





Darwin Initiative Main/Post/D+ Project Half Year Report (due 31 October 2016)

Project Ref No 23-019

Project TitleAchieving No Net Loss for communities and biodiversity in

Uganda

Country(ies)/Territory(ies) Uganda

Lead Organisation University of Oxford

Partner(s) National Environment Management Authority Uganda

(NEMA), Nature Uganda, International Institute of Environment

& Development (IIED), Wild Business Ltd & Wildlife

Conservation Society (WCS) Uganda

Project Leader Professor. E.J. Milner-Gulland

Report date and number

(e.g., HYR3)

November 2015. HYR1

Project website/ Twitter/

Blog/ Instagram etc

http://www.iccs.org.uk/achieving-no-net-loss-for-communities-

and-biodiversity-in-uganda/

Funder (DFID/Defra) DFID. Darwin initiative

1. Outline progress over the last 6 months (April – Sept) against the agreed baseline timetable for the project (if your project has started less than 6 months ago, please report on the period since start up to end September).

We outline progress against Y1 activities as numbered in section 24 of our proposal.

1.1: Project Inception Workshop. (Q1)

The inception workshop took place at the Makindye Country Club, Kampala, on the 23rd and 24th May 2016. It was attended by project partners and advisors: Oxford University: E.J. Milner-Gulland, Victoria Griffiths and Carlyn Samuel. NEMA: Francis Ogwal. NU: Achilles Byaruhanga, Michael Opige and Judith Mirembe. IIED: Dilys Roe and Julia Baker (consultant to IIED). WCS: Simon Nampindo and Beatrice Kyasiimire. Wild Business: Joseph Bull. MoWE: Mark Infield. JGI: Panta Kasoma. After the workshop a project webpage was created, where the report arising from the workshop as published, as well as other relevant project information. A 'Basecamp' site has been created to facilitate communications, which all project partners have been invited to join, and the report, the minutes of the meeting and updated project documents arising from the workshop have all been share here with project members.

The inception workshop started with a series of presentations by each team, setting out their prior work on the topic and their plans for the project. Presentations were also given on the national and international context. Next we went through the log frame clarifying timings, roles and responsibilities. Dilys Roe then led us in an exercise to develop our project's Theory of Change based on the logframe. Then we mapped the theory of change onto the logframe and checked for mismatches and holes which needed filling. Finally we mapped the budget onto the activities called for in the theory of change and checked again for mismatches.

Three key areas were highlighted as needing attention, through this process:

1) The need to liaise intensively with the WCS-led COMBO project in respect of the Business and Biodiversity Forum and our other national-level policy work, the very limited budget for this activity and yet its national-level importance as a catalyst for ongoing change, and the very large potential for impact that the activity has. We recognised that activity on this initiative

would need to be started sooner than anticipated if we were to get the momentum required for sustainability by the end of the project. See 3.4 below for our actions on this point.

- 2) The importance of liaising with government at the local level as well as the national level. This was not included in the original proposal and logframe and so has no budget, but will be important to ensure institutional buy-in within the study site. Because there is currently no funding for this important new action, Victoria Griffiths will work closely with Beatrice Kyasiimire (WCS) to explore how best to carry out this engagement, and we will seek budgetary savings elsewhere which may allow some funding to be reallocated (the need is for the costs of holding meetings including transport and per diems for local government officials).
- 3) The lack of understanding amongst all parties of the history and current status of the Kalagala offset and Bujagali and Isimba dams in terms of which government departments, individuals, businesses and international bodies were involved in the original setting-up of the offset, and which specific roles and responsibilities are with which institutions currently. See 1.2 (stakeholder analysis) for action on this point. The funding for this was found in the Oxford university budget, where £1500 was envisaged for a Masters student to support the research element, but with the topic depending on need; we decided that this analysis was a fundamental and urgent need upon which the rest of the project depended. We chose to carry it out within the team rather than using a Masters student due to the time-sensitive nature of the work and the high level of local expertise and sensitivity needed to carry out the work effectively.

1.2: Collate existing datasets. (Q1)

INDICATOR TEXT: All relevant biodiversity and social survey data collected into a spatially explicit database and analysed to assess impacts of projects/offsets.

The social data in the Environmental and Social Impact Assessments and Social Impact Assessments for both the Bujagali and Isimaba dams has been reviewed by Victoria Griffiths, researcher at Oxford University. Villages for social surveys were selected based on the villages included in these ESIAs.

Nature Uganda has collated existing biodiversity datasets for the study site, in order to inform selection of sites for repeat surveys.

In response to point 3) raised at the inception workshop we carried out a stakeholder analysis for the Bujagali and Isimba dams and the Kalagala offset. This was done by Wild Business on behalf of Oxford University. The analysis was done in a field visit which took place in September-October 2016, carried out by Nafeesa Esmail. Nafeessa collated all the available literature on the dams and offset and carried out key informant interviews with all relevant stakeholders including all project partners. The resultant report is being finalised now and will be submitted to the project team by the end of 2016.

1.3: Social field surveys. (Q2-4)

The social fieldwork protocol was developed between June and August 2016, as well as the protocols for the focus group discussions, key informant interview, individual questionnaire and choice experiments. The social fieldwork commenced on 4th September 2016 and will run until 20th December 2016.

Thirteen key informant interviews were carried out with project partners and specialists in Kampala. The aim of these interviews was to find out more about cultural heritage and traditions in Uganda and more specifically around the study site.

Two villages at each of the three sites (Bujagali, Kalagala and Isimba) are being visited with approximately 240 individuals in the larger villages at Bujagali and Kalagala being sampled and 160 individuals in the smaller villages at Isimba being sampled. The individual questionnaire, including the choice experiments, was piloted in a village near Bujagali and updated according to the findings. To date, four out of the six villages have been sampled, with the individual questionnaire and choice experiments being administered to approximately 240 individuals in each village.

The individual questionnaires were complemented by focus group discussions to explore

cultural heritage, wellbeing and change in livelihood activities in more detail. In all six villages, four cultural heritage focus group discussions are being carried out, with separate male and female groups divided according to livelihoods.

The questionnaires and field protocols were uploaded to Basecamp in order to make them accessible to all team members. The researcher, Victoria Griffiths (Oxford University) also held individual meetings with project partners in Kampala, London and Oxford in order to discuss her plans and solicit feedback, support and advice.

1.4: Ecological field surveys. (Q2-4)

INDICATOR TEXT: Biodiversity fieldwork protocol developed (June-Sept).

Michael Opige of Nature Uganda has developed a protocol for the biological field surveys which was reviewed and approved internally within NU and by Project Leader E.J. Milner-Gulland. The protocol was uploaded to Basecamp in order to make it accessible to all team members. Fieldwork is planned to be completed by the end of Y1.

1.7: Project meetings. (6 monthly)

The inception meeting was held in May, and update meetings were held between Victoria Griffiths and Ugandan project partners in September before commencing the social fieldwork. Nafeesa Esmail also held individual discussions with project partners in October as part of the stakeholder analysis. Individual bilateral discussions have been held between various partners working on different aspects of the project.

A Skype project meeting was held on the 11th November. Those present: EJ Milner-Gulland (meeting chair), Dilys Roe (IIED), Joseph Bull (WB), Julia Baker (IIED), Nafeesa Esmail (WB), Victoria Griffiths (Oxford), Carlyn Samuel (Oxford; minutes). Due to unforeseen circumstances, NEMA, NU and WCS were unable to join the call, and subsequently E.J. Milner-Gulland, Simon Nampindo (WCS) and Hugo Rainey (WCS) had individual meetings. Individual meetings with NEMA and NU are planned for January.

The minutes and action points from the 11th November meeting were shared with the project members on Basecamp.

The next full project meeting has been scheduled for w/c 3rd April 2017 to take place in Uganda.

3.4. Business and Biodiversity Forums (BBF) (Y2 Q4)

Based on the insights from our inception meeting, and given the opportunity represented by Nafeesa Esmail being in Uganda to carry out the stakeholder analysis, we brought forward this action point from Y2. Nafeesa facilitated an in-country meeting with local partners and potential interested parties to further discuss and agree upon the general approach and concept of the BBF, considerations to take into account and next steps. The meeting was attended by: Nafeesa Esmail, Francis Ogwal, Achilles Byaruhanga, Simon Nampindo, Beatrice Kyasiimire and Mark Infield. EJMG also met with Hugo Rainey and Simon Nampindo (WCS - COMBO project) and Francis Ogwal (NEMA - in-country lead on this action point) to discuss ways forward.

We decided that half a day at our first year meeting (April 2017) will be devoted to business engagement, with key potential business partners invited, and that COMBO and our teams would continue to discuss the potential institutional partnerships and frameworks that would best support a BBF that would be influential and catalytic in the longer term. We are also exploring with COMBO the opportunities for soliciting further co-funding to support the BBF. Julia Baker (IIED) has agreed to take on an enhanced role in working with COMBO and NEMA on this component of the project.

2a. Give details of any notable problems or unexpected developments/lessons learnt that the project has encountered over the last 6 months. Explain what impact these could have on the project and whether the changes will affect the budget and timetable of project activities. As described in full above, the inception workshop highlighted a number of areas in which additional action would be beneficial if the project is to fulfil its impact, based upon our development of a theory of change. We have taken actions to enhance our work in these areas as detailed above, but none of these actions required a change to the agreement. Due to the new Defra contract, which included a liability clause which was unacceptable to Oxford and therefore required renegotiation, there was guite a substantial delay in the receipt of funds from Darwin, and therefore in the disbursement of funds to project partners. All funded partners have now signed the Collaboration Agreement and have received their funding for year 1, but this delay was unfortunate, particularly in light of the reduction in the value of sterling which took place in June. The subsequent fall in the value of the dollar in November. while not fully compensating the loss incurred from the drop in sterling, was nevertheless welcome (at least in respect to project finances!). Project partners kept working despite the financial delays and therefore the project is still keeping to the planned timescales for both activities and spending. 2b. Have any of these issues been discussed with LTS International and if so, have changes been made to the original agreement? Discussed with LTS: No [other than the contract issues] Formal change request submitted: No Received confirmation of change acceptance: No 3a. Do you currently expect to have any significant (e.g., more than £5,000) underspend in your budget for this year? No 🖂 Estimated underspend: Yes 3b. If yes, then you need to consider your project budget needs carefully. Please remember that any funds agreed for this financial year are only available to the project in this financial year. If you anticipate a significant underspend because of justifiable changes within the project please submit a rebudget Change Request as soon as possible. There is no quarantee that Defra will agree a rebudget so please ensure you have enough time to make appropriate changes if necessary. 4. Are there any other issues you wish to raise relating to the project or to Darwin's management, monitoring, or financial procedures? No

If you were asked to provide a response to this year's annual report review with your next half year report, please attach your response to this document.

Please note: Any <u>planned</u> modifications to your project schedule/workplan can be discussed in this report but <u>should also</u> be raised with LTS International through a Change Request.

Please send your **completed report by email** to Eilidh Young at <u>Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</u>. The report should be between 2-3 pages maximum. <u>Please state your project reference number in the header of your email message e.g., Subject: 22-035 Darwin Half Year Report</u>