

## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Chimpanzee Sanctuary & Wildlife Conservation Trust
<b>Project Title:</b>	Piloting a Scalable PES Model to Conserve Bugoma Forest Ecosystem
<b>Grant Number:</b>	CEPF-103689
<b>CEPF Region:</b>	Eastern Afromontane
<b>Strategic Direction:</b>	3 Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors.
<b>Grant Amount:</b>	\$108,400.00
<b>Project Dates:</b>	January 01, 2018 - October 31, 2019
<b>Date of Report:</b>	December 19, 2019

### Implementation Partners

List each partner and explain how they were involved in the project

**The National Forestry Authority through its Range and Sector Offices worked hand in hand with the Chimpanzee Trust in mobilizing and raising awareness for the Bugoma catchment communities during the project lifetime. NFA's Range Manager was the key person who oversaw training for Collaborative Forest Management. National Forestry Authority also supported the project with an estimate of 3000 seedlings. Project partnered with the Hoima and Kikuube District Local Governments, dealing with several levels of Administration, at district, Sub County and the Parish. The Sub County and Parish Officials of the district supported training of farmers in good land management practices that contributed to the restoration of the river.**

**The project dealt with 2 Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) Groups that supported the mobilization for village meetings, training of the 4 village in CFM strategies and providing updates concerning Bugoma Forest Management. Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA): The project partnered with the government autonomous body when dealing with human wildlife conflicts issues that arose during the project period as the riverine forests were restored. Media: The project partnered with national and local media to raise awareness concerning the PES scheme. Local Radio Stations, National Print and TV Media visited the project area and reported. National media visited 3 times Local Radio Station Journalists 4 times during the project lifetime.**

### Conservation Impacts

Summarize the overall impact of your project, describing how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

***The main overall results of the project are;***

**124 farmers in 4 villages practiced better land management, these 124 farmers committed to practice good land management practices. This has been achieved with agreed benchmarks and commitments met. *The farmers committed to implement trenches, grass strips, check dams, plant trees, and regenerate the river bank area. The project provided in-kind incentives, that led to improvement in the farmer's well-being livelihood as result incentives given to them like solar, water tanks and money.***

**There was noted change in attitudes of the farmers involved in the project towards environmental conservation during the project lifetime, with initial reservation towards conservation of the river, to actual implementation of the interventions and eventual appreciation of the restored river. 99% farmers under the scheme cooperated fully a result of working together in groups (the Peer to peer monitoring strategy). Another noted result of the project was Improvement in knowledge of farmers towards land use planning and implementation as a result of team training them extensively and regularly.**

**Almost 600 hectares of agricultural land within the Rutoha River riparian corridor and adjacent to the Bugoma Forest was managed in a way to restore natural habitats and enhance delivery of ecosystem services. 124 direct beneficiary farmers committed 311 hectares under the scheme but in the end carried out good land management practices on areas that were more than what had been committed to the project, with the other non-beneficiary farmers in the village willingness to restore natural habitats and enhance delivery of ecosystems by planting seedlings on their land. The impact target of 500 hectares was met by just the farmers who were implementing the project and also as a result of the *restoration of river, human wildlife conflicts as increase in animal species that have increased in the project area of the 4 villages.* However, the Chimpanzee Trust is implementing a Human Wildlife Conflict project with funding from Darwin Initiatives. The Directorate of Water Resources and Management carried out a flow and quality analysis that showed that there was improvement on the quality and quantity of water around river Rutoha this attributed to reduction on the rate of erosion around river Rutoha as a result of farmers planting grass and trees**

**We short listed 4 promising buyers, however willingness was shown by 2 to support the project. These made a visit to the project area. A visit was made by potential buyers of the scheme who included Total E&P and Bugoma Jungle Lodge personnel. Total E&P is looking at options of upscaling this PES scheme to the North of Bugoma, to Budongo Forest Watershed. In addition, more partnerships have been established during the project lifetime.**

***Impact***

- **During project implementation, outcome mapping carried out showed that neighboring villages in the Bugoma area such as Makerere and Kibaali had adopted river conservation after observing what was taking place in Kisindi and Kikonda II Village.**
- **National awareness on PES through media was carried out.**
- **This project was carried in Kikuube District. Having engaged Local Government Officials during project lifetime. Kikuube District with funding from the Prime Minister's Office is implementing a watershed scheme, with lesson learned from supporting implementation. 1 Chimpanzee Trust Field Staff has been co-opted to work on the project.**
- **Improved Well-being of the households that have taken part in the scheme. Children are able to read at night at home using solar light. This is an impact derived from the incentives that were provided by the scheme.**

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
Sediment load, related to poor farming practices, out the outflow point of the Rutoha River in Lake Albert drops by 30% from baseline in 2018 within three years.	Quality and flow report showed a reduction in sediment load, however a flow up impact evaluation in 2021 would be paramount. Funding options to be looked for then for cover this activity
Creation of sustainable PES Scheme within 5 years .	Sustainability plans are in place, for partnerships with Oil and tourism sector plays to support creation of this PES Scheme within next 4 years.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
50 farmers in 4 villages practice better land management	This impact has been achieved! 124 farmers trained in water and soil conservation practices and dug trenches, planted grass strips, planted seedlings, restored area at the river bank through regeneration and created check dams at the road side to minimize run off into the river. The farmers were then organized into monitoring committees who regularly checked on each other's progress, while implementing activity interventions. There was change in-terms of better land management practices that contributed to the conservation of River Rutoha.
Creation of Bugoma water fund with atleast one private company committing to provide USD 10000 for forest villages for better farming along rivers.	This was partly achieved as Bugoma Jungle Lodge has promised 6,000 USD to the scheme that will be used to set up scheme. In additional, a follow up grant implemented in the same area is to set up a Bugoma Fund to address Human Wildlife Conflicts which have been caused by among other reasons, restoration of River Rutoha.
500 hectares of agricultural land within the Rutoha River riparian corridor and adjacent to the Bugoma Forest managed in a way to restore natural habitats and enhance delivery of ecosystem services.	This impact has been achieved! 311 hectares were committed by farmers to restore natural habitat and enhance delivery of ecosystem services and this has been achieved and an addition of about 200 hectares has been managed in such a way to contribute to the restoration of the River. In total more than 500 hectares of agricultural land within the River Rutoha riparian has been well managed to contribute to Sustainable Development goal 14 and 15.

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives

**Success:**

The project had planned to engage 50 farmers however the actual who enrolled were 124 farmers, signing contracts and 123 meeting set benchmarks. This compliance to the set standards was a success for the scheme. There was restoration of private forests around river Rutoha as a result of enrichment planting and natural regeneration as one of the interventions adopted by farmers.

The project noted improvement in the quality and quantity of water in River Rutoha as a result of tree planting, digging trenches, trash lines planting grass etc. This was reported in the flow and quality report by the Directorate of Water Resources Management that is attached here.

Willingness and cooperativeness of both leaders and community members which led to adoption of the interventions they were taught and putting into practice what they were sensitized.

As much as this was not achieved during the project period and may be completed post project, but engaging the private sector especially Total E&P and Bugoma Jungle Lodge was positive.

**Challenge:**

Delay of farmers incentives led to the delay of farmers to carry out land use interventions and also it caused some farmers to clearing part of their private forests out of frustration as agreed promises had not been met by the project management unit.

Negative attitude of some leaders at the beginning of the project like one of the leaders in certain village, whose discouragement ended up affecting the size of land committed towards River Rutoha restoration by farmers in his area.

Abrupt change of weather which was characterized by prolonged drought affected the survival rate of the tree seedlings that were given out to farmers i.e. most of them dried.

Buyer engagement, there is still lack in capacity concerning engaging private sector in Uganda.

Limitation of the geographical scope of the project.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

**Positive:**

Uptake of river conservation strategy by neighboring village farmers not in the scheme and their implementation of interventions.

99% of the farmer's adoption to land use planning intervention on their piece of land and compliant to set benchmarks.

Active participation of the local leaders in the project.

**Negative:**

Complaints from the neighboring farmer's i.e. why they were left out and not considered by the project.

Communities claiming that tree planting has led to the increase in the number of vermin's and problem animals around their area.

## Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Describe the results from each product/deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Farmer engagement and contracts	1.1	List of qualifying individual applicants in each villages	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>This was achieved during the first reporting period and reported. We signed contract previously with 124 farmers.</p> <p>In the four project villages, listing and free prior and informed agreement for the farmers to take part in the project was achieved with 124 farmers direct beneficiaries of the project from the initial 70 that the project had planned for. It was found that most farmers had smaller pieces of land at the River bank for planting and all these were engaged in addition to the large land owners. Meetings were held to mobilize the farmers in each of the villages, with the Chairpersons registering and talking to willing farmers to take part in the project, this was to encourage the enrollment unto the PES project. All land owners listed by Chairpersons were visited, with team finding out that some of the farmers had not been informed and listed by the Chairpersons, and mutual updating of the lists done in agreement with the village Leaders. Nebat made random verification, visiting farmers in the 4 villagers to ascertain whether they meet the requirements as stated by the Field Assistants and the Village Chairpersons.</p>
1	Farmer engagement and contracts	1.2	Village and individual land use plans	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>This deliverable was achieved in previous reporting period and updates remain the same as before.</p> <p>"Village and Land Use plans were done. Nebat wrote letters to each Village Chairperson to support provision of Land Use plans. The Field Assistants with a representative of the Chairperson visited each Land Owner to fill the application form but also draw the household land use plan. Each of the farmer engaged worked with a member of their family while carrying out this task.</p> <p>Meeting were arranged in the 4 villages by the</p>

				Chimpanzee Trust, with the Village Chairpersons and the Community taking lead in planned for their village in the next 10 years. Village plans were drawn in agreement with all person present at the meetings. Nebat insisted on the women providing input and drawing the village Land Use map with their contribution also documented on the maps."
1	Farmer engagement and contracts	1.3	Contracts for individuals	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>This was achieved in this reporting period, 124 contracts signed.</p> <p>We signed individual contracts with 124 farmers, with contract having conservation benchmarks, referring to landuse plans and targets set for each farmer. The contracts were translated into the local Language Runyoro, and each of the farmers signed 2 copies with one remaining at the Chimpanzee Trust Office.</p> <p>Prior to this discussion were held with the farmers concerning the contract template and draft and edits were made to the document, with mutual agreement on changes necessary.</p> <p>We were delayed by Local Council Leaders Elections with 1 of the Chairperson of Kikonda II village not returning to office. But when they did we signed contracts in the Villages.</p>
1	Farmer engagement and contracts	1.4	Collaborative Forest Management agreements with NFA	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>This was reported in the previous reporting period. Deliverable was achieved with in the reporting period however agreements in form of an addendum had to been between the Villages and the Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) Groups as already there were agreements between National Forestry Authority (NFA) and the CFM groups. 2 agreements signed by the Villages and the Collaborative Forest Groups. The upstream and midstream villages all signed agreements.</p> <p>More Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) trainings were done by the CFM Consultant for all the villages and guidelines reviewed and agreed upon with the National Forestry Authority. On-going implementation with the Community will continue even beyond project lifetime with the Collaborative Forest Management Groups and</p>

				<p>the National Forestry Authority.</p> <p>However, a knowledge and governance gap was noted as the CFM groups need more capacity building, that the current engagement may not be able to meet.</p>
1	Farmer engagement and contracts	1.5	Performance report on implementation of farmer and village agreements	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Compliance report was prepared and farmer lists for compliance as per per those who met set benchmarks. During the project period, progress, follow up monitoring and compliance monitoring were done. The 124 farmers who signed contracts onto the Scheme were regularly monitored. Final compliance data collection was utilized for performance reporting and payments. Regular performance visit were made by the Finance team and District Leaders with a reports on the status of farmer interventions prepared.</p>
2	River Rutoha environment and social monitoring	2.1	Baseline Report at below Ndongo and Nyasenke villages and household socioeconomic	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>Deliverable achieved in previous reporting period.</p> <p>Flow and quality analysis done by the Directorate of Water Resources Expert and report in place. Report attached here!</p> <p>The Water Analyst collected water samples at the source, in the forest and at the edge of Ndongo and Nyanseke villages, he and his team analysed the findings and provided a baseline report to the Chimpanzee Trust.</p>
2	River Rutoha environment and social monitoring	2.2	End line Report (Individual participants and Ecological)	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>Individual participants and ecological data collection has been carried out and report is due. Household endline surveys is being finalized and report compilation is being carried out, with information sorted and arranged.</p>
3	Engagement of potential buyers and donors	3.1	Power point presentation and/or prospectus and/or project briefs) given to private sector, government, parastatals and	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>Documentation in place, and follow up being done to align prospectus to the needs of each of the 2 currently engaged donors. though activities had commenced earlier on. Previous information put together, with Designer for prospectus approached, was updated by the Buyer engagement expert.</p>

			international donors	
3	Engagement of potential buyers and donors	3.2	Summary report on the lessons learning visits for private sector and donors, including dates of visits, agenda, and participant list broken down by gender	<p>Achieved!</p> <p>Buyer contact made and visit due to be made in late July or early August 2019, specifically TOTAL E&amp;P and Bugoma Jungle Lodge as the private Sector and donors due to visit.</p> <p>As reported in the previous report, one of the Potential Donors of the Scheme Prof. Joost visited Kisindi village and interacted with farmers.</p>
3	Engagement of potential buyers and donors	3.3	Written commitments to support scale up of the PES scheme	<p>Not Achieved!</p> <p>Commitments to support scaling up of the PES Scheme have been discussed and a proposal requested by Total E&amp;P, which is being worked upon. Willingness has been shown by TOTAL E&amp;P but not full commitment during project period.</p>
4	CEPF Institutional management and strengthening tool	4.1	Civil Society tracking tool	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Final Civil Society Tracking Tool submitted.</p>
4	CEPF Institutional management and strengthening tool	4.2	Gender tracking tool	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Final Gender Tracking Tool submitted.</p>
4	CEPF Institutional management and strengthening tool	4.3	Semi-annual reports on implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan	<p>Achieved</p> <p>A third -annual report has been prepared and is attached here. The report summarizes 6 months narrative on the Stakeholder engagements for the Bugoma PES Watershed project that has been operational in 4 villages that neighbor Bugoma Forest and River Rutoha that is a tributary of Lake Albert and a forest watershed river.</p> <p>Among the key stakeholder engagements we have held the following meetings; Village Monitoring meetings</p>



				(setting up Committees), District Leaders visit in June, Sub County Leaders visit in July, Mobilization meetings in February and March, Village Collaborative Forest Management meetings and Farmer monitoring meetings. The vital stakeholders engaged included The community members in the 4 villages where the project is set to be operational, National Forest Authority, Uganda Wildlife Authority and Kikuube District Local Government and Northern Albertine Rift Conservation Group, Local and national media houses, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund and Birdlife International, Prof. Dr. Joost de Laat Utrecht University School of Economics (U.S.E.) , A private sector company (TOTAL E&P) and businesses and other planned investments in the landscape (BUGOMA JUNCLE LODGE) and Private individual donors (Kyamaleera Wildlife Education Centre)
4	CEPF Institutional management and strengthening tool	4.4	Communication tools tracking	Achieved.  Communication tool in form of an article prepared and is attached here. In addition an article <a href="https://www.watchdoguganda.com/news/20190717/72565/world-chimpanzee-day-private-forest-owners-embrace-conservation-to-protect-endangered-human-relative.html">https://www.watchdoguganda.com/news/20190717/72565/world-chimpanzee-day-private-forest-owners-embrace-conservation-to-protect-endangered-human-relative.html</a> was written by a Journalist who was part of the team that visited the project area during World Chimpanzee Day.
4	CEPF Institutional management and strengthening tool	4.4	METT tool completed by appropriate authority	Achieved.  METT tool was completed by the then National Forestry Authority Range Manager and shared in previous report.

Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

**PES Watershed buyer document: A PES watershed project buyer document is one of the products of this project, and the documentation thoroughly describes the project, interventions, payment scheme and the management structure. This was designed and documented by the PES Expert who the Trust contracted as a Consultant, and was expected as a deliverable of the scheme.**

**Database: In addition to the PES Watershed Scheme charter in place, a monitoring and evaluation system is too in place and with this is the project database that has been utilized by the project. This is also a product of the project that supported the scheme**

## Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Consider lessons that would inform:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

The lessons during implementation were detailed in the endline evaluation of the project by the Consultants engaged by CEPF, as per the lessons learned, here are the major one per category;

- **Organization and project Structure;** Resources seemed to be allocated across different project components reasonably well, but most felt the amount of incentives to the communities was inadequate or lower than expected by the farmers. There was frustration by the farmers during project implementation.
- **Teamwork and Communication;** The Chimpanzee Trust however felt that dissemination and updates on project progress across the different components weren't optimal for the PES project because of the lack of a full-time Communications Officer. This also rendered engagement of potential funders and water buyers slow at the start, before arrival of the external expert
- **Project Planning: Start up;** Chimpanzee Trust chose CFMs as their strategic partners for linking them with the local communities at the selected PES project catchment sites. These CFMs were dormant and required some reviving prior to full engagement.
- **Progress and Tracking;** The project lacked a well-defined, internal M&E system that would have enabled proper tracking of different stages of project implementation and designated milestones.

Moreover, the number of the community members to be involved in the actual restoration work was not very well conceived and determined at the start. As a result, the original estimated number of community members to be engaged increased significantly during implementation when a high number of initially untargeted community members later expressed their interest in the PES project. This greatly affected the budget allocated for incentives which created friction around sharing of the allocated resources. To diffuse the situation, the Chimpanzee Trust had to request for extra funds from CEPF which was granted.

- **Implementation and operations:** Its important to implement PES schemes in areas where a river has buyers who utilize water downstream as this is vital. In addition, dealing with large land owner is better, Large land owners incentive is felt more and dealing with them is better than small holder farmers, however even the small holder farmers are needed. Incentives work and lead to communities conserving, however, the incentive fee was not equivalent to expected gains from alternative land use options on the land, a sustainability glitch.

The Bugoma Forest PES business case indicated a potential of generating \$90/ha annually. Whereas no contractual agreement was reached during the project period, the Bugoma Jungle Lodge who were engaged as potential water buyers confirmed that they were in negotiations and were considering

committing to a PES agreement with the Chimpanzee Trust and CFMs. They indicated that it was still too early to determine what form and amount the expected commitments would take.

- **Documentation and Dissemination:** The community representatives raised a concern that community involvement in the documentation process, as well as dissemination and engagement with the potential water buyers and other stakeholders was minimal. They felt that they should have been more deeply involved in the entire process, in order to acquire critical skills that would enable them to independently take these activities forward in future.
- **Human Resource and Training:** The community therefore did not get the opportunity to be fully and meaningfully engaged in these activities which was a missed opportunity for building local capacity that would remain in the area post-project.

## **Sustainability / Replication**

Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

### **Successes:**

- Establishment of Farmer committees and monitoring systems that peer to peer checked on each other and met set benchmarks, a sustainability mechanism that will outlive the project lifetime.
- Partnership created by the project with local leaders and the Districts.
- Outcome mapping with neighbouring villages adapting good land management practices from the PES project

### **Challenges:**

- The duration of the project, as farmers were getting used to implementing land management practices and meeting set benchmarks

## **Safeguards**

If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

**1. Natural Habitats:** The project has contributed to the restoration of riverine forests and habitat as such protecting biodiversity and ecosystems. The engagement with the communities on this project has already halted further degradation of the river banks and regeneration has been noted already however this has brought back wildlife in the River Rutoha catchment leading to more human wildlife conflicts, which had been anticipated. We applied for and received a grant from the Darwin Initiatives, to address Human-Wildlife Conflicts in the Bugoma Landscape.

**2. Physical Cultural Resources:** Forests in the landscape are looked at as cultural heritage, especially Bugoma Forest reserve that is in the Watershed Landscape that the project is operational. We have partnered with Bunyoro Kitara and signed an MoU aimed "partnering in the areas of conservation, sustainable development and livelihood improvement for the communities in Bunyoro- Kitara

Kingdom." Therefore, preservation is key as watershed landscape management contributes to this. We have submitted grant proposals to support this, yet to be funded.

3. Grievances: Chimpanzee Trust project continued to utilise the Local Council/Village leadership that provides for a system that the communities can use to channel their grievances. The Project Staff, including the Project Lead, has availed the farmers all the opportunity to express, directly, their grievances and or complaints related to the project. Farmers have the contacts of all key Project Staff. In addition, the communities have taken ownership of the project. Meetings with the farmers have involved local leadership and other stakeholders to ensure that farmers are free to air any grievances, which are recorded and the mitigation actions agreed. The major complaint received directly by project staff and through the local leadership is increasing in human-wildlife conflicts.

### Additional Comments/Recommendations

Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF

The recommendations are;

- Piloted PES projects should be longer, if they are to have lasting impact in the community.
- Farmers monetary incentives should be revised i.e. increased from USD 38 per hectare to meet cost benefit equivalent to farming options.
- Farmer's incentives should be delivered on time as per schedule, as delay in provision of the in-kind incentives impacted on project
- Capacity building aligned to Buyer and Donor engagement is vital and CEPF should train grantees on how to engage the private sector in their countries for conservation funding and support.

### Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment


**Total additional funding (US\$)**

*\$9,481.79*

#### **Type of funding**

*Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:*

- A Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*

- 
- C *Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*

**USD 3500; Blank Park Zoo bought the Field Assistants 3 motorcycles that they used during project implementation**

**USD 5981.79; Darwin Initiatives paid Staff salary for last quarter**

### **Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

1. Please include your full contact details (Name, Organization, Mailing address, Telephone number, E-mail address) below

**Dr. Joshua Rukundo Chimpanzee Trust P. O. Box 884 Entebbe [director@ngambaisland.org](mailto:director@ngambaisland.org)  
+256758221539**