

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	NatureUganda
Project Title:	Contributing to piloting data generation using the existing Environment Monitoring Plan to guide the conservation of biodiversity in the Oil and gas exploration and production areas in the Albertine Graben.
Date of Report:	31 st May 2017
Report Author and Contact Information	Michael Opige NatureUganda P.O. Box 27034, Kampala. Email: michael.opige@natureuganda.org

CEPF Region: The project was implemented in Africa, Eastern Afro-montane region, Murchison Falls National Park

Strategic Direction:2. Improve the protection and management of the KBA network throughout the hotspot.

Investment Priority2.2Support the role of civil society organizations in the application of site safeguard policies and procedures, including the strengthening of environmental impact assessment implementation in order to address ongoing and emerging threats to all KBAs, including priority freshwater KBAs.

Grant Amount: 10,000 USD

Project Dates: 1st August 2015 to 30th April 2017

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

Partners in the project	Involvement of the partners
NEMA (National Environment Management Authority)	<p>During the designing of the monitoring protocol for birds in Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP), NEMA provided the framework for designing the protocol from the EMP and supported process of developing the monitoring protocol through the biodiversity section of the Environmental Monitoring and Compliance Department</p> <p>During the search for the data on birds for MNFP that was done, it was discovered that NEMA is one of the institutions holding such data. Access to data/information/records was provided to NatureUganda and these are now included in inventory for data on birds of MFNP developed during this project.</p> <p>NEMA is using data we collected while testing the monitoring protocol for birds in MFNP to support the production of the National State of Environment Report (SOER) of Uganda 2016. This will highlight major talking points on bird diversity and oil and gas production in MFNP as a case study.</p> <p>The ED of NEMA has agreed to a memorandum of understanding</p>

	<p>(MoU) with NatureUganda to establish a long-term working relationship between the two institutions. The biodiversity section that is going to house the MoU was directing involved in its drafting and the draft is now with the NEMA legal department for final checks. NEMA has promised that this MoU will be signed by end June so as to be functional by the next financial year.</p>
<p>UWA (Uganda Wildlife Authority)</p>	<p>NatureUganda has an MoU with UWA. Through this MoU, a long standing working relationship with UWA has been built. UWA provided free access to MFNP for the monitoring plots to be established and for protocol testing.</p> <p>The research and monitoring unit of UWA together with NatureUganda, selected, surveyed and established monitoring sites for birds (referred to as monitoring plots). They also participated in testing the birds monitoring protocol developed for the EMP. Their participation was mainly through site-based staff participating in bird surveys.</p> <p>Uganda Wildlife Authority has got copies of data generated through the years from research done in MFNP. Some of these are however, presented as reports. Some of the data are from the ranger-based Monitoring and Information SysTem (MIST) programme. UWA provided access to data and such records and were included in the data inventory on birds of MFNP developed during this project.</p> <p>The ED of UWA has agreed to revising and renewing the MoU between UWA and NatureUganda. This would enable the two institutions to include new and emerging conservation priorities that were omitted in the old MoU.</p>
<p>NatureUganda</p>	<p>In collaboration with UWA and NEMA, NatureUganda developed a monitoring protocol for birds to inform subsequent monitoring of oil and gas activities and impacts on biodiversity and the environment.</p> <p>Together with UWA, NatureUganda selected, surveyed and established 18 representative monitoring plots for birds in MFNP. The sites were established in areas to include Woodlands, Grasslands, River side, and wetland habitats. The sites were geo-referenced and the GPS coordinates are available. The geo-reference have been used to produce a location map and can also be used in mapping data sources as one of the areas the State of Environment Report will look at.</p> <p>NatureUganda spearheaded the testing of the monitoring protocol for birds; collecting baseline data from all the 18 sites for the period of July 2016 and Jan 2017 that can be used for further analyses and to also enrich the National State of Environment Report (SOER) that NEMA is working on. This data is available on the British Trust for Ornithology- BTO online database where all the Land Bird monitoring data from NatureUganda is kept.</p> <p>NatureUganda initiated the process of establishing a long-term working relationship with the government agency in charge of managing Uganda's environmental affairs (NEMA). The Executive Directors of NEMA and NatureUganda formally agreed to have a Memorandum of Understanding which was drafted, discussed and is</p>

	<p>now in its final stages with the legal team of NEMA.</p> <p>NatureUganda have been party to the process to review the National Environment Act (NEA) since 2013 and is still on-going with the draft National Environment Bill further subjected to consultations. NEMA organised a consultative meeting with CSCO input on the final drafts, a meeting that NatureUganda attended. The meeting was done on 5th of Feb 2016 (see major areas highlighted in the bill). The major areas included the areas of strategic environment assessments, monitoring and audits and environmental risk assessment and project decommissioning.</p> <p>NatureUganda organised two Public-Talks relevant to the subject of impacts of oil and gas in Protected Areas. The two Public-Talks we organized were also used to disseminate information on the Oil and Gas sector to the public. The first Public-Talk was organised in June 2016 and the discussions were on the topic "Balancing Biodiversity Conservation and Extractive Industry Development in Uganda". The second topic was organised in September but delivered in October 2016 and the topic was "The level of oil development activities in the country: What needs to be done to avoid or minimize the social and economic effects of oil refinery, pipelines and oil activities in the country?"</p> <p>A comprehensive search for the data on birds for the Murchison Falls National Park was done. The data sources for studies that were done in relation to bird monitoring have been identified. The National Data bank, NatureUganda and NEMA and TOTAL E & P are among the institutions holding the data. The data available were tested against their compatibility with the requirements of the EMP. However, currently the data have not been harmonized and centralized.</p> <p>NatureUganda has to date used its advocacy network and channels to highlight biodiversity issues on oil and gas development. Through the implementation of this project, lessons were learned and they have been summarized in a poster. The poster provides the main lesson sharing avenue and several copies were produced and disseminated to including but not limited to NEMA, CSCO members, U-PCLG members and CSO ENR Network and the remaining ones will be shared further during our fourth coming Conservation Conference 2017.</p>
<p>Total E & P Uganda (TEPU)</p>	<p>TEPU is working in Exploration Area 1 (EA-1), Exploration Area 1A (EA-1A) and Exploration Area EA2 within the Albertine Region. Exploration Area 1 (EA-1) fall within Murchison Falls National Park and EA2 falls just outside the National Park. TEPU is playing a leading role within this block. TEPU, along with partners CNOOC and Tullow, are engaging with the government of Uganda to start oil production, which activities include an oil refinery in Uganda and an export crude oil pipeline. TEPU therefore provided areas with productive wells and routes where the pipeline will be constructed. The choice of the transects were therefore informed by the planned design of the development activities.</p>

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

The project mainly contributed in two areas (a) protection of the Murchison Falls National Park, a Key Biodiversity Area (b) capacity building of the Civil Society Organization (**NatureUganda**) to engage with Government and private sector. The project has strengthened the position of **NatureUganda** to support the Environmental Impact Assessment process for the pipelines through generation of data and/or information. This will help minimize the threats from Oil and gas production when mitigation measures are implemented. **NatureUganda's** capacity to engage on the issues of Oil and Gas and with NEMA and Total E & P Uganda specifically has improved. The responsibly contacts have been acquired, communication channels have been built and therefore subsequent actions will be quicker in responding to an advocacy issue. Through the project, we hope that a long term engagement platform has been built, baseline to future references have been generated and the conservation benchmarks have been drawn for this oil rich and biodiversity rich area (the Albertine Rift). The key species of conservation concern will thus be protected and the results from the ongoing studies will be used to enrich the ongoing discussions on KBA prioritization using the global criteria set by IUCN and now being tried in Uganda under the leadership of Wildlife Conservation Society.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.

Project Impacts			
1	Biodiversity data/information on birds of Murchison National properly documented as proposed in the EMP to inform oil and gas activities	data submitted	Two sets of data for the period of July 2016 and Jan 2017 were collected from the 18 sites established for implementing EMP at MFNP. The data has been harmonized with other data on birds collected by NatureUganda from the same area and nationally and entered into the NatureUganda database. This provided opportunity to merge and provide good analytical information on birds. NEMA has embarked on the preparation of the National State of Environment Report (SOER) 2016 and a focal person from NatureUganda has been seconded to NEMA following their request (see annex 8). This provides an opportunity for information from NatureUganda to contribute directly to the compilation of the SOER. Information has also been used in Clearing House Mechanism hosted by NEMA and NatureUganda will be a member of the Steering committee on the NEMA implemented project on mainstreaming biodiversity information into the Heart of government decision making. The analysis of the data will also highlight major issues on impact of oil and gas exploration and production on birds as an indicator of biodiversity.
2	Birds monitoring protocol in EMP piloted and lessons generated to inform subsequent monitoring of oil and	# of sites established and monitored	All the 18 sites that were established in the various habitats (woodlands, Grasslands, River side, and wetland habitat) have been maintained for monitoring. However, the project has established that other data on birds are available and being held by different

	gas activities		organisations (see annex 1). Additionally, individual wells have data on birds that were collected as part of the EIA regulations. The EIAs also proposed that the studies done during the EIAs be repeated. For some wells, such studies were done and the data are being held by respective companies and Petroleum Exploration and Production Department (PEPD) of Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development. Such reports can be accessed through the environment regulator, NEMA.
3	Lessons from the work disseminated through a poster to the Civil Society Coalition on Oil and Gas (CSCO) and Uganda – Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (UPCLG).	# of UPCLG and CSCO meetings attended	NatureUganda has to date used its advocacy network and channels to highlight biodiversity issues on oil and gas development. One national meeting of CSCO with NEMA and two Public-talks were attended and organised respectively (see annex 5, 6 and 7). The talk on Oil & Gas was attended by nine (9) females and 24 males, while that on balancing biodiversity conservation with extractive industry was attended by nine (9) females and 37 males. Through the implementation of this project, lessons were learned and they have been summarised in a poster. The poster provides the main lesson sharing avenue and this will be shared on our website and further during our fourth coming Conservation Conference 2017.
Project outputs/results			
1.1	A signed MoU between NU and NEMA on data, data use and management	MoU in place	The final MoU (see annex 2) was sent to the ED NEMA for final approval. And at an appropriate agreed date the MOU will be signed by the representatives from NEMA and NatureUganda.
1.2	Permanent monitoring plots established in MFNP for long term impacts of oil and gas activities	# of transects mapped	The GPS coordinates of the 18 sites established are available. The sites were geo-referenced and location maps are available. These geo-references will be helpful in mapping data sources as one of the areas the State of Environment Report will look at. The 18 transects (see annex 3) provide a basis for long term monitoring plots in MFNP.
2.1	A set of data on the birds using protocols in the EMP for productive oil wells operated by TOTAL exploration and production Ltd submitted to NEMA	data provided to NEMA	Two sets of data for the period of July 2016 and Jan 2017 were collected from the 18 sites established for implementing EMP at MFNP. Data collected using the protocol designed for birds in the EMP from the 18 sites has been transcribed to include species lists, habitat types, species richness and abundance. The analysed quantitative and qualitative information is being prepared to be included in the National State of Environment Report being prepared by NEMA. NatureUganda has been seconded into two thematic areas: Natural environment - biological and Natural environment - physical. These are two themes to which NatureUganda

			will input directly with the data and information we have on birds and specifically from EMP testing.
3.1	A poster on the lessons from systematic piloting of birds monitoring protocol in the MFNP produced and shared	# of posters produced	The poster summarising lessons from the implementation of the project has been produced. A total of 600 copies were produced and disseminated to including but not limited to NEMA, CSCO members, U-PCLG members and CSO ENR Network. The remaining copies have been kept to be displayed in the fourth coming Conservation Conference.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected:

Species Conserved:

Corridors Created:

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

The main success of this project has been the partnership and collaboration built between **NatureUganda** and government Agencies. This has provided the opportunity for **NatureUganda** to identify advocacy opportunities through which the organization can make meaningful discussions and influence their actions.

The Environment Monitoring Plan developed by NEMA had never been tried out to understand how it can be applied. Through this project, this was achieved through developing a case study on birds. The monitoring protocol for birds is now available. The protocol was designed, tested and agreed among several stakeholders and the testing produced baseline data that will be used to inform on impacts of subsequent Oil and Gas activities but also to enrich the State of the Environment Report being prepared by NEMA.

Even when there is willingness in government to collaborate with CSOs and private sector in managing environmental impacts of oil and Gas activities, the process of formalizing the working relationship is sometimes slow. Establishing a memorandum of understanding between a Non-government organization and a government agency turned out to be very lengthy requiring a lot of time, effort and patience!

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

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 projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Partners in the project	Lessons from Partners
NEMA	There is willingness in government to collaborate with CSOs and private sector in managing environmental impacts of oil and Gas activities evidenced by readiness to enter an agreement through the MoU. The process of establishing an MoU between a Non Governmental Organization and a government Agency complements

	buy-in and provides opportunities for building synergies where government agency and CSO support each other where capacity and opportunity may be lacking.
UWA	<p>Systematically involving UWA in the process starting with developing the monitoring protocol from the EMP to generating required output from the studies (all the stages) has ensured support by an arm of Government thereby providing direct influence and buy-in from all the stakeholders from Government, Civil Society and Private sector.</p> <p>UWA does not regularly survey birds during their routine monitoring of MFNP because their monitoring surveys focus on mammals. The Capacity of UWA has been increased to carry out periodic surveys of birds to monitor impacts of Oil and Gas activities on a more regular basis as they have personnel who have participated in the monitoring.</p>
Nature Uganda	<p>We have worked with many institutions through either formal or informal partnerships or collaborations. Working through such collaboration with partners and other research institutions, duplication of efforts and thus wastage of resources was avoided. Additionally, establishing a memorandum of understanding between a Non Governmental Organization and a government Agency complements buy-in and provides a CSO with meaningful advocacy opportunities and influence.</p> <p>There was need for stakeholder engagement during generation of quality data/information and proper documentation to enrich discussions on habitat sensitivity with clarity in presentation. This was done through a systematic process developed from the EMP starting with developing the monitoring protocol to generating required output from the studies. All the stages were being supported by an arm of Government thereby providing direct influence and buy-in from all the stakeholders from Government, Civil Society and Private sector.</p> <p>As NatureUganda, we wanted to understand the best time in the oil production chain to guide aware that Uganda has already approved production of oil and gas from the productive wells. The advocacy windows in the oil and gas development that can be influenced by CSOs are quite narrow when it reaches production stage but when working with a Government Agency, there are more opportunities to provide corrective options. This therefore required formal engagements that were timely.</p>

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

The project allowed the flexibility of changing project implementation period. This was quite helpful since Uganda went through a ‘quiet’ period when government and private oil companies could not agree and thereby all oil related activities stalled. This meant that we could not test the protocol with the intended parameters when oil activities went dormant. We needed to wait till the activities of oil and gas companies resumed and the project could appropriately be implemented.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Multi-sectoral participation in designing the monitoring protocol for birds, establishment of monitoring sites and testing of the protocol made it possible for information to be shared without

hesitation and mistrust. Collaboration with partners and other research institutions ensured that duplication of efforts and thus wastage of resources is avoided, while the support by an arm of Government provided direct influence and buy-in from all the stakeholders from Government, Civil Society and Private sector.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

There are three processes that have been supported by the data/ information from this project

- a) The development of the sensitivity map for Queen Elizabeth National Park (QENP) using experiences from MFNP. **NatureUganda** was co-opted to provide information on sensitivity based on birds. QENP is being proposed for exploration and therefore lessons from MFNP are very important.
- b) Data collected using the protocol designed for birds from the 18 sites in MFNP have been used to enrich the National Red-list for birds (a process that is being spearheaded by Wildlife Conservation Society - WCS).
- c) The Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) prioritization has been started (again being spearheaded by WCS). Data from the EMP implementation was used to qualify MFNP as KBA using the global KBA prioritization criteria developed by IUCN. **NatureUganda** provided data and information from the sites being monitored.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF 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 project.)
- C** Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

A total of 18 representative monitoring plots for birds in MFNP were established in the MFNP including the Woodlands, Grasslands, River side, and wetland habitats. These form a basis for long term monitoring transects / plots for bird's monitoring within the National Park and for monitoring the activities of oil and gas as they were properly geo-referenced and mapped. **NatureUganda** will include the sites in its national programme for monitoring common birds through the Bird Population Monitoring (BPM) programme.

The sensitivity map for Queen Elizabeth National Park (QENP) was developed using experiences from MFNP. **NatureUganda** was co-opted to provide information on sensitivity based on birds.

QENP is being proposed for exploration and therefore lessons from MFNP are very important. The same protocol developed for MFNP can be used for monitoring birds in Queen Elizabeth National Park.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

The project targeted Murchison Falls National Park since it is wholly inside the oil blocks and so has already experienced some direct impacts from the oil exploration and now will be compounded by oil production. The oil exploration and production activities are expected to follow the guidance from Environmental and Social Impact Studies (ESIAs) with mitigation measures to address the negative impacts. This project therefore set out to improve the capacity of **Nature Uganda** to obtain data and engage better in the **Environmental Impact Assessment** process for the pipelines that will traverse the Protected Area and position the institution strategically to advocate better in issues of oil and gas and the with the responsible institutions and Agencies.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Achilles Byaruhanga
Organization name: Nature Uganda
Mailing address: achilles.byaruhanga@natureuganda.org
Tel: +256 414 540 719
Fax: +256 414 533 528
E-mail: nature@natureganda.org

*****please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved for project from inception of CEPF support to date	Describe the principal results achieved during project period (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No		Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No		Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	MFNP is 3,893 sq.km. = 389,300 ha.	Additional researches on other taxa have been commissioned to help understand the biodiversity and the ecosystem sensitivity of the area better.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No		
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No		

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under **Community Characteristics** and **Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit**, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Total																					

If you marked “Other”, please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:

