



Alternative sustainable livelihood sources for forest-edge hunting communities

Mid-term Review

Project Reference 21-016

Submitted to Defra and DFID by LTS International

21st March 2016



LTS International Ltd

Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan
Penicuik, EH26 0PL
United Kingdom

Tel. +44 (0)131 440 5500

Fax. +44 (0)131 440 5501

Email. mail@ltsi.co.uk

Web. www.ltsi.co.uk

Twitter. @LTS_Int

Registered in Scotland Number 100833

Acronyms

BCFS	Budongo Conservation Field Station
BFR	Budongo Forest Reserve
BSLG	Budongo Sub-county Local Government
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CFM	Collaborative Forest Management
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
Darwin	The Darwin Initiative
Defra	Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs
DFID	Department for International Development
MFA	Masindi Farmers' Association
MTR	Mid-term Review
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NDP	National Development Plan
NFA	National Forest Authority
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
RZSS	Royal Zoological Society of Scotland
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority

Executive Summary

Aim of the evaluation

This Mid Term Review was commissioned to provide an external perspective on project progress and future direction, for the benefit of the project partners and the Darwin Initiative. The project selected was 'Alternative sustainable livelihood sources for forest-edge hunting communities (21-016) led by Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS) and was carried out in November 2015.

The review included field site visits, interviews with project implementers and beneficiaries, and document review. It was expected to answer two questions:

How is the project progressing against the project logframe using the OECD DAC evaluation criteria as a guide?

What is the capacity of the project to undertake M&E and how well is it able to demonstrate evidence of its progress?

Project 21-016 'Alternative sustainable livelihood sources for forest edge hunting communities'

(Darwin Grant Value £123,000)

This 3 year Main project is situated in Budongo Forest Reserve (BFR) and in selected surrounding communities, in western Uganda. Hunters living in villages on the edge of the reserve set snares to catch antelopes for subsistence and commercial purposes. This has long-term effects on forest fauna populations including significant impacts to chimpanzees, which are caught in the snares leading to injury and, in extreme cases, death.

According to the "Eastern Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*): Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan 2010-2020", at least 25-35% of the habituated communities in Uganda suffer from snare related injuries. Furthermore, hunters and farmers living in close proximity to the forest edge often have their crops raided by wildlife, further increasing human-wildlife conflict. This close interaction with wildlife increases the risk of disease transmission between humans and animals (reverse zoonosis) and animals and humans (zoonosis).

The project is working with hunters to reduce their impact on forest fauna by providing them with breeding goats for subsistence and commercial purposes. It is further supporting them, and other rural poor - including pit-sawyers and subsistence farmers - by providing seed for

non-traditional crops, which are more resistant to crop raiding by wildlife and have higher commercial value. These activities are complemented by training. They are conditional on project beneficiaries signing a conservation agreement with BCFS, BSLG, NFA and UWA, prohibiting them from engaging in illegal activities in the forest and requiring them to introduce homestead sanitation to limit the spread of diseases between humans and animals, and vice versa.

Progress against project logframe

There is significant evidence that good progress is being made towards achieving the projects outputs and outcome: "Hunters and their dependents, in twelve forest edge communities supported to develop alternative sustainable livelihoods that are compatible with wildlife conservation".

Two hundred and eighty-four households, supporting over 1,400 dependents, have signed conservation agreements with the project, and its partners, prohibiting them from engaging in illegal activities in the forest. It requires them to introduce homestead sanitation to limit the spread of diseases between humans and animals, and vice versa. Of these households, 70 were previously engaged in hunting.

In return for these conservation agreements, the project has provided support including:

- Veterinary care for farm animals
- Distribution of goats for livelihood diversification
- Training in alternative livelihoods including agronomy and vocational skills (e.g. motor mechanics course)
- Materials and training to plant buffer zones with cash crops that had the additional benefit of reducing human wildlife conflict

There is evidence of a measurable reduction in the number of snares confiscated from the forest by the project's snare patrol team, and all project beneficiaries have established and maintained homestead sanitation.

Progress towards the outputs and outcome directly supports implementation of both the CBD and Uganda's National Development Plan and is, therefore, delivering against the dual objectives of the Darwin Initiative – biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.

The project is contributing to three Aichi Targets:

- #5: Reducing the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests
- #11: areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved effectively and equitably managed
- #14: ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded

Capacity to undertake M&E

The project is following a detailed plan and all project team members have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Generally, the logical framework and associated indicators are SMART. However, there are several examples where dates for the submission of source material, identified to verify outputs and outcomes, are not defined. This has an impact on the ability of the project to measure progress towards several of its outputs and its outcome, and therefore manage the projects activities to keep it on track.

Conclusions

There is significant evidence that good progress is being made towards achieving the projects outputs and outcome. Furthermore, the project is directly supporting implementation of both the CBD and Uganda's National Development Plan and, therefore, is delivering against the dual objectives of the Darwin Initiative – biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.

Recommendations for the project

The review made the following main recommendations for the project to consider:

Project delivery effectiveness

Recommendation: In future consider the inclusion of annual milestones to monitor progress of livelihoods outputs

Recommendation: Indicators to measure progress of environmentally friendly buffer zone cropping and consider inclusion of additional indicators to monitor progress.

Recommendation: Update log frame indicators with milestones to allow progress measurement. There are several examples where dates for the submission of evidence to verify outputs and outcomes are not defined, which impacts the ability of the project to measure progress towards several of its outputs and its outcome.

Project Evidence

Recommendation: It is important to expedite analysis and reporting of project data on biodiversity impacts, so that results may be captured by BSLG and shared with the wider local, regional and international conservation community. This dissemination of information will be critical to helping BCFS secure further funding to upscale its activities and in supporting BSLG to incorporate findings into their agricultural output reports, which may have an influence on local and district level policy.

Project Design

Recommendation 1: Review and revise the logical framework to include dates for the submission of identified source material to verify the outcome and outputs, and to improve the ability of the project to report against progress.

Recommendation: Change the wording of Output 1 to reflect the projects adaptation to include pit-sawyers and the poorest households not involved in any illegal activities.

Recommendation: Change the wording of Output 2 to reflect the projects adaptation to include pit-sawyers and the poorest households not involved in any illegal activities, and the projects focus on eight rather than 12 villages.

Sustainability

Recommendation 2: Consider amending conservation agreements for future beneficiaries receiving support to establish goat herds, by making support conditional on willingness to donate two goats back to the project for introduction to new project households.

Recommendation 3: Consider amending the conservation agreements for future beneficiaries receiving support to grow non-traditional crops, by making support conditional on willingness to reinvest in their adopted activities.

Contents

Acronyms	
Executive Summary	
Aim of the evaluation	
Project 21-016 'Alternative sustainable livelihood sources for forest edge hunting communities'	
Progress against project logframe	
Capacity to undertake M&E.....	
Conclusions	
Recommendations for the project	
Contents	
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Aim of review.....	1
1.3 Scope of review	2
2. Methods	2
2.1. Document Review.....	2
2.2. Semi structured interviews.....	2
2.3. Opportunistic informal discussion	3
3. Project Review.....	3
3.1 Progress against objectives	3
3.1.1 Partnerships	3
3.1.2 Relevance.....	5
3.1.3 Effectiveness	6
3.1.4 Efficiency	14
3.1.5 Impact	15
3.1.6 Sustainability	17
3.1.7 Influence.....	19
3.2 Capacity to undertake M&E	19
4. Conclusions	19
5. Recommendations.....	20

5.1. Recommendations for Project	20
Annex 1: Tabular account of progress and achievements against the logframe.....	21
Annex 2: People Consulted.....	26
Annex 3: Materials Reviewed as part of the MTR.....	28

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

A Mid Term Review (MTR) of Darwin Initiative project 21-016: '*Alternative sustainable livelihood sources for forest edge hunting communities*' was undertaken in November 2015.

The lead institution is the Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS) and activities are implemented through the Budongo Conservation Field Station (BCFS). The project is situated in Budongo Forest Reserve and in selected surrounding communities, in western Uganda. Project information is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Darwin Project Information

Project Ref Number	21-016
Project Title	Alternative sustainable livelihood sources for forest edge hunting communities
Country	Uganda
Contract Holder Institution	Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS)
Partner Institution(s)	Budongo Conservation Field Station (BCFS)
Darwin Grant Value	£123,000
Funder	DFID
Start/End dates of Project	1 April 2014 – 30 March 2017
Project Leader Name	Dr Fred Babweteera
Project website	www.budongo.org
MTR date	November 2015

1.2 Aim of review

This MTR was commissioned to provide an external perspective on project progress and future direction, for the benefit of the project partners and the Darwin Initiative.

1.3 Scope of review

This is a formative review designed to answer two questions:

- 1) How is the project progressing against the project logframe using the OECD DAC evaluation criteria as a guide?
- 2) What is the capacity of the project to undertake M&E and how well is it able to demonstrate evidence of its progress?

2. Methods

The review followed the OECD DAC evaluation criteria for evaluating development assistance. Evidence listed in the projects current logical framework and submitted to Darwin and/or collected during the field visit, was reviewed and triangulated to verify progress against the outcome and output measurable indicators. Triangulation involved interviews and opportunistic informal discussions with project staff, interviews with project partners and beneficiaries, and visual observation of project activities.

2.1. Document Review

Prior to the field visit, the reviewer was provided with all materials submitted to Darwin by the project. This was limited to the Stage 2 Application, Half Year Report 1, Annual Report 1 and Annual Report Review 1. At the time of writing, Half Year Report 2 had not been submitted to Darwin and is overdue. Further to these materials, the reviewer studied several other documents. These documents were mainly those cited in the project application and reports but also included documents selected by the reviewer following discussions and interviews with key stakeholders and based on his knowledge of other development projects in the region. A full list of literature consulted during this review is included in Annex 2.

2.2. Semi structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with all project staff, with key individuals from partner institutions and other key stakeholders, and with several project beneficiaries from four participating villages. In total, 26 interviews were conducted. Notes taken during the interviews were transcribed in full, resulting in the production of rich, qualitative data. Questions posed during the interviews were designed to address the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and to verify progress against the outcome and output measurable indicators. A full list of people interviewed is included in Annex 1.

Interviews with key individuals from partner institutions were arranged by the project, in consultation with the reviewer. Once in country, the reviewer requested additional meetings with other key stakeholders. It was not possible to meet with the national CBD focal point for protected areas in Uganda, Mr Aggrey Rwetsiba, who works closely with the project; nor Mr

Francis Ogwal, the CBD focal point for the country, with whom the project also plans activities due to unavailability.

Interviews with project beneficiaries were focused on four villages, from a total of eight currently participating in the project. These villages: Karongo, Nyakafunjo, Nyabigoma and Kapeeka were selected for the following reasons:

- Karongo and Nyakafunjo each host a Buffer Zone Cropping Demonstration Site established by the project, are key foci for project activities and are within easy travelling distance of BCFS.
- Nyabigoma hosts demonstration sites within farmers' gardens and is within easy travelling distance of BCFS.
- Kapeeka receives development support from both BCFS and the National Forest Authority (NFA) Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) initiative. Beneficiaries therefore provide insight in to how BCFS activities may support and compliment related programmes and activities at the local level.

While some interviews with project beneficiaries were pre-arranged, in order to ensure that the full range of benefits accrued by beneficiaries could be evaluated, many interviews were undertaken opportunistically in the villages visited. This combination of planned and opportunistic interviewing ensured the reviewer was not subject to project influenced bias.

2.3. Opportunistic informal discussion

The reviewer was based at BCFS for five days. Each morning and evening before and after formal review activities, the reviewer took full advantage of engaging the project team in informal discussions about the project, and the wider conservation and development issues in the region. These discussions augmented information gathered during the interviews and served as another method to triangulate evidence.

3. Project Review

3.1 Progress against objectives

3.1.1 Partnerships

The contract holder institution, RZSS, has supported wildlife conservation and research in Uganda for the past ten years. In Uganda, RZSS activities are implemented through BCFS, situated in Budongo Forest Reserve, western Uganda. RZSS and BCFS enjoy a long-standing and extremely effective partnership. RZSS funds all BCFS core running costs, supporting BCFS to concentrate efforts on implementation and development of its conservation and research programmes. The project leader, Fred Babweteera, is both Africa regional coordinator for RZSS and Director of BCFS.

In implementing this project, BCFS is working with several partners to effect change: Budongo Sub-county Local Government (BSLG), National Forestry Authority (NFA), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and Masindi Farmers Association (MFA). With the exception of MFA, which is a members' association, all partners are signatory to conservation agreements with the beneficiary communities, which form the basis for the project outcome. All of these partnerships have proved effective and the activities of the project are complimentary to both the mandate, and activities, of the project partners.

With the exception of MFA, relationships with these partners was in place well before the inception of this project and each were involved in the initial pilot, which informed the design of this project. The maturity of these partnerships has greatly supported the progress of the project to date.

Budongo Sub-county Local Government

BSLG is the key partner in the implementation of this project and is responsible for identification and mobilisation of community based beneficiaries. The partnership is strong and BSLG have welcomed project activities as complementary to its own development initiatives. BSLG identified the beneficiary households and registered them at the sub-county level. Furthermore, representatives of BSLG attended the initial confidence building meetings with ex-hunters, organised by the project, to assure them that they would not be reprimanded for any past involvement in illegal activities.

National Forestry Authority

NFA is responsible for the custody of central forest reserves and have welcomed project activities as complimentary to their own mandate. Representatives of NFA attended the initial confidence building meetings with ex-hunters, and the subsequent training seminars and workshops, to show their support for project activities and to assure them that they would not be reprimanded for any past involvement in illegal activities.

Uganda Wildlife Authority

UWA is responsible for conserving and managing Uganda's wildlife. Representatives of UWA attended the training seminars and workshops to show their support for project activities and to assure ex-hunters that they would not be reprimanded for any past involvement in illegal activities.

Masindi Farmers Association

MFA is a members' organisation offering farming extension services to communities in the district of Masindi. BCFS engages MFA to provide technical advice to the project and directly to project beneficiaries.

3.1.2 Relevance

The problems the project is trying to address were identified in the application and are summarised below:

Hunters living in villages on the edge of Budongo Forest Reserve set snares to catch antelopes for subsistence and commercial purposes. This has long-term effects on forest fauna populations including significant impacts to chimpanzees, which are caught in the snares leading to injury and, in extreme cases, death. Of the habituated chimpanzee communities in Uganda, at least 25-35% suffer from snare related injuries according to the “Eastern Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*): Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan 2010-2020”. Furthermore, hunters and farmers living in close proximity to the forest edge often have their crops raided by wildlife, further increasing human-wildlife conflict. This close interaction with wildlife increases the risk of disease transmission between humans and animals (reverse zoonosis) and animals and humans (zoonosis).

The project has been appropriately designed to combat these problems. However, the project needs to further adapt and refine its approach to maximise the likelihood of the outcome persisting after the end of the project (sustainability, see section 3.1.6).

The project is working with hunters to reduce their impact on forest fauna by providing them with breeding goats for subsistence and commercial purposes. It is further supporting them, and other rural poor - including pit-sawyers and subsistence farmers - by providing seed for non-traditional crops, which are more resistant to crop raiding by wildlife and have higher commercial value. These activities are supported by training, and are conditional on project beneficiaries signing a conservation agreement with BCFS, BSLG, NFA and UWA, prohibiting them from engaging in illegal activities in the forest and requiring them to introduce homestead sanitation to limit the spread of diseases between humans and animals, and vice versa.

The design of the project is appropriate to support implementation of the CBD. The project supports implementation of all five strategic objectives of Uganda’s Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), published in April 2002, and remains in line with the Fifth National Report to the CBD, submitted in March 2014. Specifically, the project is addressing five of the nine key threats identified in the CBD Programme of Work for Protected Areas: poaching, human-wildlife conflict, poverty, diseases in wildlife and encroachment on forest reserves.

At the national and local level, the project compliments the work of UWA and NFA. UWA is responsible for the conservation of all wildlife, both inside and outside protected areas. As such, it is responsible for the conservation of chimpanzees in national parks and reserves, as well as on private land. However, in practice, NFA manages the forest reserves, including Budongo Forest Reserve, and assumes responsibility for wildlife conservation. Since NFA lacks the capacity to effectively manage forest reserves, this project is supporting the

implementation of activities which neither NFA or UWA have the capacity to develop or manage. Furthermore, the project is supporting key objectives of the Eastern Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*): Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan 2010-2020, in Uganda, which identified disease, hunting and habitat degradation as the major threats to chimpanzee conservation.

The project supports several objectives of the National Development Plan (NDP), Uganda's current Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, which was introduced in 2010/11, since it has been designed to have an impact on livelihoods of the most vulnerable. At the beginning of the project a livelihoods assessment of hunters' households, in 12 target villages, was undertaken. This assessment was used to establish the livelihood status among households adjacent to Budongo Forest Reserve and to identify potential alternative livelihoods to hunting. Rural hunters are a vulnerable group facing significant hardship. They are amongst the lowest income earners in the region and their farms are often raided by wildlife because of their proximity to the forest edge. Interviews with several ex-hunters benefitting from this project revealed that catch per unit effort is very low, with many ex-hunters stating that they caught only one or two animals a month.

Following feedback from local leaders and community members that the project was only targeting and benefitting "wrong-doers", the project extended its support to pit-sawyers, who are understood to set animal snares during their forays in to the forest, and the poorest households not involved in illegal activities. This modification also addressed the potentially perverse outcome of incentivising illegal activities.

Two hundred and eighty-four household heads, supporting over 1,400 dependents, are benefitting from the project through a combination of benefits including: support to develop alternative livelihoods, including those derived from animal husbandry and the cultivation of cash crops; improved agronomy and vocational skills; and, improved homestead sanitation. Almost 70 of these households are female headed although support given and benefits accrued is directed towards all household members. **Gender equality has been considered and appropriately addressed by the project.**

3.1.3 Effectiveness

This section first reviews the extent to which the project outputs are being achieved and then considers progress towards the project outcome, as defined by progress against outcome level indicators. The appropriateness of output and outcome level indicators is discussed and, finally, the validity of outcome level assumptions is considered.

Progress towards project outputs

Output 1: List of individual hunters, their respective household dependents and livelihood analysis conducted.

This output was completed during year one. Two hundred and eighty-four household heads, supporting over 1,400 dependents in ten villages, were identified and registered in to formal groups. As stated above, while the project was originally designed to target only hunters, following feedback from local leaders and community members in participating villages, the project extended its support to include pit-sawyers and the poorest households not involved in any illegal activities.

The livelihoods analysis, which was undertaken in July 2014 (but not submitted to Darwin), sampled 100 randomly selected households from the 12 villages originally targeted by the project - those which share a boundary with Budongo Forest Reserve. The analysis examined (i) livelihoods of households and (ii) extent and profile of households involved in illegal activities in the forest reserve.

Recommendation: Change the wording of this output to reflect the projects adaptation to include pit-sawyers and the poorest households not involved in any illegal activities.

Output 2: Conservation agreement/framework to support hunting communities and their dependants established in 12 villages.

To focus project delivery, the number of villages benefitting from project activities has been reduced to eight, while the number of beneficiaries targeted by the project remains the same. This output is expected to be completed by the end of 2015. The conservation agreements form the basis for the project outcome. Eight conservation agreements – one for each village targeted by the project – have been signed by each participating household head, and by BSLG and NFA. The reviewer was shown original documentation, dated October 2015. Although UWA are yet to sign the agreements, they fully support project activities and are expected to add their signature before the end of 2015.

Conservation agreements are the result of activities successfully implemented under this output. Forty-six confidence building meetings, with local leaders and representatives from BSLG and NFA, were held to assure target beneficiaries that they would not be reprimanded for past involvement in illegal activities. These meetings were followed by 40 training seminars and workshops (conducted over 46 days) to build the capacity of beneficiaries to implement alternative livelihoods, and to raise awareness of zoonotic and reverse zoonotic diseases, and the impact of snares and traps on chimpanzees and other wildlife. These confidence building meetings, training seminars and workshops led to each participating village forming an association, registered with BSLG, and the drawing up of the conservation agreements. These conservation agreements bind each association to denounce illegal activities in the forest and to introduce homestead sanitation to limit the spread of diseases

between humans and wildlife (and vice versa), in exchange for the alternative livelihoods support offered by the project.

Recommendation: Change the wording of this output to reflect the projects adaptation to include pit-sawyers and the poorest households not involved in any illegal activities, and the projects focus on eight rather than 12 villages.

Output 3: Household specific alternative livelihoods sources selected through participatory methods with individual beneficiary households; Understanding of economic potential of improved agricultural practice as opposed to illegal hunting practice.

Household specific alternative livelihoods have been selected for all beneficiary households. During interviews with beneficiaries it was clear that they understood, and in many cases were realising, the economic potential of improved agricultural practice as opposed to illegal hunting practices. However, the indicators identified to measure understanding of economic potential of improved agricultural practice as opposed to illegal hunting practice are insufficient to measure progress towards this output.

Recommendation: In future consider the inclusion of annual milestones to monitor progress.

Output 4: Agricultural demonstration farms established to promote adoption of buffer-zone cropping systems that minimise crop loss to wildlife.

During the first year of the project, five demonstration farms were established along the edge of Budongo Forest Reserve. The project initially planned to establish 12 demonstration farms, of one acre each. However, feedback from farmers that demonstration farms should be located on plots of land of similar size to their own gardens (typically $\frac{1}{4}$ acre) saw the project adapt its approach. Rather than establishing a further seven large demonstration farms, the project has worked with between one and three farmers, in each participating village, to demonstrate buffer zone cropping systems within their own gardens.

Recommendation: Update Indicator 1 to reflect this adaptation.

Interviews with farmers during the review revealed that the incidence of crop raiding by wildlife had reduced dramatically and, anecdotally, by far more than the 30% target by the end of year 3. At the demonstration site in Nyakafunjo, the community coordinator for the project who, among other things, is responsible for recording daily occurrence of crop raiding, provided evidence that crop raiding had been eradicated following the introduction of crops planted adjacent to the forest edge which are unpalatable to primates. While this is very encouraging, data recording reductions in the frequency and intensity of crop raiding by wildlife is yet to be formally analysed and the working paper on buffer zone cropping systems is not due until the end of the project.

Recommendation: Indicators to measure progress towards this output are insufficient. Consider inclusion of additional indicators to monitor progress.

Progress towards the project outcome as defined by progress against outcome level indicators

There is significant evidence that good progress is being made towards the project outcome: "Hunters and their dependents, in twelve forest edge communities supported to develop alternative sustainable livelihoods that are compatible with wildlife conservation". As previously stated, to focus project delivery, the number of villages benefitting from project activities has been reduced to eight, while the number of beneficiaries targeted by the project remains the same. This adaptation will support the outcome to persist beyond the end of the project.

Recommendation: Change the wording of the outcome and outcome level indicators, to reflect this focus.

Progress and recommendations, where relevant, against each outcome level indicator is outlined below, in Table 2.

Table 2: Progress and recommendations against outcome level indicators

Indicator	Means of verification	Progress	Recommendation
1. Twelve conservation agreements signed and implemented between ex-hunters' associations and Budongo Conservation Field Station/Budongo Sub-county Local Government	Signed Conservation Agreements with a list of beneficiary signatories	8 conservation agreements, one per participating village, have been signed by the project beneficiaries and by BSLG and NFA. The project is waiting for UWA to sign the agreements. All beneficiaries interviewed by the reviewer claim they are abiding by the conditions of the agreement.	
2. Increased farm production of 250 hunting community households with livestock herds increased from 0 to 12 by year 3; The increased farm production shall be a joint effort of all household members including wives and children	Household agricultural output survey, Local government agricultural survey	In year one, 90 beneficiary households were supplied with two female goats and a number of beneficiaries interviewed by the reviewer had increased their herd from 0 to 12. No goats were provided during year two and the project leader thinks it unrealistic that a further 160 households will be targeted before the end of the project. On this basis, it is highly unlikely that that the target for this indicator will be met.	If the number of target households is to be scaled back, it is recommended that the project works with those households to identify alternative support. This is important to minimise risk of undermining the conditions stipulated in the conservation agreements.
3. House hold incomes of hunting communities increased from \$0.8 per day to \$1.2 per day by year 3	Household income surveys	During interviews with beneficiaries it was clear that they understood, and in many cases were realising, the economic potential of improved agricultural practice as opposed to illegal hunting practices.	

Indicator	Means of verification	Progress	Recommendation
<p>4. A minimum of 8 ex-hunters' complete vocational skills development programme per year; Household incomes of the trained ex-hunters increased from \$0.8 per day to \$2 per day</p>	<p>Number of ex-hunters with vocation training and their household incomes; quality and quantity of commodities (especially wood-based items) produced by the beneficiaries</p>	<p>The number of beneficiaries completing vocational skills development programmes exceeded its target in year 1. The target for year 2 was met in November 2015. In January 2016, 28 beneficiaries will enrol on a horticultural course and a further 8 will enrol on a motor mechanics course. If they all complete their training, the target for year 3 will be significantly exceeded. Two beneficiaries of vocational training were interviewed during the review. Both beneficiaries indicated that their income had increased significantly. Since there is anecdotal evidence that the skills being learned are in local demand, it is likely household incomes for all beneficiaries of vocational training will increase.</p>	<p>Remove reference to wood-based items to verify the since no beneficiaries opted for carpentry.</p>
<p>5. A minimum of three non-traditional agricultural crops used for buffer zone cropping adopted by 100 forest edge community households, including ex-hunter households by end of year 3.</p>	<p>Household agricultural output survey, Local Government output reports, video footage and photographs of homesteads before and after project implementation</p>	<p>A wide variety of non-traditional crops are being trailed by the project. The incidence of crop raiding by wildlife has reduced dramatically suggesting that farmers will adopt the use of non-traditional crops for buffer zone farming.</p>	

Indicator	Means of verification	Progress	Recommendation
6. The number of snares surrendered by ex-hunters; The number of snares recovered in the forest per day reduced from over 20 to less than 5 in the first year; No new records of snare injured chimpanzees and increases in the population of hunted fauna in years two and three of the project	Spatial and temporal variations in snare recovery data; number of new snare injured chimpanzees; periodic large mammal survey reports by BCFS	Data collected by the snare patrol team shows a significant reduction in the number of snares collected per unit effort/ day, from over 20 to an average of 7 (recorded in most recent available monthly summary – September). It is expected that this number will continue to fall as the project progresses. Only one new record of a snare injured chimpanzee had been made within the past six months.	The project recognises that it is unrealistic to expect a measurable increase in the population of hunted fauna in years two and three of the project, since biodiversity does not have a linear response to conservation activities. It is recommended that the project revises this indicator accordingly.
7. 250 ex-hunter's households establish and maintain pit latrines, waste disposal sites and livestock cages/sty; The percentage of beneficiary households with proper homestead sanitary facilities increased from 20% to 100% by year 3	Household sanitary facilities' survey, video footage and photographs of homestead sanitary facilities before and after project implementation	Targets exceeded since establishing and maintaining homestead sanitary facilities (and livestock pens, where applicable) is a pre-requisite to receiving project support. All households' signatory to the conservation agreements (284) have established sanitary facilities; all households that have received goats (90) have established raised livestock pens.	
8. Livestock for 250 households receiving periodic veterinary care to increase productivity and	Reports capturing statistics of veterinary rounds and the number	Targets exceeded. To date, over 400 households have received periodic veterinary care, including 100% of the beneficiary households who have	

Indicator	Means of verification	Progress	Recommendation
<p>minimise the risk of zoonotic diseases; The proportion of beneficiaries' livestock receiving veterinary care increased from 5% to 75% by year 3</p>	<p>of livestock treated; local government veterinary report</p>	<p>received goats from the project (90). This is because the project extends veterinary care to all owners of domestic animals in target villages, not only to project beneficiaries.</p>	

Validity of outcome level assumptions

The project has identified three outcome level assumptions:

- 1) Full cooperation by the ex-hunters and commitment to sustain the selected livelihoods projects
- 2) Hunters will be willing to donate two female goats/pigs for the expansion of the scheme to other villages
- 3) Quality of farm produce is good and competitive on the market

Assumption 1 is valid. However, the project has adapted and developed to include other vulnerable groups and, therefore, no longer has a sole focus on ex-hunters. Pit-sawyers and poor households not previously involved in any illegal activities are now included. This assumption should be updated to reflect this adaptation.

Assumption 2 is invalid. The project has not asked any beneficiaries of goats to donate animals for the expansion of the scheme. Furthermore, the project has not made beneficiaries aware that this is assumed. It will now be difficult for the project to impose this assumption and broaching the subject may risk losing the beneficiaries' trust.

Recommendation: Consider applying this requirement to future beneficiaries of goats by formalising willingness under the conservation agreements

Assumption 3 is valid but is partly beyond the control of the project. For example, it does not consider the impact of climate variability and the wider potential impact of climate change. While the majority of farmers interviewed by the reviewer confirmed that farm produce quality has been good and financial returns have out-competed those accrued from planting traditional crops, many farmers complained that rains arrived very late in 2015 and that crop yields were damaged by lack of water and intense sunshine. There is anecdotal evidence that, in this region of Uganda, rains have been arriving later and are less reliable over the past few years.

3.1.4 Efficiency

The project is being run efficiently and has successfully balanced its biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation elements.

The project leader, Fred Babweteera, is highly organised and clearly motivates, inspires and commands the respect of the project team, and the wider BCFS project staff and students. Although responsible for direction and monitoring of the project, day-to-day project management has been the responsibility of Dr Caroline Asimwe, Conservation Coordinator and Head Vet at BCFS. However, with the expansion of her veterinary responsibilities, Geoffrey Muhanguzo, BCFS Field Station Manager, has now assumed the role of project manager.

The project is following a detailed plan and all project team members have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The methodology of the project is appropriate to achieve the intended outputs and, according **to all project beneficiaries interviewed by the reviewer, assistance provided by the project has measurably improved their livelihoods, particularly in terms of income, and, in conjunction with material support from the project, has stopped them from engaging in illegal activities** (however, at this stage of the project it is not possible to fully corroborate this).

Technical support services to beneficiaries' farms, which includes technical guidance in agronomy, animal husbandry and business management has been very well received and has also had an impact on other community members, as indirect beneficiaries. For example, all community members in target villages are able to glean technical advice from project beneficiaries and, when the project administers veterinary care to domestic animals provided by the project, the service is extended to owners of all domestic animals in the village.

Although the number of direct project beneficiaries is modest, **the project's influence on decision makers and its impact on non-project beneficiary households indicates that the project has significant potential to be scaled up both locally, within Budongo sub-county; regionally, within Masindi district; and nationally, in areas where humans and forest fauna are in conflict.** Coupled with RZSS's long term and on-going support for BCFS's core running costs, **this project represents good value for money.**

3.1.5 Impact

Biodiversity

Initially, the project began undertaking monthly biodiversity monitoring surveys, with the aim to monitor any change in encounter rates of chimpanzees, and those species targeted by hunters, within 3km of villages participating in the project. However, it soon became clear that biodiversity would not show a linear response to project activities and measurable impacts on biodiversity encounter rates may not be observed until after the project end.

In response to this, the project adapted its approach to focus on frequency of observed illegal activity, including snares and pit-sawing sites, and frequency of observed animal spoor along a network of over twenty "impact transect lines", which extend from villages participating in the project for 3km into Budongo Forest Reserve.

It is expected that reductions in the frequency of observed illegal activity will positively correlate with observed increases in animal spoor encounter rates however, this correlation may not be evident until late in the project cycle or after the projects has ended. To date, no formal analysis of this data has been undertaken however, **data collected by the snare patrol team shows a significant reduction in the number of snares collected per unit effort, as compared to the pre-project baseline.** The latest monthly snare sighting summary sheet was completed in September 2015 and shows a daily average of

approximately seven snare retrievals. This compares favourably with the pre-project baseline of approximately 20.

Under this Darwin project, the monthly average incidence of snare retrievals has reduced significantly. **This reduction in snares is expected to have significant positive impact on local biodiversity conservation.** Evidence for this already exists: in the past 6 months, only one chimpanzee snare injury has been recorded. This is noted as a significant achievement for BCFS since at least 25-35% of habituated chimpanzees in Uganda are known to suffer from snare related injuries.

Recommendation: It is important to expedite analysis and reporting of this data so that results may be captured by BSLG and shared with the wider local, regional and international conservation community. This dissemination of information will be critical to helping BCFS secure further funding to upscale its activities and in supporting BSLG to incorporate findings into their agricultural output reports, which may have an influence on local and district level policy.

Further positive impact on biodiversity is expected as a result of the projects emphasis on homestead sanitation. All beneficiary households are required to install a functional pit latrine, a garbage disposal pit, a kitchen ware drying rack and, if livestock has been provided by the project, raised livestock pens. Installing homestead sanitation is the responsibility of the beneficiary household and is expected to be done in advance of receiving project support. 100% of project beneficiaries have complied with this condition and BCFS have accolades from local government officials in this regard. Since animals, including chimpanzees, are known to raid homesteads, these sanitary measures are expected to minimise the risk of disease transmission between humans and animals (reverse zoonosis) and animals and humans (zoonosis), and therefore have a positive impact on biodiversity conservation. Expected reductions in the spread of diseases may result in an additional livelihood benefit of reduced medical bills for project beneficiaries however, at present, it is understood that human health data is not being captured by the project. Again, it is important to expedite reporting of the data collated by the projects vet team to inform BSLG's veterinary report, which may have an influence on local and district level policy.

Poverty

The projects' actions are supplemented by its awareness raising activities, delivered through its community conservation education programme and confidence building and training seminars/ workshops. During interviews with project beneficiaries, it was evident that these activities have had an impact on peoples understanding of biodiversity and the impact of human-wildlife conflict on livelihoods, health and biodiversity.

Household agricultural output data collected by the project is expected to provide evidence of poverty alleviation among project beneficiaries, as a result of its support to develop alternative livelihoods. The introduction of non-traditional crops, which are less prone to

wildlife raiding than traditionally grown cassava and maize, has enabled project beneficiaries to diversify their farm produce. Traditional crops often contribute little to household income because all households harvest their crop at the same time, flooding the market and leading to a reduction in produce value. Diversification addresses over supply and supports farmers to tap in to markets with higher potential returns. The project claims that, during the first planting season, beneficiary farmers recorded a 30% rise in farm produce income. While the project is yet to formally analyse data, during the project review, all beneficiaries of agricultural support interviewed by the reviewer confirmed that their earnings had significantly increased. **Typically, this increase in earnings was understood by the reviewer to be significantly higher than 30%.**

Additionally, the provision of goats to ex-hunters is expected to have an impact on poverty alleviation. Project beneficiaries receiving goats receive two females, upon installation of a raised goat pen at their homestead. The females are then bred with a male goat, typically loaned by a neighbour or by the project. Beneficiaries are encouraged to wait until they have reared ten goats before considering slaughter, for subsistence or commercial purposes, in order to establish and sustain a breeding herd. Again, agricultural output data is yet to be analysed by the project, so evidence of increased household income from goats is not available. However, of those ex-hunters, interviewed by the reviewer who had successfully reared a herd of at least 12 goats, all had consumed at least one for subsistence purposes and sold at least one for commercial purposes; and had therefore received both a livelihood and a poverty alleviation benefit.

Finally, consultation with the project team revealed one unplanned project impact: students from Makerere University, Kampala, who have visited the buffer zone cropping demonstration sites have shared lessons learned with their colleagues. While this impact cannot be quantified, this sharing of knowledge may have impacts on any related projects involving these students, in the future.

3.1.6 Sustainability

The policy environment is strongly in support of the projects activities since these are aligned with government plans to alleviate poverty, through the modernisation of agricultural practices. Furthermore, the project is aligned with the mandates of its partner institutions and fills critical capacity gaps. However, further steps need to be taken to ensure that lessons learned are adequately and effectively disseminated in a timely manner. Key to the sustainability of this project is its ability to inform the policy environment of the benefits accrued by the beneficiaries and the impact of project activities on biodiversity. The mechanism through which to do this is to influence Local Government reports on agricultural and veterinary outputs, by disseminating household agricultural, income and veterinary data. Well informed Local Government reports may influence agricultural policy at both the local and district level and thus support the persistence of the project outcome. While it is understood that, at the end of the project, a working paper on buffer zone cropping systems

will be submitted to the Local Government production department, with the aim to influence policy through the demonstration of improved farmers' livelihoods, regularly informing the Local Government of key findings may smooth the way for policy changes to be implemented expediently.

Those project beneficiaries receiving vocational training are highly unlikely to re-engage in illegal activities (if they were previously engaged) and will accrue significant poverty alleviation benefits, since there are plentiful employment opportunities for the vocations being learned.

At the project level there are two key risks to sustainability. One risk affects livestock production and one risk affects non-traditional crops.

While one of the outcome level assumptions is "Hunters will be willing to donate two female goats/pigs for the expansion of the scheme to other villages", the project has not made beneficiaries aware of this and broaching the issue may now risk losing the beneficiaries trust.

Recommendation: Consider including this requirement as a condition of conservation agreements signed with future beneficiaries. This will support up-scaling of the scheme, while empowering beneficiaries to share responsibility for the schemes wider impact, which is supported by on-going veterinary care provision by BCFS.

During interviews with beneficiaries receiving project support to grow non-traditional crops, while most indicated significant financial benefits had been accrued as a result of project activities, some indicated they would not have money to procure seed ahead of the next growing season to continue with activities. Furthermore, those beneficiaries requested support from the project to assist them in procuring seed. Of those beneficiaries who claimed this position, all stated they had made significant profits as a result of project activities, profits several times greater than they received when farming traditional crops. Additionally, all cited provision of school fees as the reason for their financial hardship. It may have been that, upon seeing a westerner representing a donor organisation, these individuals were courting further support.

Recommendation: Consider approaches to ensure beneficiaries are supported to continue planting non-traditional crops, following initial project support.

If these risks to sustainability are addressed, it is highly likely that income derived from alternative sustainable livelihoods will a) accrue benefits in excess of those derived from illegal activities and b) will be sustained. If sustained, these alternative livelihoods would provide incentive not to return to illegal activities incompatible with wildlife conservation.

3.1.7 Influence

The project is interacting with key decision making authorities including BSLG, NFA and UWA. Furthermore, the project interacts with the CBD focal point for Uganda. While the project compliments the work of NFA and UWA, it is unclear to what extent it is influencing decision makers and change. The ability of this project to influence change lies in its ability to inform key decision making authorities of the co-benefits to poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation being accrued by project activities. This requires the project to influence Local Government reports on agricultural and veterinary outputs through dissemination of regular household agricultural, income and veterinary survey data. To date, the project is yet to analyse or disseminate such data. Well informed Local Government reports may influence agricultural policy at both the local and district level. At the end of the project a working paper on buffer zone cropping systems will be submitted to the local government production department. While it is hoped that this paper will influence agricultural policy, any influence will not be fully realised until after the project is complete.

3.2 Capacity to undertake M&E

The project is following a detailed plan and all project team members have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Generally, the logical framework and associated indicators are SMART however, there are several examples where dates for the submission of source material, identified to verify outputs and outcomes, are not defined. This has an impact on the ability of the project to measure progress towards several of its outputs and its outcome.

4. Conclusions

There is significant evidence that good progress is being made towards achieving the project's outputs and outcome. Two hundred and eighty-four households, supporting over 1,400 dependents, have benefitted from the project and there has been a significant reduction in the number of snares retrieved from the forest, indicating that project beneficiaries are abiding by the conditions set out in the conservation agreements. **This progress is directly supporting implementation of both the CBD and Uganda's National Development Plan and is, therefore, delivering against the dual objectives of the Darwin Initiative – biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.**

Through this project, BCFS have continued to strengthen relationships with key institutional partners and further their work with vulnerable communities living adjacent to Budongo Forest Reserve. The project is aligned with the mandates of these institutions, and fills critical capacity gaps. The policy environment is strongly in support of projects activities, since these are aligned with government plans to alleviate poverty, through the modernisation of agricultural practices. However, to maximise the projects wider impact, further steps need to

be taken by the project to ensure that lessons learned are effectively disseminated in a timely manner.

While the logical framework and associated indicators are generally SMART, there are several examples where dates for the submission of source material identified to verify outputs and outcomes are not defined. This has an impact on the ability of the project to measure progress towards several of its outputs and its outcome.

5. Recommendations

5.1. Recommendations for Project

There are three main recommendations for the project to consider:

Recommendation 1: Review and revise the logical framework to include dates for the submission of identified source material to verify the outcome and outputs, and to improve the ability of the project to report against progress.

Recommendation 2: Consider amending conservation agreements for future beneficiaries receiving support to establish goat herds, by making support conditional on willingness to donate two goats back to the project

Recommendation 3: Consider amending the conservation agreements for future beneficiaries receiving support to grow non-traditional crops, by making support conditional on willingness to reinvest in activities

Annex 1: Tabular account of progress and achievements against the logframe

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Progress and Achievements to date
<p>Outcome: Hunters and their dependants, in twelve forest edge communities supported to develop alternative sustainable livelihoods that are compatible with wildlife conservation.</p>	<p>Twelve conservation agreements signed and implemented between ex-hunters' associations and Budongo Conservation Field Station/Budongo Sub-county Local Government</p> <p>Increased farm production of 250 hunting community households with livestock herds increased from 0 to 12 by year 3; The increased farm production shall be a joint effort of all household members including wives and children</p> <p>House hold incomes of hunting communities increased from \$0.8 per day to \$1.2 per day by year 3</p> <p>A minimum of 8 ex-hunters complete vocational skills development programme per year; Household incomes of the</p>	<p>Signed Conservation Agreements with a list of beneficiary signatories</p> <p>Household agricultural output survey, Local Government agricultural output reports</p> <p>Household income surveys</p> <p>Number of ex-hunters with vocational training and their household incomes; Quality and quantity of commodities (especially wood-based items) produced by the beneficiaries</p> <p>Household agricultural output survey, Local Government agricultural output reports; Video footage and photographs of homesteads before and after project implementation</p>	<p>Eight conservation agreements signed between project beneficiaries, Budongo Conservation Field Station (BCFS), Budongo Sub-county Local Government (BSLG) and National Forest Authority (NFA).</p> <p>90 beneficiary households supplied with two female goats. Data for household agricultural output survey has not been analysed. Data has not been fed into Local government agricultural output reports.</p> <p>Household income surveys are ongoing. Data for household agricultural output survey has not been analysed.</p> <p>18 project beneficiaries have completed vocational courses. 10 in year 1 (5 x hairdressing & cosmetology; 5 x tailoring);</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Progress and Achievements to date
	<p>trained ex-hunters increased from \$0.8 per day to \$2 per day</p> <p>A minimum of three non-traditional agricultural crops used for buffer zone cropping adopted by 100 forest edge community households, including ex-hunter households by end of year 3.</p> <p>The number of snares surrendered by ex-hunters; The number of snares recovered in the forest per day reduced from over 20 to less than 5 in the first year; No new records of snare injured chimpanzees and increases in the population of hunted fauna in years two and three of the project</p> <p>250 ex-hunter's households establish and maintain pit latrines, waste disposal sites and livestock cages/sty; The percentage of beneficiary households with proper homestead sanitary facilities increased from 20% to 100% by year 3</p> <p>Livestock for 250 households receiving periodic veterinary care to increase</p>	<p>Spatial and temporal variations in snare recovery data; Number of new snare injured chimpanzees; Periodic large mammal survey reports by BCFS</p> <p>Household sanitary facilities' survey; Video footage and photographs of homestead sanitary facilities before and after project implementation</p> <p>Reports capturing statistics of veterinary rounds and the number of livestock treated; Local government veterinary report</p>	<p>8 in year 2 (brick laying). Income has not been analysed.</p> <p>A wide variety of crops are being trialled by farmers and there is evidence to suggest that the farmers will adopt these. Data for household agricultural output survey has not been analysed. Data has not been fed into Local government agricultural output reports.</p> <p>Over 3,300 snares have been recovered but exact number has not been analysed since annual report 1; in September 2015, average number of snares recovered in the forest per day was 7; one new record of snare injured chimpanzees over past 6 months; increases of hunted fauna is not being measured.</p> <p>284 households have established and maintained pit latrines, waste disposal sites and livestock cages/sty; 100% of beneficiary households have proper homestead sanitary facilities</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Progress and Achievements to date
	productivity and minimise the risk of zoonotic diseases; The proportion of beneficiaries' livestock receiving veterinary care increased from 5% to 75% by year 3.		Livestock for over 400 households have received periodic veterinary care; 100% of beneficiaries' livestock are receiving veterinary care
Output 1: List of individual hunters, their respective household dependants and livelihood analysis conducted.	Report of a livelihood analysis of beneficiary households. Parameters assessed to include level of education and income, family size, assets including land, number of snares possessed and hunting frequency.	1.1 Report of a livelihoods analysis.	Livelihood analysis report completed in May 2015
Output 2: Conservation agreement/framework to support hunting communities and their dependants established in 12 villages.	<p>Register of all ex-hunters and their household members in the 12 villages.</p> <p>Forty confidence building meetings and 48 training seminars held with ex-hunters' groups</p> <p>Formally signed conservation agreements between BCFS and hunters' associations.</p>	<p>Register of all ex-hunters and their household members in the 12 villages</p> <p>Report of confidence building meetings and training seminars; Photos of participants in session.</p> <p>Signed agreements</p> <p>Storage facility of recovered snares</p> <p>Records of snare injured chimpanzees.</p>	<p>Register of all ex-hunters and further beneficiaries, including pit-sawyers and poorest members of community completed in eight villages</p> <p>Forty confidence building meetings and 48 training seminars held.</p> <p>Eight conservation agreements signed between project beneficiaries, BCFS, BSLG</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Progress and Achievements to date
	<p>Collections of snares recovered from ex-hunters and within the forest</p> <p>No new record of chimpanzees maimed or killed by snares</p>		<p>and NFA.</p> <p>Over 3,300 snares have been recovered but exact number has not been analysed since annual report 1</p> <p>One new record of snare injured chimpanzees over past 6 months</p>
<p>Output 3: Household specific alternative livelihoods sources selected through participatory methods with individual beneficiary households; Understanding of economic potential of improved agricultural practice as opposed to illegal</p>	<p>Guidelines for improved agronomic practices accepted by the local government production department</p> <p>Income levels of beneficiaries' increase from \$ 0.8 to at least \$ 1.2 per day</p> <p>Vocational training curriculum tailored for illiterate or semi-illiterate community members developed by end of year 1</p>	<p>Brochures of improved agronomic practices</p> <p>Household agricultural output survey; Video footage and photographs of homesteads before and after project implementation</p> <p>Number of beneficiaries enrolled for vocational training</p>	<p>Not to be published until project end</p> <p>Household income surveys are ongoing. Data for household agricultural output survey has not been analysed.</p> <p>Project beneficiaries have completed vocational courses. 10 in year 1 (5 x hairdressing & cosmetology; 5 x tailoring); 8 in year 2 (brick laying). Income has not been analysed.</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Progress and Achievements to date
hunting practice			
<p>Output 4: Agricultural demonstration farms established to promote adoption of buffer-zone cropping systems that minimize crop loss to wildlife</p>	<p>12 demonstration farms of 12 acres minimum established by end of year 1</p> <p>Working paper on buffer zone cropping systems accepted by local government production department</p> <p>Frequency and intensity of crop raiding by wildlife reduced by 30% by year 3</p>	<p>Number and/or acreage of demonstration farms. Photos of demonstration farms</p> <p>Print of working paper on buffer zone cropping systems</p> <p>Report of crop raiding dynamics in project area</p>	<p>5 large demonstration sites established and, following feedback from farmers that demonstration farms should be located on plots of land of similar size to their own gardens, the project has worked with between one and three farmers, in each participating village, to demonstrate buffer zone cropping systems within their own gardens</p> <p>Not to be published until project end</p> <p>Not to be published until project end</p>

Annex 2: People Consulted

Name	Role	Organisation
Fred Babwateera	Project Leader	RZSS/ BCFS
Geoffrey Muhanguzi	Field Station Manager	BCFS
Caroline Asiimwe	Head vet/ Conservation Coordinator	BCFS
John Paul Okimat	Research Intern	BCFS
Eric Okwir	Research Intern	BCFS
Moses Agonchia	Karongo community coordinator	BCFS representative
Vincent Yogini	Nyakafunjo community coordinator	BCFS representative
Fred Lemeriga	Kapeeka village, BCFS chairperson	BCFS representative
Joronim Bategeka	Chairperson	BSLG
?	Programme Officer	MFA
Esther Barungi	Extension worker	MFA
Moses Kabairdho	Forest Sector Manager, Budongo	NFA
George Edema	Deputy Principal	Uganda Technical College, Kyema
Thomas Yia	Registrar	Uganda Technical College, Kyema
Acema Mansur	Kapeeka village chairman	-
Oyika Saveri	Beneficiary	-
Daniel	Beneficiary	-
Enoth Nyitbri	Beneficiary	-

Malak Arumadri	Beneficiary	-
Betty Att	Beneficiary	-
Asuman Kahwa	Beneficiary	-
Annette Asiimwe	Beneficiary	-
Susan Piko	Beneficiary	-
Eric Ezaruku	Beneficiary	-
Moses Lumundu	Beneficiary	-
Geoffrey Pario	Beneficiary	-

Annex 3: Materials Reviewed as part of the MTR

21-016 Darwin Initiative Stage 2 Application

21-016 Darwin Initiative Half Year Report 1

21-016 Darwin Initiative Annual Report 1

21-016 Darwin Initiative Annual Report Review 1

International Monetary Fund (2014). *Uganda. Poverty Reduction paper – Progress Report*. IMF Country Report No. 14/354. Washington, D.C: IMF

National Environment Management Authority (2014). *Fifth National report to the Convention on Biological Diversity*. Kampala, Uganda: NEMA.

National Environment Management Authority (2012). *Action Plan for Implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity's Programme of Work on Protected Areas*. Kampala, Uganda: NEMA.

National Environment Management Authority (2002). *Republic of Uganda National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*. Kampala, Uganda: NEMA.

Plumptre, A.R., Rose, R., Nangendo, G., Williamson, E.A., Didier, K., Hart, J., Mulindahabi, F., Hicks, C., Griffin, B., Ogawa, H., Nixon, S., Pintea, L., Vosper, A., McLennan, M., Amsini, F., McNeilage, A., Makana, J.R., Kanamori, M., Hernandez, A., Piel, A., Stewart, F., Moore, J., Zamma, K., Nakamura, M., Kamenya, S., Idani, G., Sakamaki, T., Yoshikawa, M., Greer, D., Tranquilli, S., Beyers, R., Furuichi, T., Hashimoto, C. and Bennett, E. (2010). *Eastern Chimpanzee (Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii). Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan 2010-2020*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.