activity indicators” of the log-frame, it is not likely that the FAC have increased their incomes by 40% compared to year one. However, as mentioned, the baseline does not permit that kind of comparison, it simply does not contain detailed income surveys useful for establishing income baselines (however it does give good justifications for the Project activities). At the same time it is not really fair to use those indicators for measuring Project performance, due to the design considerations mentioned initially. The project has not initiated the design and setting up of a monitoring system for AF actions, but is reporting on activities only. The project is not producing consolidated data and narrative analytical reports. The ETR finds that the Project is focusing too much on trying to achieve the indicators of the activities and in so doing loses focus of the intended goal. Unfortunately the goal is not well described or articulated in the Project document. E.g. what does it entail to become a demonstration site for CFM and livelihood improvement?. Could it be a package of modules (on training, IGA and conservation) which should be produced, validated and disseminated for replication? it is not easy to find any strategic analyses in the project documents that delve on these issues.

It would serve the Project purpose better to focus on the CFM associations and measure performance based on progress in these (including the CFM sub-groups), according to a *revised intervention strategy*.

### **3.2.3 Echuya Forest Reserve Conservation Objective**

This objective is composed on 3 outputs and 17 activities, concerning: the review of the Echuya management plan by NFA and FAC (demarcation of the (production zone) forest for CFM local plan activities, targeted studies of biodiversity, establishment and implementation of sustainable harvesting/off-take of forest products (bamboo); Selected aspects of the management plan implemented (NFA supported in boundary maintenance, restoration of degraded areas etc.)

Lessons learnt influence national/local policy and practice to support sustainable forest management at ECFR and across Uganda (incl. Produce and disseminate policy briefs).

The Project has made consultations and held workshop to identify issues to be included in the revised general management plan for Echuya, which have been presented to NFA (the focus is on inclusion of strategic issues and the inclusion of ecotourism). However, the approval process has been stalled in NFA, it requires NFA board approval which has not been possible due to restructuring of the board. This means that all activities dependent on NFA action have been postponed.

The Project has supported NFA and FAC to develop sustainable off take quotas for resources in particular bamboo and firewood, and the associated forms have been put into use. The Project is tracking what is being removed from the forest. The intention is that data will be compared with studies on the resource to get an idea of sustainable off-take quotas. For monitoring, there are designated access points for entry to forest which have been used for off-take monitoring routines on a monthly basis. This is controlled by the PEA at 8 entry points, at agreed days of the week for the respective CFM groups.

Regarding the zonation outputs, there is ambiguity in the log-frame of two related outputs concerning zonation, i.e. between the general forest zonation into management zones (production, buffer, core) and CFM local plan zones for harvesting according to the CFM agreements. The CFM areas within the forest are in the production and buffer zone – each CFM group has its own area. In any case the zonation is done but not yet approved in the reviewed CFM agreements, and demarcation of the CFM areas is not yet done.

The Project has produced one (out of 5 expected) policy brief (*“Collaborative Forest Management – demonstrating linkage between livelihoods and sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest, Uganda”*). This brief provides a good overview of constraints to CFM in Echuya forest in general, but in order to “influence national/local policy and practice” in CFM across Uganda the ETR finds that it is as yet premature to expect sufficient consolidated lessons learned to generate further policy briefs to influence national/local policy before EOP.

**Low Key Monitoring** (now called Locally Based Monitoring) in Echuya was initiated in 2013 after being designed in a 5 day workshop with participation from NFA, local government and UOBDU. The intention of the LKM system is to provide an opportunity to monitor the health of ECFR and collect information that would help NFA and other partners in decision making. Twelve Joint Low Key Monitoring rounds were carried out by each of the four monitoring teams (monthly basis). A review has recently been done (Sept. 2014) of the system, as envisaged in the design. The LKM system involves 6 steps in which agreements are made on what to monitor, team composition, trail layout and observation criteria, monitoring equipment, data handling etc. The teams formed in Echuya consist of 5 people: 1 NFA staff, 1 Local Govt. staff, 3 FACs (minimum 1 woman).

In the earlier LKM design, focus was mainly on monitoring biodiversity elements and the system was criticised for not being sufficiently relevant for the communities, who were more reluctant to participate. It seems that in the new design document by DOF (Locally based monitoring, June 2014), focus has shifted more towards livelihood improvement elements to be monitored away from conservation and biodiversity as was the (sole) intended purpose of LKM earlier.

In the present system applied in Echuya, the elements monitored focus on Grauers swamp Warbler and Fancolin sp. bamboo regeneration, fire incidence, grass harvesting, water level and occurrence of medicinal plants. Bamboo resource state is directly relevant for the FAC, making it more meaningful for the participating FAC. The question still remains whether the system will provide valid biodiversity information. The Project is of the opinion that it does, but that it is not necessarily scientifically relevant – it only gives indications, and the relevance thus depends on level and the use at which the information is applied. For the FAC, it can give important indications. Also, the Project indicates that the process is contributing to the FAC perception of resources ownership. The



ecotourism groups recognise the importance of seeing bird species and therefore appreciate the importance for monitoring birds, also in the forest.

Sustainability is of course the other caveat, the Project is “facilitating” (i.e. paying allowances) for team members, apart from providing initial equipment and clotting (raincoats). This raises the question whether the LKM would be continued after EOP. Already it has been difficult to engage the local government representatives, as they require higher allowances (for transportation).

It is recommended that **LKM trails should be in CFM areas for sustainability concerns (more relevant for FAC to monitor their “own” area)**. This has not been possible because the management plan is not approved and zones are not yet demarcated.

Under this output were also foreseen specific research studies but this has not materialised (some were done under the RSPB supported former phase).

Another output under this objective concerns the implementation of selected aspects of the Echuya management plan. This has not been done, as the plan has not yet been approved. However, **according to Dir. Corporate Affairs NFA, it is possible that the Echuya management plan can be approved “soon”. There is a new board in place which is reviewing the plan.**

**In the meantime, a collaboration MOU between the Project and NFA was signed during this ETR mission**, which commits NFA in a more concrete manner than the existing supportive statement letter. With the MOU now signed, **it is possible to initiate some of the management plan related activities which have been put on hold**. NU can now continue working with “local CFM plans” and finalising the revision of the CFM agreements.

### **3.3 Gender mainstreaming, equity issues**

The community interaction shows that the Project has paid attention to promote human rights of poor and excluded groups. The Project has focus on especially equity issues in activities involving mixed Batwa-other tribes and Batwa groups alone by applying “affirmative action”, e.g. Batwa groups receive more direct support such as seed and implements. Specific interventions are merited because they have challenges of food security – they are rated some doing well, some bad. One group is doing very well especially in potato growing, but the other is still struggling.

There have been good efforts and success in inclusion of marginalised groups especially the Batwa as well as women in the CFM association activities capacitating and empowering women and marginalised groups. Further focus could be made to increase the proportion of Batwa in the key positions of the CFM associations.

The Project also focuses on disaggregating data by gender, and generally it is appreciated that the Project makes efforts to address inequalities. Some activities have been directly addressing the resolution of conflicts among different stakeholder groups and local government or NFA. Women are not marginalised per se culturally, but have no say especially on land issues and tree planting, while the women traditionally tend plantations and engage in micro projects. Decision making

Concerning land related issues are almost always a man's issue, the Project is trying to empower women to come on legal terms with men in that respect for them to participate in decisions. There are no specific trainings focussing on gender, but the Project is ensuring that women are always involved in activities, and e.g. are represented on CFM committee.

### **3.4 Project management, organisation and technical assistance**

The cooperation with DOF and Project management responsibilities are defined in the contract signed between NU and DOF which details all responsibilities of both parties. NU (CEO) has overall management responsibility for the Project. There is no steering body described in the contract between NU and DOF. Both the contract and the PD state that NU will take "overall responsibility for project implementation". The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) has no steering functions (powers to amend or change the project document, approve work plans and budgets etc). Therefore, any change in procedures will have to be directed to the executive committee of NU and DOF informed, if not described in the contract. The ETR considers it a weakness that there is no steering body, which would have been able to address several of the highlighted issues in this report. However, it is also clear that the PAC should not have the mandate of a steering body.

The International Project Manager in DOF is solely responsible for coordination and implementation of the DOF technical input to the Project. The TA provided by DOF concerns LKM and supervision. While the ETR has not seen any supervision reports, it is understood that they do not cover strategy issues, problems concerning the log-frame or difficulties in establishing M&E systems. **It is recommended that DOF TA focuses more on such issues.**

The job descriptions given for the TA to be provided by DOF apart from supervision, is indicated in PD Annex 7 no. 15 & 16. (Science and conservation officer and Ecotourism marketing consultant respectively) make references to Indonesia and do not seem to be adequate for the Echuya project. **It is recommended to revise these job descriptions with a view to change the inputs in favour of general support e.g. in monitoring.**

A note on the DOF-NU contract re. revision of the log-frame: the contract specifies under item 8. that *"Change of budgets and LFA can be requested to DOF/Danida by 15th July and 15th January every year in connection with submission of Project progress reports. Change of payment scheme can only take place once a year through request to DOF/Danida no later than 15 June. Reallocation of the approved budget lines may take place with up to 10 per cent of the involved budget lines after written request and approval from DOF. Further reallocation of funds and release of contingency is not allowed without approval from Danida."*

Although the Project has not made use of this paragraph, it is recommended to change this paragraph in future contracts so that log-frame changes generally are not allowed to be made during implementation, especially for elements higher than activity level (this does put more demand on designing a solid log-frame in the first place!).

## 3.5 Efficiency

### 3.5.1 Project expenditures

The overall expenditure of the project from the date of inception in July 2011 up to end of June 2014 has been DKK 3.771.533 which is about 50 % of the total budget of DKK 7.832.527. The remaining balance at this time is DKK 3.278.564.

Financial monitoring is based on activity-based accounting budget lines. The efficiency of project activities at output level can be followed, it shows that the project is primarily **under-spending in the activity budget lines, especially actions related to the conservation objective** (outputs 3.x). On the other hand, **the Project cannot execute certain activities as the activity-indicator based budget is exhausted for a particular activity**. The log-frame issues of over-detailing activities affect this finding.

Field allowances for Project staff seem to be on the low side. Field staff travel allowances cannot always cover the actual costs, there is room in the budget to increase allowances.

Assuming similar expenditure rates as in the foregoing years, it is estimated that about 1.7 mill DKK will remain at EOP (please see Annex 4). This would be enough to continue operation for about one year.

### 3.5.2 Staffing

The long term TA is comprised of Project Manager, Conservation officer, Agroforestry officer, Community Development officer, Finance and Administration Officer, Office Assistant and Driver. Five Parish Extension Assistants (PEAs) are field based in parishes around Echuya forest located 60 kilometres from Kabale office. Staffing seems adequate for the Project at hand.

The project was launched in July 2011, however, project start-up was delayed until January 2012, apparently there were some recruiting problems of the Project Manager, the former of which left already April 2012, after which the Community Development officer was acting PM until November 1st 2012, at which time the present PM came on board. The Conservation officer and Community Development officer came from the former RSPB supported project.

Consultants or facilitators have been contracted for specific tasks, detailed in Annex 3.

### 3.5.3 Financial management and operational planning

The Project operates with *monthly meetings* institutionalised for operational planning and implementation. All staff, PEAs included, are updated on information from secretariat, all staff give feedback from field, challenges and needs are discussed and solutions to challenges discussed. Based on this procedure, monthly plans are revised and planning for next month agreed upon. Weekly operational plans are then prepared. Weekly meetings are held primarily to discuss and schedule vehicles and resources – share updates on operational information etc. This constitutes an excellent approach to operational planning and seems to work fine.

However, operational planning and implementation is *activity based* as discussed in previous chapters. Each activity is dependent on justification for financing based on the preparation of the so-

called concept note. The concept note is a document which describes in detail the activity to be carried out, its rationale, the resources to be involved, and the financial justification. Funds are not released by the FAO until the concept note is received.

Procedures for financing activities:

- 1- Concept note justifying the activity, rationale, methodology, outcomes, budget, work plan
- 2- FAO receives concept note, make local purchase order with supplier,
- 3- Items delivered with invoice
- 4- FAO writes requisition to PM
- 5- PM approves
- 6- FAO makes cheque voucher
- 7- FAO writes cheque
- 8- Supplier provides receipt for having received the money.

Once the activity is finalised, an activity report is prepared. Paper use is quite extreme and can be as much as 200 pages for an activity. This is attached to the financial documents, copied and sent to Kampala for review by the secretariat.

This procedure may be suitable for stand-alone advocacy based campaign activities, but not for results based management of already justified project activities. In order to make the work planning process more efficient, the ETR recommends **that the concept note should be considered only as a technical document, and it should be taken out of the financing procedures.** It should be replaced with a simple reference to the activity plan e.g. “workshop with CFM group” (could be included a reference number or similar reference to the technical details held with the officer in charge).

**Recommendation: the concept note should not be part of financial procedures – and it should not be required for carrying out routine activities already programmed in work plans and as per the log-frame. This change can be implemented quickly.**

Project reporting: in general Project reporting is quite good, with quarterly reports being produced regularly. Also, the Project produces semi-annual status reports required by Danida. The quarterly reporting is only activity based following the log-frame indicators for activities. There is limited narrative reporting on the higher goals. However, at end of the quarterly reports the Project writes some lessons learnt – with the intention of compiling at end of project, as specified in the Project document.

### **3.6 Monitoring & Evaluation**

The Project document has a section on Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting, which only refers to initial design changes of PD and the expected reports to be produced. There is **no mention of an overall Project M&E system for monitoring project progress as per LFA** (and no specific system has been developed for this).

However, under the section Activities in the PD, there is a paragraph 3.3 “Incorporate lessons learned into national policy” with a sub-heading “*Set up of monitoring and evaluation systems*” indicating that “We will undertake initial (Yr1) assessments of social financial and economic

parameters to provide a baseline for monitoring and evaluation. We will put in place monitoring and reporting plan/system which uses stakeholder group monitoring and field staff monitoring to check agreed indicators this will include developing a monitoring system to track progress of the adopted IGAs, SWC, SOA, EST Monitoring reports will be submitted to regular meetings of the project steering group and project advisory committee. We will facilitate mid-term external evaluation and by the end of the project formalise a sustainability strategy.”

Perhaps as an interpretation of the PD, the M&E systems indicated in log-frame are:

- 1) Activity 1.1.2. “NFA and FACs develop Joint participatory M&E system to monitor CFM implementation”

Monitoring of CFM implementation is prescribed as part of step 9 Implementation in the CFM Guidelines (p.40), and is also mentioned in the CFM agreements.

- 2) Activity 2.3.5 “Develop a M&E system to monitor progress of the adopted AF technologies”

The project is gathering data on support delivered, (trees planted, seeds given etc.). However the project is not producing consolidated data or narrative analytical reports. The approach has been to launch “assessment activities” (e.g. assessment of microfinance groups) as singular events and report on that.

As mentioned earlier, there have been no systems developed as yet.

**At this late stage is not realistic to design and implement an overall Project monitoring system, especially considering the need to revise the log-frame. Therefore, this should be left to be done at time of the LF revision.**

Joint participatory M&E system for CFM monitoring plans can be developed in connection with the follow-up process for the CFM agreements and their implementation. The system might evolve from the off-take recording prescriptions presently being monitored.

As for M&E system to monitor progress of the adopted AF technologies, the Project is not producing consolidated data or narrative analytical reports. It does not make use of spatial planning (maps and databases) which make it difficult to visualise and share information, both from a management perspective and for the communities. It would have been possible to establish a system based on data gathered on the support delivered (trees planted, seeds given etc.), but the Project does not seem to have the capacity needed for designing and implementing such systems.

For both of these systems it is recommended that they be built according to a group-based strategy, giving meaning to the development of “joint participatory systems”. Group wise approach is already being used for the microfinance groups, but **the Project needs to articulate an overall group-based approach to implementation, and build monitoring from the group perspective, and attach reporting to that.**

The ETR asked the Project to produce an overview of the attended groups and sub-groups, indicating also the number of members. It was also asked to indicate a ranking of the perceived performance of the groups (see Annex 5). This kind of simple compilation gives an immediate overview of the status of the groups and the magnitude of the actions (1494 members). **It is recommended that the**

**Project defines success criteria for each group and their present status in relation to those criteria (the “ranking” but spelled out in detail).** This can then be expanded to define a strategy for the groups *differentiated* according to their situation. Then it would be a straightforward matter to establish training needs and support needed for each group. The Training for microfinance groups conducted made use of SWOT analysis and action planning – this method could be adapted for all groups and activities.

As mentioned, especially GIS and database expertise is lacking to develop especially management plan related information and spatial planning. There are two short term positions indicated in the PD on GIS and database management, however, the job descriptions presented in the PD Annex 7 no. 12 would need to be revised. It is recommended that a GIS person is contracted to initially install a GIS system, compile all digital data available for the region and prepare base maps useful for Project planning. The main focus of the GIS expert should then be to give the staff an initial understanding of the use of such tools, through on the job training. This can be implemented before EOP.

The database expert job description (no. 14) also needs to be revised. It should not be expected that he/she would design surveys/instruments as indicated – that should be left to the Project Team. It is recommended that the Project first develop a system of forms which can be demonstrated to be working manually, then it can be adapted and converted to a digital system, which should be the expert’s task. Also in this case the Project staff should receive on the job training in using the system.

Due to the late stage, and given the recommendation on the change in log-frame and strategy, this task is best undertaken at a later stage, possibly after the start of a new phase.

#### **4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The objectives of the ECFR Project are well in line with the policies of the forest sector and the ETR considers that the Project remains highly relevant for the main beneficiaries (farmers and their communities around Echuya forest, targeting potentially about 40,000 people).

Project design deficiencies have affected performance. The linkages between the different levels of the log-frame are not clearly defined, there are many outputs with overlapping activities, project achievement is monitored based only on the “achievement” of activities, which make planning and reporting more difficult. The strategy presented does not provide clear guidance on exactly how the strategy elements are going to be implemented by the Project. A better description of the end goal and the strategy to reach it should be clearly spelled out. There should be no target indicators for activities, rather a stricter focus on means and inputs.

The KAP study was combined with the Baseline Survey carried out in 2012, but the quality of the baseline survey indicators do not permit monitoring of any change from Yr1 to the present. A training needs assessment has not been done on an individual basis for Project staff

The ETR finds that in general project activities have been mainstreamed in Local Government and to some extent in NFA work plans, and that commitment to Project activities is in place, but action is still dependent on Project implementation.

In terms of the training objective, it seems clear at least that FAC are still not able to “advocate for the developed CFM agreements, livelihood approaches and lessons learned at national level” and are not likely still to be so at EOP.

The livelihood improvement activities are centred around the 4 CFM associations and sub-groups. The Project does not, however, report on a group wise basis (except for microfinance) but instead reports on each activity and its indicators. Tree planting is perhaps the most accepted and widely recognised activity also by local governments. Bamboo domestication still needs experimenting and more targeted research. It is however recommended to expand and scale up bamboo domestication, which is supported by NFA. The prospects are good that that ecotourism facilities are functional by the end of project. The market survey presented economic justifications of all proposed IGAs and confirmed the validity of the IGA selection, which should be continued.

The Project has produced an excellent report on microfinance assessment in CFM associations, which gives a precise status of the progress, constraints and opportunities. There is however, no Project strategy for how to pursue microfinance further. Support is still needed for business planning, tying this with income generating activities, including NTFPs, skills in agro-forestry based microenterprise development, and microfinance.

The Project has made consultations and held workshop to identify issues to be included in the revised general management plan for Echuya, (inclusion of strategic issues and ecotourism), but NFA board approval has not been possible due to restructuring of the board. The implementation of selected aspects of the Echuya management plan, including demarcation of LKM trails and CFM areas has not been done, as the plan has not yet been approved. However, there is now a new board in place which seems promising in this respect.

The Project has supported NFA and FAC to develop sustainable off take quotas for resources and the Project is tracking what is being removed from the forest with the intention to compare data with studies on the resource to get an idea of sustainable off-take quotas, however levels have not yet been established.

The result of Project efforts concerning the training, IGA and conservation objectives are promising, but not yet self-supporting or expanding. The numbers of beneficiaries participating is quite low (~1500) and thus the impact is limited. In terms of effectiveness, the project will come close to achieving some of the indicators such as soil and water conservation (18 sites) and tree-planting (200,000 trees) while bamboo domestication will be under 10% of target (1000 of 10,000). Regarding livelihood indicators such as “income levels raised 40% above baseline” for some groups, this will likely not be achieved, nor will it be possible to determine, as the quality of the baseline document does not allow for this kind of comparison.

In general, it seems the project has had a big impact in terms of awareness raising, but less so in terms of raising incomes for the target groups and physical achievements in general.

The lack of monitoring systems and activity based orientation of Project has made it difficult to follow up on the objectives and goals. It would serve the Project purpose better to focus on the CFM associations and measure performance based on progress in these (including the CFM sub-groups). **It is therefore recommended that the CFM associations and sub-groups should be the prime focus of the Project, and progress should then be followed up closely and reported on by**

**association/group.** The training strategy for FAC should be based on assessments of training needs in all CFM associations and groups and training targeted and differentiated according to needs.

It is **recommended that monitoring systems for CFM and IGA tracking be built according to the proposed group-based strategy**, giving meaning to the development of “joint participatory systems”. Group wise approach is already being used for the microfinance groups, but the Project needs to articulate an overall group-based approach to implementation, and build monitoring from the group perspective, and attach reporting to that.

At this late **stage is not realistic to design and implement an overall Project monitoring system, especially considering the need to revise the log-frame. Therefore, this should be left to be done at time of the LF revision.**

Efficiency has been lower than expected and there will be surplus funds (about 1.7 mill DKK) at EOP. The project is primarily under-spending in the activity budget lines, especially actions related to the conservation objective (outputs 3.x). On the other hand, the Project cannot execute certain activities as the activity-indicator based budget is exhausted for a particular activity (activities too narrow). Design issues and the reduced effectiveness aspects have influenced the efficiency negatively. Assuming similar expenditure rates as in the foregoing years, there are sufficient funds to continue Project operation for about one year.

Using the so-called concept notes for justifying log-frame defined activities is not considered efficient. **It is recommended that the concept note should not be part of financial procedures – and it should not be required for carrying out routine activities already programmed in work plans and as per the log-frame.** This change can be implemented quickly.

**There is little emphasis on M&E or progress reporting against higher level indicators and the capturing and dissemination of knowledge and learning still seems to be limited.** Reporting could be improved with more narrative and analytical reporting. It is recommended that such reporting is built into the next phase, perhaps by introducing annual reporting with specific focus on capturing higher level indicators. It was discussed to keep quarterly reporting, but compile the 4<sup>th</sup> quarterly report as an annual report with more narrative reporting.

Concerning the future of the Project, termination in June 2015 would be unfortunate, as the Project has not achieved its goals and sustainability would be jeopardised. While there are funds available to continue for another year or so, a no cost extension without changes after project termination is not recommended, given the findings in this report. **The main recommendation is thus to continue the Project after termination under the new CISU-programme, initially as a no-cost extension, but after a thorough overhaul of the log-frame, implementation strategy and training approach, internal procedures and M&E.**

The ETR believes that with a restructuring of the log-frame as indicated, most outputs can be continued while activities should be revised to reflect better the causal relationship activity-output-objective-goal. Activities that should not be included are: 2.1.7 Revenue sharing systems and 3.1.2 “Support central and local NFA staff to determine if it is feasible for NFA work at ECFR to be self-supporting.” This answers the main question of which major activities and outputs to include and continue that would make most sense to be continued into a 3-year CISU-program.



**Recommended immediate changes (before EOP): to introduce M&E with more qualitative indicators on a CFM association and sub-group basis, and prepare simple group wise forms for recording progress. It is recommended that the Project prepares lessons learnt and ensures dissemination of best practices of CFM before end of Project.**

**Recommended medium term changes (should be in place when the Project is integrated into the CISU-programme): the approach to supporting the CFM associations and sub-groups should be revised, a community intervention strategy should be prepared, with clear goals for the groups, and PD and log-frame re-written to accommodate the changes.** A modular support strategy could be devised e.g. with step wise with rankings on group performance vs. the goals. Sustainable Micro-finance might be included here as the ultimate goal for the groups, with training and M&E differentiated according to group needs.

This would imply strengthening the Project's community support capacity through expanding the PEA numbers and/or skills levels.

It is not recommended to phase-in the proposed Kisyo-ha-Kitomi forest until at least after the one year extension or until the Project has proven that the revised Project can actually serve as model for expanding into other forest reserves.

# Dansk Ornitologisk Forening (DOF)

## Terms of Reference

### External Review

#### *Improved livelihoods through sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest, Uganda*

A Review of the 4-year Danida-funded project '*Improved livelihoods through sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest, Uganda*' is planned to take place in September 2014. This document presents the Terms of Reference for the Review Mission to be carried out by an external consultant.

#### **I. Background**

The project started in July 2011 and runs till June 2015. It has a budget of DKK 7.832.527.

Dansk Ornitologisk Forening (DOF-BirdLife Denmark) works closely together with national BirdLife-partner organisation in Uganda, **Nature**Uganda, who is responsible for implementing the project in Uganda in cooperation with local authorities and local communities. DOF is mainly responsible for administration and supervision but also provides technical assistance (TA) on Locally Based Monitoring (LBM) and TA + backstopping on Outputs 1.3 and 2.1 and financial management systems + procedures.

The project is situated in the south-western part of Uganda by the border to Rwanda. The aim of the project is to demonstrate that the forest adjacent communities improve their livelihoods sustainably through entering into Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) agreements with the National Forestry Authority (NFA) on Non-Timber Forest Product (NTFP) use and IGA input from the project. Project activities are implemented in all 9 parishes surrounding the Echuya Forest.

The Echuya Forest is a unique and important ecosystem and natural area with 12 out of 24 Albertine Rift endemic species. Furthermore, the forest provides important resources for the local communities who depend on it for their livelihoods, both directly by collecting bamboo, fuel wood, medicinal plants, food (animals/plants) and grass for roof thatching, but also indirectly through crucial ecosystem services such as water catching and -supply, and soil preservation and improvement.

The project's overall objective is *Forest adjacent communities (FACs) around Echuya Central Forest Reserve (ECFR) provide a national demonstration of how to develop a sustainable source of income through Collaborative Forest Management (CFM)*. It has three immediate objectives:

1. *Capacity of FACs, NFA and **Nature**Uganda increased to manage NRM projects and to communicate and advocate for the developed CFM agreements, livelihood approaches and lessons learned at national level;*
2. *Incomes and livelihoods of FACs equitably improved and social benefits they receive increased through training/ support in sustainable livelihood options and natural resource management;*
3. *The ecological integrity of ECFR improved through securing the natural resources, environmental services and biodiversity in the long term.*

One expected outcome is that the local communities are able to create increased income and participate actively in decision-making processes on the management of the forest through the CFM groups and the CFM agreements in place. Furthermore, it is expected that the Locally Based Monitoring of biodiversity and of human natural resource extraction from the forest in combination with regular forest patrols provides a more firm basis for forest management decisions. The intended result of the monitoring is also a more efficient protection of the Echuya CFR resulting in improved livelihoods for the surrounding communities. The selected Income Generating Activities (IGAs) undertaken are taking place both inside and outside the forest to optimize and diversify all aiming for sustainability economically and ecologically. The CFM groups are key in this work of striking the balance between maximizing off-take of natural resources and ensuring the ecological integrity of Echuya CFR.

## II. Objective and Approach of the Review

The main objective of this Mid-Term Review is to provide DOF and partners with an assessment of:

- progress and challenges towards the project's set indicators and efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability in its implementation as well as the feasibility of finalising the project within the planned timeframe (July 2011 – June 2015)

Based on the assessment and lessons learned during the first 3 years of the project and its main approaches (such as CFM agreements and LBM) to provide DOF and partners with recommendations on:

- which of the current major activities and outputs would make most sense to/should be continued into a 3-year CISU-program and in what way, to increase the sustainability and impact of interventions
- when and how to phase-in a new site (Kisyoha-Kitomi forest) into the 3-year CISU-program after first having secured the long term sustainability of the interventions in Echuya, captured the lessons learned on the Echuya project to inform the phasing-in of the new site (Kisyoha-Kitomi forest)
- the feasibility of applying for a no-cost extension of (some of) the current project activities in ample time before the planned finalisation of the project (end of June 2015 as per current project document) as part of the phasing-in of the Echuya component into the 3-year CISU-program

The review will take note of cross cutting issues, especially gender, indigenous peoples (a group of indigenous Batwa are included in the current project), equity, poverty/income levels and environment.

### III. Scope of work

The focus of the Review will be on the level of progress towards the achievement of the three immediate objectives as well as a critical assessment of the main approaches of the project.

The consultant is expected but not limited to assess the following questions:

- *Capacity building of FACs, NFA and NatureUganda*
  - How has the project contributed to strengthening the general understanding and application of the CFM regulations among the three stakeholders, the general population in the 9 parishes as well as the different levels of Local Government and beyond from an overall perspective?
  - How has the project contributed to building capacity and sustainability of the four local CFM groups around Echuya Central Forest Reserve (ECFR)?
  - How has the project prepared partners for collaboration between and within the four CFM, NFA and other relevant stakeholders around ECFR to make CFM a mutually beneficial avenue?
  - Which areas of capacity are being practically implemented for benefit of stakeholders or resource being conserved?
  - How has the project contributed to spurring compliance to the CFM agreements by CFM groups/FACs and NFA and creating a fruitful collaboration between the same?
  - How well has the project succeeded in preparing partners in advocating and sharing the CFM experiences in ECFR to a relevant national audience of CFM practitioners?
  - How has the project prepared for adoption, scaling up and retaining (sustaining) expertise in areas where capacity was built?
  - How has the project succeeded in addressing gender, equity and indigenous groups (Batwa) in the context of CFM?
  - What other capacity did the project benefit from due to its nature, ability to attract and complementary options initially not envisaged?
  - What are the main opportunities, challenges and achievements within the capacity building needs of participating partners?
  
- *FACs incomes and livelihoods*
  - Has the project from an overall perspective contributed to improved livelihoods in the FACs?
  - Has the project provided adequate avenues for FACs to participate meaningfully in improving their own livelihoods?
  - How well has the project succeeded in improving livelihoods and incomes for the FACs from the use of forest resources, including ecotourism?
  - How has the project contributed to improving livelihoods and incomes for the FACs through targeted activities in the surrounding farmland?
  - Can the project demonstrate and document the contribution of the IGAs/various economic activities (e.g. agro-forestry, apiary, mushroom

farming, fruit growing, bamboo farming, eco-tourism etc.) to improved livelihoods (e.g. money gained per IGA per household per year and its share of total household income) and their respective challenges to ascertain which IGAs that are genuinely profitable and useful for replication?

- How has gender, equity and indigenous groups (Batwa) been addressed?
- What are the main opportunities, challenges and achievements within the livelihoods and income improvement options demonstrated?
- What are the main challenges for CFM to play a more positive role and with a higher positive impact on livelihoods/income of FACs as well as savings on budgets and possibilities for increased income to NFA?

➤ *Ecological integrity of ECFR*

- What new innovations did the project contribute to ensure sustained conservation and biodiversity protection?
- How has LKM/LBM contributed to this goal vis-à-vis the CFM group/NFA patrols?
- Has LKM/LBM as well as forest resource off-take monitoring contributed to a stronger feeling of ownership of process and forest resources among the CFM group members as well as NFA staff?
- How has the project succeeded in facilitating an inclusive process of reviewing the expired ECFR general management plan?
- How well does the reviewed ECFR general management plan address and ensure forest and biodiversity conservation, (e.g. for Grauer's Swamp Warbler)?
- What options/deliverables exist to demonstrate practical application of promoting ecological integrity?
- How has gender, equity and indigenous groups (Batwa) been addressed?
- What are the main opportunities, challenges and achievements in maintaining the ecological integrity of ECFR?

In addition the consultant will assess the following:

- effectiveness of management systems and administrative procedures
- quality, effectiveness and timeliness of the supervision and support provided by **Nature**Uganda, Kampala, staff during implementation of the project activities measured against the terms of contract/MoU, and in general
- capacity, role and challenges of project management, staff and Parish Extension Assistants (PEAs)
- quality and extent of support by DOF

Based on the results of the above assessments, highlight the main lessons learned and present specific recommendations as deemed relevant for the finalisation of the current Project, the recommendations stipulated in section II above as well as recommendations for how the model and methodology used could be replicable in another context. Experiences from other similar projects are welcome.

#### IV. Approach and Time Frame

Prior to the field visit the consultant will study the background documents provided by DOF and discuss the Review with responsible DOF staff. The main part of the Review will be carried out in Uganda where the consultant will meet project staff and PEAs, local communities, representatives from local civil society organisations (CFM groups, UOBDU etc.), Local Government representatives, NFA and *Nature*Uganda, Kampala, staff. The consultant will prepare and present a Debriefing Note on the last day of his/her visit. During most of his/her stay he/she will be based in Kabale and Kisoro, with a short stay in Kampala as well. After the consultant's return to Denmark he/she will draft the Review Report and, based on comments from DOF and *Nature*Uganda, the Final Report.

Time frame:

Preparation of field visit, review documents etc.	Denmark	3 days
Flight to Kampala, Uganda	International travel	1 day
Field visit	Uganda	8 days
Flight back to Copenhagen	International travel	1 day
Draft report	Denmark	5 days
Final report	Denmark	2 days
<b>Total</b>		<b>20 days</b>

Details of field visit:

- Visit the *Nature*Uganda offices in Kampala and conduct interviews with all relevant staff, visit the NFA offices in Kampala and conduct interviews with Executive Director in a meeting with a few other important NFA officers
- Visit the Project Office in Kabale and conduct interviews with all relevant project staff, go through written and electronic documents produced
- Visit selected project areas and conduct interviews in villages around Echuya Forest
- Meet representatives of CFM groups
- Meet relevant local authorities, mainly at District level
- Meet and interview any person deemed relevant to shed more light on the Project implementation after consultation with DOF and *Nature*Uganda

The Review will be carried out by an external consultant, assisted by the Programme Manager in the headquarters of *Nature*Uganda, Mr. Michael Opige.

## VI Required qualifications of the consultant

The consultant is expected to have at least the following qualifications.

Extensive experience with:

- reviews/evaluations
- NGO projects
- Participatory/collaborative forest management
- natural resources management
- improved livelihoods and income generating activities
- community involvement and strengthening of civil society
- cross cutting issues
- biodiversity conservation

It is an advantage if she/he has a wide scope of experiences from similar projects in developing countries against which he/she can measure the Echuya Project. It is a further advantage if the consultant has extensive experience from Uganda and/or other East African countries.

## VII. Draft schedule for the External Review

Tentative schedule for field visit:

21 <sup>st</sup> September	Departure Copenhagen, arrival Entebbe 22:00 and transfer hotel Kampala
22 <sup>nd</sup> September	Meetings with <i>Nature</i> Uganda staff, Kampala
23 <sup>rd</sup> September	Drive to Project office in Kabale. Introduction meeting with Project field staff
24-28 <sup>th</sup> September	Field visits and meetings. See attached draft program
29 <sup>th</sup> September	Prepare de-briefing; debriefing, flight back to Copenhagen late evening

## VII Reporting

The consultant will deliver the following outputs:

1. Prepare and present a brief Inception Note to DOF no later than 14<sup>th</sup> September 2014
2. Present a Debriefing Note with preliminary findings and recommendations on the last day of the field visit
3. Forward a draft copy of the Review Report to DOF not later than 6<sup>th</sup> October 2014
4. After comments from DOF forward a Final Review Report to DOF on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 at 12 pm at the latest



**Background Materials**

Project Document

Project Implementation Plan

Project LFA

Project budget

Organisational diagram

LBM system first version

Contract between DOF and *Nature*Uganda

Status/progress reports

Echuya CFR draft revised Management Plan





## Annex 2

### Field work schedule

Date	Location	Person(s) involved	Time	Activity
Saturday 20/9	Kampala	Hotel		Evaluator arrives at Entebbe , transfer to Fair Way hotel in Kampala.
Mon 22 <sup>nd</sup>	Kampala	ED	Morning	Evaluator is picked by NU Driver and meets NU Secretariat staff: ED, PM and FAO. Discuss final field work schedule.
22 <sup>nd</sup>	Kampala	ED	Afternoon	Evaluator meets NU's partners e.g. NFA (Director Corporate Affairs, Director Natural Forests, CFM Coordinator)
Tue 23 <sup>rd</sup>	Kampala- Echuya	ED	Morning	Evaluator travels to Kabale
23 <sup>rd</sup>		PM Echuya	Evening	Introduction meeting with Project field staff. Agree on final field work schedule. Roles of staff in ETR.
Wed 24 <sup>th</sup>	Echuya	NU Project partners PM..	Morning	Echuya project staff: PM, Technical Officers and Project Accountant. Presentation of project progress, thematic presentations by staff. (capacity building, livelihoods development & IGA, CFM and conservation, participatory processes (group formation etc). Crosscutting issues.,  Interview with staff. (individually or in selected groups)
24 <sup>th</sup>	Echuya		Afternoon	NU Project partners in Kabale: District Natural Resources Officer, District Chairman, BMCT and IGCP, ITFC.  Interview with staff. (thematic)
Thu 25 <sup>th</sup>	Muko and Bufundi , Ikamiro Kacerere	PM , LC III Chairman and Sub-county Chief of Bufundi Sub-county	Morning	(a) Ikamiro parish (IGA): - Soil and water conservation, - Fruit garden , - Mushroom growing  (b)Kacerere (IGA) : - Tree planting, - Energy cook stoves - Bee keeping, - Fruit growing , - Bamboo domestication.  (c) Meet CFM members in Kacerere  Interviews with Parish Extension Assistants of Ikamiro, Kacerere and Kishanje in field.

Date	Location	Person(s) involved	Time	Activity
				Overnight stay in Kisoro
Fri 26 <sup>th</sup>  26 <sup>th</sup>	Echuya, Bufundi	PM, NFA Forest Supervisor NU Project partners in Kisoro: District		NU Project partners in Kisoro:  District Natural Resources Officer, District Chairman, District Environment Officer (project contribution to the Environment and Natural Resources sector plans, general district development plans and community livelihood improvement.)  Coordinator UOBDU: project interventions to address equity and inclusion of indigenous Batwa in the CFM arrangement  Overnight stay in Kisoro
Sat. 27 <sup>th</sup>	Echuya, Kanaba	PM LC III Chairman of Kanaba sub-county, CFM committee members and FACs	Morning	- Meet CFM committee members in Kanaba, sub-county  - Visit project interventions in Kanaba sub-county: (Bee keeping, - Soil and water conservation, Fruit growing.....)  - Visit community nursery at Kagano, Kanaba  - Interview Parish Extension Assistants of Muhindura and Kagezi parishes  - Meet NFA Forest Supervisor at Echuya forest on the way from Kisoro to Kabale
Sat. 27 <sup>th</sup>	Echuya,	PM, Staff	Afternoon	Interviews with staff (thematic, accounting, monitoring ....)  Interviews with staff (management, coordination ,etc)
Sun. 28 <sup>th</sup>			Morning	Compilation of results, preparation de-briefing, report drafting
Sun. 28 <sup>th</sup>			Afternoon	Cont. Interviews with staff (management, coordination ,etc) (optional)
Mon 29 <sup>th</sup> 29 <sup>th</sup>			Morning	wrap-up meeting for project staff  Evaluator travels to Kampala
Tue 30 <sup>th</sup> Tue 30 <sup>th</sup>			Morning	Report drafting
			Afternoon	Evaluator debriefing NU Secretariat

Date	Location	Person(s) involved	Time	Activity
Wed 1 <sup>st</sup> October				Evaluator Departure

**Acronyms:**

BMCT = Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust

CFM = Collaborative Forest Management

ED = Executive Director

FACs = Forest Adjacent Communities

FAO = Finance and Administration Officer

IGCP = International Gorilla Conservation Programme

NFA = National Forestry Authority

NU = Nature Uganda

PM = Programme Manager

UOBDU = United Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda

LC = Local Council

## List of facilitations and/or consultancies as of September 2014

No.	Name of the consultant/Facilitator	Activity	Date/timing
1	Future Dialogue	Baseline /KAP for EFCP	August 2012
2	Ambrose Bugaari effective skills development consultants	Market survey	December 2013
3	Peter Nareeba Reev Consult International-Kabale Branch	Training report on financial management and group dynamics for Nature Uganda supported micro-credit groups around Echuya Central Forest Reserves	February 2014
4	Robert Bitariho, Ph.D	Refining resource off-take monitoring form	February 2014
5	Narice Byaruhanga	Training of FACS & NFA in forest resource monitoring	March 2014
6	Mushroom training and resource centre - Kabale	Mushroom production and marketing in Bufundi Sub county in two parishes of Kashasha and Kacerere; and Muko Sub County in one parish of Ikamiro	April 2014
7	Mr. Justus Masanyu Agriculture officer Northern division Kabale municipality	Facilitation of fruit growing and management for Kacerere and Ikamiro farmers – passion fruits and tree tomatoes	May 2014
8	Mr. Sabiti Elijah a local facilitator in apiary management	Training of FACS in apiary management in Kisoro and Kabale districts.	July 2014
9	JVC Investment ( U ) ltd-James Byamukama	Review of Kisoro & Kabale district tourism plans, development of Echuya/ECOTA tourism business plan	August 2014

## Estimated end of project budget status

Project Activities	Budget	Expenditure Jul-Dec 2011	Expenditure Jan-Dec 2012	Expenditure Jan-Dec 2013	Expenditure Jan-Dec 2014	Cummulative Expenditure from start of project	Balance	Balance EOP (estimate)
<b>1. Activities</b>	2.681.907		187.350	362.153	205.432	754.935	1.926.972	1.400.000
<b>2. Investments</b>	747.600		460.781	151.628	83.553	695.962	51.638	0
<b>4. Local staff</b>	1.765.472	52.557	395.806	413.119	218.856	1.080.338	685.134	150.000
<b>4. b. National external consultants</b>	149.316		57.437	0	0	57.437	91.879	0
<b>5. Local Administration</b>	532.958		112.029	120.390	66.792	299.211	233.747	50.000
<b>6. Project Information Denmark</b>	132.624		0	0	0	0	132.624	100.000
<b>7. Project Supervision (DOF Denmark)</b>	883.650		0	0	0	883.650	0	0
<b>8. Evaluation total</b>	156.570		0			0	156.570	0
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>7.050.097</b>	<b>52.557</b>	<b>1.213.403</b>	<b>1.047.290</b>	<b>574.633</b>	<b>3.771.533</b>	<b>3.278.564</b>	<b>1.700.000</b>

## Groups working with EFCP around Echuya Central forest reserve

CFM group	Membership		TOTAL	User groups /sub groups	Membership <sup>1</sup>	Rating <sup>2</sup>
	Males	Females				
MECADA- Muko Echuya conservation and development association – In parishes of Karengyere and Ikamiro	189	111	300	Bee keepers	56	3
				Mushroom	18	3
				S&WC group	72	2
				Energy saving group	89	3
				Kagano Ngozi Kweyombeka group – Micro credit group	117	3
BECLA- Bufundi Echuya conservation and livelihood association. In three parishes of Kacerere, Kishanje, and Kashasha	451	80	531	Mushroom growers	75	3
				Bee keepers group	110	3
				Tree growers	400	3
				Passion fruit farmers	98	
				S&WC group	200	4
				Hand craft and basketry group	80	1
				Energy saving group - Nyamatembe	90	3
				Kashasha Women Mushroom - micro credit group	21	3
				Kashasha Biika Oguze group micro credit group	18	3
MEFCAPAA	131	89	220	Bee keepers	160	4
				Tree growers	200	3
				Fruit growers - Tree tomatoes	80	1
				Soil and water conservation	89	2
KADECA	311	132	443	Bee keepers	62	3
				Tree growers	310	2
				Fruit growers - Tree tomatoes	160	2
				Soil and water conservation	120	3
				Energy saving	35	1

CFM group	Membership		TOTAL	User groups	Membership <sup>1</sup>	Rating <sup>2</sup>
				group		
				Batwa group*	54	2
				Kanaba Twongyere Umusaruro – Micro credit group	476	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	1082	412	1494			

1) non-unique numbers i.e. one person can be represented in various groups 2) Key for the rankings: (1 =low, 4= high) performance

\*Batwa group in Birara do all activities together due to the fact that they were settled in one place (Bee keeping, Soil and water conservation, Energy saving, agriculture- beans and Irish potato growing)

**Literature**

Baseline Survey Report for Improved livelihoods through sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest, Uganda . Project report. Alex Muhweezi. 2012.

Collaborative Forest Management – demonstrating linkage between livelihoods and sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest, Uganda. Project Policy brief. Opige, M.

Concept Note. Participatory Management of Natural Resources and Improved Livelihoods in and around Important Bird Areas. Program 2015-2017. June 2014.

Draft Survey report commissioned and produced for Nature Uganda Hamlet Mugabe

Forest Management Plan For Echuya Central Forest Reserves For The Period 1st July 2011 – 30th June 2021. NFA.

Locally Based Monitoring and Management of Natural Resources. DOF June 2014.

National Biodiversity Strategy And Action Plan National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). 2002.

Report On Assessing Project Supported Microcredit Groups Around Echuya Forest. Technical report. Community Development Officer-EFCP . Project report. November 2013.

Report On Market Research And Analysis For The Identified Igas For Communities Living Around Echuya Central Forest Reserve. Project Report 2013.

Status And Distribution Of Montane Bamboo In Echuya Central Forest Reserve, S.W. Uganda. By Fredrick Ssali and Robert Bitariho Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation, Ruhija, Kabale May 2013

Strategi for dansk støtte til civilsamfundet i udviklingslandene. Min. Of foreign Affairs, Denmark. Dec. 2008.

The Logical Framework Approach. Fourth Edition. Handbook for objectives oriented planning. NORAD.

The National Forestry and Tree planting Act. 2003.

The Status and Distribution of Grauer's Rush Warbler (*Bradypterus Graueri*) In Echuya Central Forest Reserve. Hamlet Mugabe. 2013.

Training report on financial management and group dynamics for Nature Uganda supported micro-credit groups around Echuya Central Forest Reserves. Project report.



**Project documents:**

CONTRACT 2011-2015 Between NATURE UGANDA And DOF-BIRDLIFE Denmark

Improved livelihoods through sustainable management of forest resources in and around Echuya Forest, Uganda .PROJECT DOCUMENT. 2011.

PAC minutes (June 2012-May 2014).

Quarterly reports (April-June 2012 – April-June 2014).

Semi-annual progress reports (2011-2013)

<b>List of Persons met by Evaluator during Mid-Term review of Echuya Project</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1	Adios Kyomukama	District Natural Resources Officer-Kabale
2	Alice Mudugani	BECLA -Executive member
3	Allen Bamparana	KADECA-Executive member
4	Alsen	Acting Sub-county chief, Kanaba
5	Charles Rukademwa	Farmer-Kagano village, Muhindura
6	Edward Nzabamenya	KADECA-Vice Chairperson
7	Emmanuel Sendegeya	KADECA-Executive member
8	Evarina Mukamazera	KADECA-Executive member
9	Francis Sembagare	KADECA-Executive Member
10	Geoffrey Mbabazi	BECLA-Executive Member
11	Godfrey Batugwebyabo	BECLA-Defence
12	Godfrey HabwaRuhanga	BECLA-General Secretary
13	Grace Nizeye	Farmer, Muhindura parish
14	Grace Sezonga	BECLA-Executive Member
15	James Muhwezi	Sub-county Accountant
16	John Agaba	Farmer-Matakara Village, Ikamiro
17	John Ruribikiye	LCIII Chairperson, Bufundi Sub-county
18	Joseph Nizeye	LCIII Chairperson, Kanaba Sub-county
19	Julius Byabagambi	Farmer-Nyamatembe, Kacerere

20	Loyse Tabuu	BECLA-Treasurer
21	Mable Mutabazi	Farmer-Bigyegye village, Ikamiro
22	Medard Niwamanya	Nursery attendant, Kishanje
23	Michael Hashakimana	KADECA-General Secretary
24	Moses Orishaba	Farmer-Nyamatembe, Kacerere
25	Philemon Bazohera	Nusery Attendant , Kishanje
26	Richard Munezero	District Tourism Officer-Kisoro
27	Sarafina Tibifumura	BECLA-Executive member
28	Shallot Ninshaba	UOBDU
29	Steven Rumanzelmisi	KADECA-Executive Member
30	Yubu Rubibi	KADECA-Executive Member
31	Zinkubire Stanley	BECLA – Chairperson

<b>Project staff</b>	
Mike Opige	Programme manager
Geoffrey Akule	Financial officer
Henry Mutabaazi	Project manager -
Henry Mfitundinda	Finance and Administration officer-
Niwamanya Rogers	Technical Officer Agro forestry-
Valence Turyamureba	Technical officer; Conservation -
<b>Community Extension Officers</b>	
Mbabaazi Esther	for chibumba and Kagezi parishes
Nyiramutunzo	for Birara and Muhindura

Jennifer	
Zoreka keresi	for Kishanje parish
Komuhangi Bony	for Kacerere and Kashasha
Joseph Barugahare	for Karengyere and Ikamiro
Miriam Akatukunda	Office Assistant

<b>Others</b>	
Aheebwa Justine,	Natural Forest Management & ecotourism, NFA
Kabi Maxwell	Forest Utilisation specialist, NFA.
Baruyahare Vanancio,	Forest Supervisor NFA, Echuya Forest Reserve.
Paul Musamali Buyerah	Director corporate Affairs, NFA.
Pamela Kalembe	Audit Senior, Whiteknight partners