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Concepta Mukasa
Project Focal Point (AUPWAE)
1. Introduction

The Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) with funding from the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) is carrying out research on “Gender, Tenure and Community Forests in Uganda and Nicaragua”. In Uganda, CIFOR is collaborating with the School of Forestry, Environment and Geographical Sciences of Makerere University and the Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and the Environment (AUPWAE). The overall goal of the research project is to improve women’s tenure rights to forests through their increased participation in community forest user groups with regard both to decision making and livelihood benefits. The purpose of the project is to enhance stakeholder uptake of institutional and policy innovations to promote women’s participation, specifically regarding the way in which community forestry-related decisions include women and reflect their particular interests. These innovations will be based on a clear understanding of the obstacles to, and the motivations and conditions necessary for the emergence of mixed user groups and women in positions of authority over natural resources.

As part of the project, a training workshop on Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) was held from 28th March to 2nd April, 2011 at Makerere University, School of Forestry, Environment and Geographical Sciences.

1.1. Objectives

The overall objective of the ACM training workshop was to equip the participants (ACM Research team and other stakeholders in the Forest sector) with the ACM approach and the skills required to successfully implement it.

The specific Objectives included:

1. Introduce and deepen the participants’ conceptual base and understanding of the ACM approach.
2. Equip and deepen the participants with skills necessary for using the ACM approach through practical exercises such as role plays and field activities.
3. Assist the participants to develop action plans for implementing ACM.
4. Support the participants to document the process and key lessons learned for use in producing action research publications for different audiences.
1.2. Participants

A total of 15 participants (5 females and 10 males) attended the training workshop. They included staff from Makerere University, District Forestry Officers from the 3 study districts, namely: Mpi, Masaka and Rakai, staff from AUPWAE, Ministry of Water and Environment representative and representatives from non-government organisations (NGOs) from Mpi, Masaka and Rakai (See participants’ attendance list in Annex IV).

1.3. Duration

The workshop lasted for six days from 28th March to 2nd April, 2011. The 4 days were for theory; one day was used for practical exercise in the field with the community and one day for preparation of draft workshop proceedings and report.

1.4. Workshop Content

The workshop covered the following aspects (see workshop programm in Annex I for details:

- Natural Resource Management Approaches
- Introduction to Adaptive Collaborative Management
- Field work
- Reflection and learning
- Action planning

1.5. Methodology

The workshop was conducted in a participatory way using a variety of methods including: lectures, field work, brainstorming, group work, role plays, discussions, experience sharing, plenary presentations, visual aids and case studies.
2. Workshop output

Day 1: 28th March 2011

2.1. Opening Remarks by Prof. A. Y. Banana

Prof. Banana welcomed participants to Makerere university and gave a brief about the “Gender, Tenure and Community Forests in Uganda and Nicaragua” project. This project was funded by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) through the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). The project is being implemented in Uganda by Makerere University, School of Forestry, Environment and Geographical Sciences and the Association for Ugandan Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment (AUPWAE). The over-all objective of the project is to improve women’s tenure rights to forests through their increased participation in community forest user groups with regard both to decision making and livelihood benefit sharing. This is in line with the new Uganda Forest Policy and the recent governance reforms in the forest sector that encourage participation of local communities in forest management.
In Uganda, the project is being implemented in the districts of Masaka, Mpigi and Rakai. Mukono and Wakiso have been selected to be the control districts. The following are research questions guiding the study:

1. To what extent is gender mainstreamed in Uganda’s forestry policies, laws, programmes and projects?
2. To what extent are women involved in decision making, agenda definition and benefit sharing at multiple levels of governance, from local to district scales?
3. What are the main impediments to women’s greater participation?
4. Do governments and external actors such as NGOs support women’s participation in community forest management? In what ways? What are the outcomes?
5. What kinds of governance arrangements, processes and structures can be designed to encourage the inclusion of women in community forestry?

Prof. Banana informed participants that women in Uganda are the most disadvantaged in terms of land ownership and household income. In addition, women rarely participate in decision making in the forest sector. Enabling policies and laws to enhance women participation in forest management exist but are not implemented. In conclusion, Prof. Banana told participants that the use of ACM approaches in the management of the forestry resources in Uganda is one of the strategies that may enhance participation of women in the sector.
2.2. Opening Speech by Guest of Honor, Mr. Oluka who represented the Commissioner of Forestry Sector Support Department (FSSD)

Mr. Oluka apologized that the Commissioner was not able to come and open the workshop. She had another Government assignment in Jinja. Mr. Oluka informed participants that the National Forestry Policy (NFP) of 2001 recognizes gender (women and youth). He noted that men deal in timber for cash while women mainly deal in subsistence products like food products, collection of herbs and arts and crafts materials which yield less income compared to timber. The Commissioner outlined strategies in the NFP. He informed participants that the policy is very gender sensitive and encourage women participation in forest management. She gave an example of the Farm Income Enhancement and Forestry Conservation (FIEFOC) project that is managed by the Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD). In this project, 40% of participants are supposed to be women. At present, less that 10% of the participants are female. The commissioner outlined the obstacles that hinder the participation of women in forest projects. The Commissioner concluded by saying that good gender sensitive policies and strategies are in place but what is lacking is implementation. Efforts should be made to over come the obstacles that prevent women participation in forest management activities. He then declared the workshop open.
2.3. Setting the stage for the workshop by the Facilitator

Through self introductions, it was revealed that most participants had prior knowledge about participatory approaches. Most participants (87%) ranked their level of knowledge of participatory approaches from 3 to 5, as shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.1. Workshop overview

The consultant gave an overview of the workshop programme. She summarised what the workshop was going to cover in the six days as shown in Annex I (for the detailed workshop programme, see Annex VI).

![Dr. Tendayi Mutimukuru-Maravanyika Facilitating the workshop](image)

**Figure 3: Dr. Tendayi Mutimukuru-Maravanyika Facilitating the workshop**

2.3.2. Participants Expectations

The following is a summary of the participants’ expectations

1. Experience sharing
2. Increased Stakeholders participation in forest management
3. Increased Knowledge on ACM/Forestry
4. How to up scale ACM to other areas of the country.
2.3.3. Workshop objectives, Road map/workshop process

The facilitator pointed out the objectives and aims of the workshop (as indicated in section 1.1 above).

In order to facilitate the smooth running of the training workshop, participants agreed on rules of the workshop that participants were expected to abide to. The participants also set up committees responsible for the welfare, documentation and feed back.

2.4. Background to ACM

2.4.1. Natural Resource Management Approaches

Top-Down Management Approaches
In the last century, Westerners had an interest in preserving the wilderness of the African environments. Colonialists looked at Africa as an Eden (the biblical Eden). Early colonial forest policies emphasized preservation/protection rather than management of natural resources; leading to reservation of large tracks of land for national parks and state forests. Local communities were perceived as ignorant and irresponsible and their access to the natural resources were restricted.

Conservation measures and management was top-down using command and control strategies. Local communities did not participate in decision making. This often led to development of conflicts such as illegal harvesting of forest resources. Due to limited financial and human resources, governments were not able to protect the forest reserves and national parks adequately. This led to over-harvesting, increased encroachment and eventually to resource degradation. Conservation and natural resource managers were forced to look for alternative management strategies, and participatory approaches began to surface in conservation debates.

Participatory Approaches (Bottom – Up approaches)

These approaches:
1. Aim at incorporating views of the local communities in conservation projects
2. Emphasize community participation in the management and protection of forest resources.
3. Stress the use of local knowledge in natural resource management
4. Empower communities on utilization of forest resources.

Proponents of these approaches believe that communities are heterogeneous in terms of strategies and utilization of resources; and that it is only when local actors are
involved in decision making, that proper conservation of natural resources can be effected.

**Recent criticism of Participatory Approaches**
Opponents of participatory approaches point out that these approaches:

1. Fail to incorporate lessons learnt during the implementation of the project as an integral part of resource management process.
2. Are based on wrong assumptions.
3. Create a dependency syndrome in the communities.
4. Idealize Indigenous knowledge while scientific knowledge is down-graded,
5. Fail to devolve real decision making power to the local communities
6. Over emphasizes the role of local cultures in natural resources management

### 2.4.2. Natural Resource Management in Uganda

The reform in the forestry sector started in 1997 and led to a new Forest Policy, 2001, the National Forestry Policy (NFP) of 2002 and the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act (NFTPA) of 2003. These government instruments decentralized and / or devolved management of forestry activities. The mandate for management of Central Forest Reserves (CFRs) was vested to the National Forest Authority (NFA) which was formed to replace the dissolved Forest Department in 2004. NFA manages 15% of the forest estate in Uganda. The management of National Parks and Wildlife reserves was vested to Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) which takes care of another 15% of Uganda’s forest estate. The mandate of managing local forest reserves, forests on private and public land outside the protected area network and trees on farm was vested with the District Forestry Services (DFS). This accounts for 70% of the forest area in Uganda. The Key actors in the DFS include Local Government Councils, the District Forestry Departments, Service providers and farmers themselves. The forestry sub-sector reform process recognized the role of other actors in forestry development. The actors include central and local government agencies, private investors, NGOs and local communities.

The National Forest Policy (2001) provides directions for sustainable management of the forestry sub-sector in Uganda. The integration of participatory approaches in Natural Resource Management was initiated 10 years ago. Communities can participate in forest management under Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) arrangements.

Recent studies however show that CFM has not been very successful. Degradation of forest resources have continued even after these governance reforms. It is against this background and conviction that new management strategies are being developed. For example, CIFOR initiated ACM approach to improve the outcome of Participatory approaches.
2.5. Introduction to Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM)

The facilitator asked the participants what they understood ACM to be. The following were their responses:

- Stakeholders agree on what to do jointly
- Stakeholders adjust management strategies and activities based lessons learnt and outcomes of the previous activities
- It is a coping management strategy

The Facilitator informed participants that ACM is built on:

1. Collaboration and learning,
2. A value-adding approach whereby individuals/ groups who use or manage a resource, agree through a process of participatory action research (PAR) to act together and draw up management plans for their resources.
3. Focuses on skills/behavior of people
4. Central to ACM is PAR (participatory Action Research)
5. Characterized by deliberate efforts by groups to communicate negotiate and seek opportunities to learn together and adapt management practices
6. Focuses on processes

2.5.1. What is Participatory Action Research?

The Facilitator informed participants that Participatory action research (PAR) involves learning by doing. A group identifies a problem, takes action to resolve it, monitors the outcomes, evaluates the outcome, reflects and learns from the activity. Change actions are based on peoples thinking. PAR is ideal for complex situations – difficult to predict cause and affect relationships.

2.5.2. Assumptions underlying ACM

1. Complexity and uncertainty is inherent in Natural Resource Management (NRM). Factors and circumstances affecting NRM are: geographical, ecological, social, political, economic, institutional and random factors /surprises for instance earthquakes and diseases.
2. Learning by doing is the only effective way for addressing complexity and uncertainty.
3. Forest dependent people have capacity to act, because they have invaluable knowledge about their systems – hence it is important for them to also participate in resource management
4. Communities have important information about the status of their forest resources, hence the need for that information to be captured.

5. Resource management efforts that ignore gender equality are doomed to fail.

6. Without a basis for making joint decisions and agreements by all stakeholders in NRM, efforts invested in NRM are likely to fail.

7. Social capital is a precursor to collective action and it should be enhanced.

2.5.3. ACM Principles

1. Principle 1: Collaboration amongst stakeholders in learning and action. The role of ACM facilitators is to take stakeholders /communities through a process that will enable them to come out of poverty whilst sustainably managing the forests.

2. Principle 2: Management interventions are consciously designed after lesions learnt from prior activities.

3. Principle 3: Learning is effectively translated into adjustment of strategies and management inventions.

2.5.4. How does ACM address criticisms of participatory approaches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>How ACM addresses it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged assumptions on conservation – paying lip service to community needs</td>
<td>ACM aims to seriously enhance both status of natural resources and human well being. Local people through visioning exercises, determine the management process and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to incorporate learning as an integral part of resource management</td>
<td>Social learning is a key element in ACM and is enhanced through PAR and collaborative monitoring processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to devolve decision making power to local communities</td>
<td>In ACM, effort is made to ensure that all stakeholders (including marginalized groups such as women) participate in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency syndrome resulting in collapse after outsiders withdraw</td>
<td>ACM deliberately aim to break dependency syndrome through various ways (e.g.) empowerment training. Also local stakeholders own the process as they would have effectively participated in decision making at all stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous knowledge is idealized and western knowledge down-graded</td>
<td>Both forms of knowledge are taken as crucial and feed into decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Institutions romanticized</td>
<td>ACM deliberately aim to transform existing institutions so that they become effective. E.g. ACM, through capacity building on leadership results in downwardly accountable, democratic and transparent resource management institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.5. Processes /Tools necessary for successful and sustainable ACM process

The following are necessary for sustainable implementation of ACM:

1. Facilitation
2. Documentation (process and content)
3. Conflict resolution
4. Effective supportive institutions
5. Assertive and not passive communities - Empowerment training crucial for passive communities.

ACM Steps
The following are the essential steps necessary for implementation of ACM:

1. Team and partnership building
2. Negotiating entry into the community
3. Community mobilisation
4. Understanding the local context and starting points
5. Identifying local priorities – preparing the stage of PAR
6. Conducting PAR with resource users
   a. Participatory action planning
   b. Implementation of action plans in an experimental way
   c. Collaborative monitoring and reflection
   d. Joint learning and joint decision making to improve the next actions
   e. Joint action for stakeholders - influencing forest policy to support participatory resource management

Envisioned immediate impacts
1. Improvements in policy making processes through increased number of avenues for information flow from local level to the policy process level.
2. Improvements in local governance
3. Improved collaborative and negotiation skills
4. Improved adaptive capacity for stakeholders:

Envisioned long term impacts
1. Empowerment & decision making: marginalised forest actors have a greater ability to act on their interests; forest stakeholders are enabled to think more critically and longer term regarding forest management
2. Linking forest and human well-being: Better managed forests for both local people's well-being and conservation interests; livelihoods and livelihood strategies improve.

2.5.6. What is the Difference between ACM and Collaborative Forest Management

The difference between ACM and Collaborative Forest Management are shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Difference between ACM and Collaborative Forest Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Forestry Management</th>
<th>Adaptive Collaborative Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rigid – have to follow rules/ government laws, policies and regulations – stick to agreement</td>
<td>• Flexible – allows learning and adjustment where necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only works with communities adjacent to forests</td>
<td>• Embraces all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restricted to Forests</td>
<td>• Broader – principles apply not only to Forestry but even other NRs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided by policy and legislation- no thinking outside the box</td>
<td>• Guided by innovation, learning – allows for experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less participatory – people don’t look for new things</td>
<td>• More participatory and feed into policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low resource mobilization due to fewer stakeholders</td>
<td>• High degree of resource mobilization as it involves a number of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited negotiation. Once agreement is reached and signed no more negotiation</td>
<td>• A lot of facilitation and negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process is very long before signing agreement</td>
<td>• ACM process seems to be even longer than CFM process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited use of researched data</td>
<td>• Decisions made based on empirical research carried out during implementation of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.7. Issues raised by participants about limitation of implementing ACM in Uganda

Table 4 shows some issues raised by participants about ACM implementation limitations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can land tenure system be resolved to enable women participate in forestry management?</td>
<td>Parliament in Uganda is addressing this issue in the new land policy that will soon be enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the ACM processes be up scaled to cover whole country?</td>
<td>The assumption is that once the process becomes successful and all stakeholders get tangible benefits to communities, other communities and districts will demand for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the probability that ACM is a better approach than CFM?</td>
<td>a) There are lessons that we have learnt from CFM and that we should build on these as we implement ACM. For example, lack of trust, transparency, limited benefit sharing and limited involvement of all stakeholders in the process led to poor outcome of the CFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) ACM goes beyond forests; it includes all Natural Resources such as wetlands – on which people depend on for food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Due to culture which inhibits women from inheriting land, rural women need to be empowered through provision of information and technologies that can enable them get incomes and be able to acquire their own land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.8. ACM Case Study - Mafungautsi State Forest

The facilitator gave an example of Mafungautsi State Forest in the Miombo Woodlands where she was actively involved in implementing ACM. This is an area that is richly endowed with timber, broom grass and honey among others. It is the third largest indigenous forest covering in Zimbabwe covering an area of 82,000 hectares. There are several forest adjacent communities who depend on this forest for their livelihoods. The forest is also a watershed serving four major rivers.

In 1954-1993, Mafungautsi State Forest was solely managed by the Forest Commission. In 1994 a pilot resource sharing project (RSP) was created so that communities could also participate in the management of the forest. However, the RSP failed to produce positive results. The resource continued to degrade and there was numerous of the conflicts between the forest authorities and communities. This called for a change in the management strategy. ACM approaches were introduced in 1999 to ensure sustainable use of the resources.

Steps undertaken to establish ACM in Mafungautsi State Forest

The following steps were undertaken:

1. Entry to the communities was negotiated
2. Stakeholders were identified and exiting conflicts resolved,
3. Capacity building of participating communities in leadership skills, group formation and negotiation skills.
4. Situation analysis and identification of obstacles
5. Visioning for the future

Outcomes realized after three years of implementation:

1. Increased transparency and accountability between the different stakeholders
2. Better product harvesting methods introduced to enhance regeneration of the required grasses for making brooms.
3. Adding value to the brooms (improvement in design of the brooms) to attract better prices
4. Incentives were put in place to encourage women participation. For example, women were encouraged to come to work with their children because lack of baby care facilities in the village was a major obstacle preventing women from participating in forest activities

Failures:

1. ACM ignored the existing unequal distribution of resources within the communities.
2. The project did not address the wider needs of the community

4. The communities were not able to continue with the ACM process after the withdraw of the project facilitators

**Day 2: 29<sup>th</sup> March 2011**

On the second day of the workshop, the challenges of using the ACM approach and processes/ tool necessary for ACM implementation (facilitation, conflict resolution, process documentation, putting in place effective Institutions and empowerment training) were discussed. These are discussed separately below.

**2.5.9. Challenges of using the ACM approach**

Participants were divided into four groups to discuss the challenges that may arise while implementing ACM in Uganda. The following is the summary of the outcome of the group work:

- Free riders – people who discourage others to participate but then join the group after the project has produced positive results.
- Lack of political goodwill to protect the forests
- Political interference in management
- The communities may not be able to make quick decisions under ACM because of the wide consultation with stakeholders
- It is difficult to generate common understanding of the issues at hand
- The process may be expensive in terms of human and financial resources and therefore difficult to sustain
- It is difficult to keep all institutions and stakeholders in the forest sector actively involved for a long time
- Lack of alternative sources of income may force communities to illegally harvest forest resources
- Conflict of interests among the numerous stakeholders may derail the ACM process
- Special interest groups (women, youth, vulnerable groups) may be marginalized in the decision making process
- Long negotiation process may lead to some stakeholders withdrawing their participation in the process

Participants were again divided into four groups to discuss how the above challenges could be over come. The summary of the outcome of the group work are presented in table 5.
**Table 5: Proposed strategies for overcoming challenges of implementing ACM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Suggested solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to generate a common understanding in the community</td>
<td>Engage all stakeholders in developing a vision for the forest in question, each stakeholder develops their own vision for a given time period e.g. for five years and then together develop a joint vision which caters for the interests of all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Slow decision making                                                     | • Not all the members may be able to participate in the decision making. It is important to work with communities and stakeholders representatives.  
  • The representatives may then provide feedback to all parties involved. |
| Sustainability of funding                                                | All stakeholders (Central government, District local government -DLGs, NGOs, CBOs, private sector, communities) should participate in resource mobilization. |
| How to influence peoples’ attitudes towards ACM.                         | • Establish demos/model communities to show successful application of ACM.  
  • Network with communities that have successfully implemented ACM e.g. the VI-agroforestry strategy in Masaka  
  • ACM should target at improving both the local livelihoods and the health of the natural resource(s) |
| Poverty                                                                  | • Add value to the products harvested to obtain better prices  
  • Improve on the marketing skills of farmer  
  • Encourage co-operative marketing of products to improve on bargaining power. For example, in Masaka and Rakai farmers are collectively marketing bananas to overseas markets. |
| Political interference in management                                     | • It is important to also involve politicians in ACM, not as managers but as participants. For instance, a project similar to FIEFOC did not take off until it was changed to capture the interests of local and national politicians.  
  • Involvement of local politicians and leaders makes it easy to enforce bye-laws developed by the community relating to the management of the forest resources. |
| How to keep institutions and individuals constantly involved in ACM      | • It is important to institutionalize ACM at the local and national levels so that it becomes an official government program.  
  • Introduce ACM in the training institutions  
  • The communities should own the process |

**Workshop Action Points**

• Recommend to CIFOR for long-term funding.

Challenges: 9 sites are too many with limited funds
2.5.10. Processes/ tools necessary for ACM

Facilitation
The topics discussed under facilitation included: definition of facilitation; facilitation steps; and processes and tools for facilitation.

The participants understood facilitation as:
1. Enabling something to happen
2. Guiding a discussion or process
3. Supporting, guiding, educating
4. Providing human, financial, or technical support to the community to enable it to come up with an agreed action
5. It is the community and not the facilitator or an outsider who own the process.

The facilitator also presented the core principles of facilitation as well as the qualities of a good facilitator (see the presentation on facilitation). A question was asked on what political incorrectness was: by being politically incorrect, one says something because he believes in it – not because this is what he/she thinks people wants to hear. Being politically correct means saying something because this is what you think people want to hear.

Conflict Management
Participants shared their experiences in resolving conflicts. The following key issues were found to be the main causes of conflict in natural resources management:
1. Lack of clear roles by stakeholders
2. Lack of clear conflict resolution procedures and structures to follow
3. Unequal benefit sharing
4. Mistrust within and between stakeholders

The participants reported that there are numerous conflicts between communities and the various bodies managing forest resources in the country. They gave an example of the conflict between NFA and the communities around Sango Bay forest reserve caused by land shortage and lack of transparency in allocating forest land to private tree farmers.

The facilitator made a presentation on conflict resolution and the various methods for resolving conflicts. The major methods for resolving conflict included:
1. Suppressing /avoiding the conflict
2. Intensifying conflict until one wins
3. Having principled negotiation between the aggrieved parties
4. Mediation with a neutral person but one who has good standing in the community
5. Litigation – use of legal system

Process Documentation
The facilitator stressed that process documentation was very important in the implementation of ACM. It helps to track the decisions made, what have done and the key outcomes. There is a Process Documentation Guide that can be followed for record keeping. It is important for the ACM facilitators to meet and reflect together after each field activity and document the lessons learnt and plan for the next activities. Facilitators should encourage communities to document and keep records of their own so that they can also keep track of their decisions and lessons learned from the activities they are implementing. It is therefore important for the communities to identify someone who can document the discussions and activities carried out by the communities.

2.6. NRM Institutions

The facilitator made a presentation on NRM institutions. She said that no single definition exists for the term institution – some use it to refer to rules and regulations, whilst others use it to refer to NRM organisations. Institutions, both as organisation and rules were said to be important in NRM. Examples of NRM organizations are the environmental committees – it is important that these be representative and downwardly accounting and transparent if they are to help resources to be managed sustainably. She also emphasized that rules and regulations to support resource management should be put in place and the means for enforcing them established. It was emphasized that for rules to work, they must:

- be enforced at minimal cost to the community
- come from the grassroots/communities to be readily respected by communities
- be recognized by upper levels of governance

Day 3: 30th March 2011

On the third day, the following topics were covered:

- Steps involved in implementing ACM
- Preparation for the field
2.7. Steps involved in implementing ACM

2.7.1. Getting Started

a) Team and partnership building
Team and partnership building are essential to initiating change, as they set stronger foundations for all activities that follow. The basic objectives and requirements for team and partnership building are similar. However, there is a distinction between building a team and building a partnership.

i. ACM Team building
Who should be on the ACM facilitation team? It was suggested that the ACM Team should be made up of researchers and development practitioners. The ACM team is mutually responsible for the implementation of the PAR process and ultimately accountable for the outcomes and success of the project. The team composition should reflect the aim of the project. There should be a balance between development practitioners and researchers with teamwork abilities. Team members should have both facilitation and analytical skills. It was agreed that the following persons will form the Ugandan ACM team:
1. Members from AUPWAE include: Concepta Mukasa, Tibazalika Alice and Harriet Nabirye Muloki
2. Members from Makerere University are: Prof. Abwoli Banana and Mr. Mohammed Bukenya
3. Three Community Development Officers (1 person from each study district)

ii. ACM Partnership building
The facilitator explained that a partnership was an explicit agreement, whether written or not, that the ACM team establishes with an individual, group or organization who have a role to play in the implementation of the project.

The facilitator stressed that partnership building is a continuous process. New partners may join the change process while others drop out in case their interest in the project changes.

b) Building the PAR Team and Partnerships
It is important for the team leader to organize meetings and workshops with the PAR team and partners to:
1. develop a common understanding,
2. to ensure that people are at the same level of understanding of ACM,
3. explore differences in work style,
4. explain the importance of working as a team,
5. discuss anticipated challenges and approaches for dealing with challenges, and
6. agree on roles and responsibilities for team members / partners.

The facilitator also emphasised the need for regular feedback and reflection meetings to jointly evaluate progress.

**Community entry and Mobilisation**

The entry point varies from one community depending on:

1. political and cultural norms of the community
2. Previous interaction of the research team with the study community.
3. Presence or absence of relevant institutions within the area

**Participants reported that the following are the community entry points in Uganda:**

- Making contact and seeking permission from the technical and political leaders at the district and sub county levels.
- Request DFO, CDO or NGOs to identify and mobilise study communities
- Making contact and seeking permission from the village leadership and explain why you have come, the benefits and costs to the community.
- In case of private or communal forests, making contact and seek permission from the owner of the forest

While in the community, it is important to:

1. Make several reconnaissance visits to convince the local leadership, opinion leaders and the marginalized groups to participate in the ACM process
2. Understand the socio-economic condition of the community
3. Understand the condition of the forest and or other natural resources of interest present in the study area
4. Plan for community-wide and multi-stakeholder meeting

The community-wide and multi-stakeholder meeting is held to:

1. Raise people’s awareness of the project,
2. Explain the objectives of the project and expected approach,
3. Solicit their permission and interest to work with them, and clarify what their roles might be,
4. Inform them about the next steps, and solicit advice and ideas from them.
2.7.2. Understanding local context and starting points and aims

The facilitator explained that before initiating any action through the participatory action research (PAR) process, it is crucial to know where you are starting from, and where you are headed. In order to assess where we are starting from, three methodologies are normally used, namely: the context study; the diagnosis and baseline study.

a) Context studies (baseline studies)
Context studies present a picture of the whole management system making it possible to collect information on past and present state of interactions among stakeholders, actors and their environment. They involve identification and analysis of diverse parameters, including biophysical, socio-economic and political characteristics of the site or the system.

Participatory Techniques include: transect walks, resource maps, focus group discussions, discourse analysis, biophysical studies to assess the status of the resource base, socio-economic surveys, Venn diagrams that show linkages between various organizations (stakeholder analysis) and to find out who the important stakeholders are in the area; and semi structured interviews.

b) Diagnosis of local context
The participatory diagnosis enables actors to identify the superficial and underlying, direct and indirect, proximate/close and remote causes of the identified problems. A good diagnosis is not easy to carry out: often the causes and the consequences interact, making it difficult to separate the two.

The following are the issues to focus on during a diagnostic study:

- Discuss the different aspects of a natural resource management problem observed in the study area e.g. the impact of climate change on the local vegetation
- Discuss the impact (direct or indirect) of the different aspects of climate change.
- Discuss the vulnerability of the different social groups and their ability to adapt to climate change.
- How are the different groups responding?

Tools for Diagnosis of local context include: brainstorming, historical trends analysis, matrix, focus group discussions, role plays, analysis of local discourse, with feedback to the local communities and Problem tree analysis, among others.
Problem Tree Analysis

In a plenary session, two participants illustrated how the ACM team could use a problem tree together with communities to understand the problems the community face. The facilitator used a hypothetical problem in a given village where babies were seen drowning. Through brainstorming, participants’ produced the problem tree shown below.

![Problem Tree Diagram]

Figure 4: A problem tree constructed from the example of the drowning babies
Figure 5: An example of how to convert the problem tree to an objective tree
2.7.3. Conceptualizing Change

The facilitator informed participants that in order to bring about change, you need to:

- Visualize the desired future.
- Identify the criteria and indicators that help to operationalize the vision.
- Conduct a baseline survey to assess the current state of both the resource and the socio-economic status of the community

Visioning

The following are the steps taken to formulate a common vision for the community:

1. Divide the community into groups (according to gender or vulnerability).
2. Ask the groups to carry out a diagnosis of local context using the various tools
3. Visualize the desired future situations for each group.
4. The groups then work together to agree on a vision for the whole community
5. Develop indicators and develop strategies that can be used to achieve the vision
6. Carry out action planning.

2.8. Planning for the Field Visit

In preparation for field work, Professor Banana gave a brief background about the site for the field work. He said that the community where the field study is to be conducted is called Mbazzi and use Butto/Buvuma and Lwamunda government and Namungo’s private forest. The government forest reserves have been severely degraded and have been leased to private tree growers for establishment of pine and eucalyptus plantations. Individual households are also engaged in woodlot establishment.

Prof. Banana informed participants that the forests in this area were in a good condition 15 years ago. The faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Makerere University piloted a collaborative forest management (CFM) approach in this area ten years ago. There were a few sub-counties on board which were in the vicinity of these forest reserves. Makerere University introduced several incentive schemes such as rearing of improved goats and eco-tourism. At that time, CFM was not yet institutionalized and therefore, there was no supporting law.

The forests in the area were degraded during 2000-2004, a period when the forest department was undergoing restructuring and governance reforms. This period was characterised be weak government institutions which could not enforce forest laws.
After the brief, participants developed a programme for the field day and agreed on the activities to be conducted (see box 1 below).

**Box 1: Activities for the field work**

**STEP I:**
**Objective:** What are you trying to achieve overall and during this particular step and process?
Learn how to facilitate a diagnosis and visioning exercise for stakeholders.

**Approach:** What will you do to achieve the objective? What steps will you take and why? Who will be involved at each step and why?

**Diagnosis**
1. Introductions
2. In December some people said that the key problems in the area were a,b,c,d.
3. Are these all the problems or there are others. If no what other problems are there?
4. Which one is the most pressing problem (decide which tool to use to identify the most pressing problem)
5. Start by building the problem tree.

**Visioning**
Assuming all the problems have been identified in a combined problem tree are solved, what do you see happening to your community, the forest resources, to your household in the coming 5 years.

Aspects of monitoring: What is going to be observed, monitored and documented as you go?
- Group dynamics and participation
- Listening skills
- Is the discussion focused or not
- Time
- Eye contacts
- Body language
- Process
- The findings/products of the discussion.

**STEP II**
**Approach:** What did actually do to achieve the objective? Was the approach modified in practice? If so, how and why?

**Successes:** What went well, and why?

**Challenges:** What did not go well? What were the stumbling blocks and why did they occur?

**Findings:** What did you learn from the activity you carried out?

**Resolutions:** What decisions were taken by participants?

**Lessons:** What lessons or insights can you derive from these experiences to share with others trying to address similar challenges? What were you surprised to find out from the participants? What were you surprised to find out about the approach itself?

**STEP III**
**Recommendations:** What will you do the same and differently next time? What can be done to overcome the challenges encountered during the implementation?
Day 4: 31st March 2011

The participants were then divided into three groups for field work; to have focused group discussion with the youth, women and men. Each participant was assigned a role to play during the field work.

2.9. Fieldwork in Mbazzi Village Mpigi District

The meeting started at 11.00 am with an opening prayer and a welcome note from the Local Council Leader of the area. He introduced us to the community and acknowledged our presence in the community in December 2010. He noted that in addition to the work that we had left on the ground 3 months ago; other conservation projects had been initiated in the area. He noted an example of a nature conservation project in Muduuma Parish which is affiliated to the Catholic Church.

Mrs. Concepta Mukasa introduced the team as researchers from Makerere University, and the purpose of the visit was to learn and test new approaches to forest management. She also thanked the community members for making an effort to attend the meeting in spite of the busy planting season.

Figure 6: Introduction by Mrs. Concepta Mukasa prior to group discussions
After self introductions from the community members (see Annex V) and the ACM participants, Prof. Banana further expanded on the purpose of our visit. He thanked members of the community for the good relationship that exist between the Mbazzi community and Makerere University that has existed since 1994. Prof. Banana was however concerned about the recent severe degradation of the forest resources in the area. Prof. Banana emphasized that there is a need to save forests in Mpigi district and this is why we have again chosen to work in this community to find new approaches of managing the forest resources together with communities.

2.9.1. Feedback to the community-findings from the study conducted in December of 2010

Mr. Bukenya who headed the research team in December briefly presented the research finds to the community members. He informed the community members present that:

- Resource harvesting varied according to gender. Men harvest mostly timber and charcoal for income while women harvested mushrooms, firewood and fruits for subsistence.
- Women rarely participate in the decision making in relation to tree planting.
- Women’s involvement in commercial forestry and tree planting is affected mostly by lack of land in addition to cultural taboos.
- The community has not benefited from the 5% forest ownership rights given to forest users by NFA. Instead outsiders have taken the advantage of establishing commercial woodlots.
- Unsustainable cutting of trees have led to a scarcity of firewood and timber in the area.
- Although the community initiated a CBO (known as KAKAPEA), it has not been active in nature conservation and tree planting projects. However intervention from Rotary Club of Kyenegera and Busoga Trust Fund have established projects promoting energy conservation, tree planting and initiating income generating activities in the village.

Community members briefly discussed the problems faced by the community in respect to forest resources. These included the following:

- Land shortage tenure
- Leasing of forest land by NFA to outsiders
- Encroachment on forest land for agriculture
- Poverty
- Poor working relations with the district forest authorities
- Lack of information about forest management and conservation.
2.9.2. Group work with communities

Objective: The objective of group work was to identify challenges encountered by men, women and the youth of Mbazzi community in relation to use of the natural resources in the area and develop a problem tree.

Men's Group

Figure 7: Problem Analysis - Men's group

Figure 8 shows the problem tree by men of Mbazzi.
Problem tree for Men in Mbazzi Village

Decreasing number of animals
Long Periods of Drought
Lack/shortage of Forest products

Deforestation
Corruption

Poverty

No Market for products such as maize and they sell at low prices
Shortage of Land
Laziness (e.g. by the youth)
Increase in diseases

High population growth
Indifference [They do not care]
Lack of medicines

No Extension worker
Lack of a vision for farmers by the government
High inflation and high cost of commodities – e.g. we need to sell 10kg of maize to buy 1kg of sugar
Communities highly taxed by the government

Group I: Members
- Polly
- Betty
- Herbert
- Joseph
- EUZ

Figure 8: The problem tree by men of Mbazzi
**Causes of poverty according to men**

- Inflation (money has lost value)
- Lack of markets
- Unemployment
- Diseases
- Laziness
- Increased population that has reduced land
- Poor foresight by the government.
- High tax rates.
- Ineffective government policies

**Effects of poverty**

- Deforestation
- Corruption
- Long drought periods
- Shortage of forest products

**Evaluation of the focus group discussion by men**

- Good dynamics and participation, sometimes the discussion led to heated arguments.
- Listening skills- People were listening and participative
- Discussion focus- The group got confused and lost direction when it came to identification of the main problem. The facilitator requested members to vote since no consensus was achieved.
- Time management- A lot of time was spent in trying to obtain a common vision of the problems

**General Remark**

The process was, on average, conducted well and attracted high levels of involvement from the participants.

**What went well?**

1. The facilitating team held informal interactions with the participants prior to commencement of the discussions. This helped in setting up a free and open environment for discussion of the subject matter.
2. The circular sitting arrangement was good as it allowed little obstruction of participants by other participants.
3. Eye-contact between the facilitator and the participants was very good.
4. The general level of participation was high
5. There was good use of open-ended questions to stimulate thought processes.
6. The facilitator often echoed participants’ opinions in other words to the rest of the members to ensure that what a participant said had been well understood by others.
7. The facilitator always followed up on different lines-of-thought over an issue whenever they emerged at the same time.

**What did not go well?**

1. Some participants showed minimal interest in contributing to discussions on the subject matter.
2. The discussion site was an un-even ground, with some participants sitting at higher level compared to others. This could have psychologically contributed to the less participation of some few participants in the process.
3. Directions of discussions often followed the lead established by the first few people who spoke on a topic.
4. Little effort was made by the facilitator to deliberately foster participation of the non-participating members.
5. Time keeping during discussions was poor. This could have partly been due to the lack of a well-stipulated time allocation for the discussion.

**Group II Male Youth**

*Figure 9: Problem Analysis - youth group*
Figure 10: The problem tree by male youth of Mbazzi
Lack of Income Generating Activities” was identified by the youth as the focal problem. Causes of lack of income generating activities:

- Overpopulation
- Poor organization
- Lack of capital
- Lack of electricity
- Lack of markets
- Low levels of education
- Lack of knowledge ad skills
- Small land holdings

Effects of Lack of Alternative Income sources/employment

- Food insecurity
- Unemployment
- Domestic violence
- Stealing
- Deforestation
- Diseases
- Death

What went well during the focus group discussion with the youth?

- Problem identification and articulation went well because there was free interaction

What did not go well during the focus group discussion with the youth?

- It was difficult to reach a common a consensus,
- Process was hijacked by a few opinion leaders
- Some individuals could not change their problem.
Group III Women and female youth of Mbazzi

Figure 11: Problem analysis - Women Group
Figure 12: Problem Tree for the Women and female youth

Group III: Members
- Mukasa
- Bukenya
- Concepta
- Denis

Environmental Degradation
Poor Farming methods
Lack of development
Reduced forest products e.g. herbs
Tree Diseases

Lack of awareness

Ignoring Training
Limited Self Mobilisation
Being Aloof
Unreliable extension workers
Lack of interest/ Laziness
No implementation of lessons learned
Using pair wise ranking (See Annex II), the major problems for women were ranked as shown below:

1. Ignorance/Lack of adequate knowledge about SFM
2. Drying of water sources
3. Small landholdings
4. Tree diseases and pests
5. Lack of quality tree seedlings
6. Lack of firewood
7. Tree deplete soil resources (water, nutrients)
8. Lack of permission to access reserve area

What went well during the focus group discussion with the women and female youth?

- Facilitation was well done and this generated a lot of discussions
- All members participated i.e. young and elderly women.
- Facilitator actively encouraged all participants to air out their views.
- A consensus was reached of the priority problem using pair wise ranking.

What did not go well?

- The girl youths had different problems from the mature and would have preferred to be in their own discussion group.
- When the groups are diverse, it is difficult to reach a common consensus

What the women and female youth wanted from the research team?
The women and female youth demanded:

- for trainings on alternative means of earning a livelihood
- to be trained on how they could better use their small land holdings to enhance their income
- that all stakeholders (NFA, Private Investors) should come to a round table for discussions so as to come to an understanding on how to manage the forest resources better.

The summary of the three problem trees, namely for men, male youth, women and female youth are show in Annex III.
Day 5 Programme

1. Recap of what happened in the field
2. ACM Steps continued:
   - Action planning
   - Implementation of the action plan
   - Participatory monitoring & evaluation
3. ACM Site Selection
4. Action planning by ACM team for period April to September 2011
5. Production of Workshop proceedings
6. Workshop evaluation and Closing remarks.

Recap of what happened in the field
What went well during field work?
- Community mobilization was good. The team received good reception
- Facilitation by participants was generally good
- The community and research team provided food and refreshments
- Good entry point due to previous contact with the community by Makerere University
- Good Prior preparation, planning and organization
- Community members keen to discuss with the research team

What did not go well during field work?
- The research team members did not freely interact and socialize with the community members
- Community members thought that we are teachers and we had come to teach
- It was difficult to use the problem tree

What will you do the same or differently next time? What can be done to overcome the challenges encountered during implementation?
- More time should be allocated to problem identification
- Venue selection should be given adequate consideration
  - Large enough for different groups to discuss without interference from other groups
  - Large enough to develop the problem tree
  - Consider the weather conditions
2.10. Participatory Action Research

The facilitator informed participants that there are two levels of planning.

1. Planning for action research – by the PAR team and
2. Participatory action planning with local communities and other stakeholders

Action research enables the articulation of the rationale for engaging in change processes (particularly for researchers).

**Objectives of Action Research planning for this project includes**

- To articulate the background and rationale that has hindered participation of women in NRM decision making process.
- To articulate how the ACM “case studies” will inform a broader community of practitioners working on similar issues;
- To ensure that the research team plans in detail the approach that will be used to facilitate (initiate and sustain) change.

The outcome of the action research planning is an Action Research Protocol with:

- Title
- Background and justification
- Objectives of change
- Research questions and hypotheses
- Approach to be used in facilitating change
- Information to be collected on the change process *and* on the impacts of change, and methods for its collection
- Outputs that will facilitate broader information sharing
- Expected outcomes

Participatory action planning aims to support local communities and other stakeholders to develop a concrete strategy for moving from the visioning process to actions that will enable them to achieve the vision. It includes key actions and how they are going to be carried out.
2.10.1. Participatory Action Planning Process

- Recap on the issue being discussed
- Discuss the issue or problem to be tackled
- Brief group members on the format of the action plan, which generally has the following components:
  - What (Activity);
  - How (Approach);
  - Who (Roles and Responsibilities);
  - When (Timeline);
  - With what Resources (local first, followed by external).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What Activities</th>
<th>Who will be responsible</th>
<th>What roles</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>With what resources</th>
<th>Who will monitor that activities are carried out</th>
<th>Indicators to be monitored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.11. Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring of PAR activities is the most fundamental element of managing change. In the absence of monitoring, both the “action” (reaching development or adaptation goals) and “research” (learning lessons from the change process) will suffer. The monitoring activity is carried out at two levels: participatory monitoring and evaluation, (PM&E); and project based monitoring and evaluation. There is need to monitor indicators and implementation of action plans.

**Participatory M&E**

PM&E is not just a matter of using participatory techniques within a conventional M&E setting. It is about radically rethinking who initiates and implements the process, and use of learns learnt.

**Why Participatory M&E?**

PM&E promotes self reliance in decision making and problem solving. It also offers new ways of assessing and learning from change that are more inclusive, and more in tune with the views and aspirations of those most affected.

**Developing a PM&E Plan**

Reliable data and information is required to prepare a good PM&E plan. The following are the data collection techniques often used:
• Resource maps to monitor changes
• Before and after pictures of where we are now and afterwards
• Diaries
• Venn diagrams
• Matrix scoring
• Flow diagrams

What would the facilitator do if the communities select an activity that is not in line with the project objectives or have many problems they would like to attend to?

Response: The facilitator should use his/ her own facilitation skills to guide the process. Partners who have capacity to solve other problems could be contacted.

2.12. Up-Scaling ACM

The participants agreed that ACM should:

1. Start small
2. Be demanded by communities
3. Involve key stakeholders and policy makers e.g. the Commissioner, the DFOs, the politicians / members of parliament from the beginning.
4. Involve the media.
2.13. Action Planning for the Period April to September 2011

The participants were divided into two groups; one making an action plan for Mbazzi community and the second group making the strategic action plan for up scaling ACM in Uganda. The action plans developed by the two groups are shown in table 6 and 7.

Table 7: Action Plan for Mbazzi Community April to September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>What Activities</th>
<th>Who will be Responsible</th>
<th>What Roles</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>With what resources</th>
<th>Who will monitor that activities are carried out</th>
<th>Indicators to be monitored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote participatory forest management</td>
<td>Identification of stake holders</td>
<td>DFS ACM-team NFA CDOs LCs</td>
<td>Identification Documentation</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Allowances Stationary Transport Air time Camera</td>
<td>ACM-team Community DFS</td>
<td>Number &amp; type of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of community/other resources.</td>
<td>Mobilization Document /Mobilisation Mobilization</td>
<td>DFS ACM-team NFA CDOs LCs</td>
<td>Mobilization Document /Mobilisation Mobilization</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Allowances Stationary Transport Air time</td>
<td>ACM-team Community DFS</td>
<td>Number of people mobilised Kinds of Resources mobilised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>What Activities</td>
<td>Who will be responsible</td>
<td>What roles</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>With what resources</td>
<td>Who will monitor that activities are carried out</td>
<td>Indicators to be monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up scaling of ACM from case study to national coverage</td>
<td>Identify key stakeholders</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>Organizing workshops</td>
<td>April to Sept</td>
<td>HR, leadership, advisory board, secondary information</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>Numbers of stakeholders contacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of stakeholders agreed/accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country wide consultations with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>Mobilisation</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>HR, Funds, Logistics</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>Numbers of stakeholders consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>HR, logistics, funds, workshop</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>Number of workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance of workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments were as follows:

- The time frame was so general that it is difficult to know exactly when to do what. So it is important to be more specific with time.
- It may not be possible to implement some up scaling activities because of budget and time constraint.
2.14. Workshop Evaluation

At the end of the presentations, the participants evaluated the workshop. The results are presented in the table below.

1. Improvement in level of knowledge of ACM

The Participants knowledge of ACM before and after the workshop is presented in table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>Before ACM</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of Participants.</th>
<th>After ACM training workshop</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Major Lessons/ Insights Gained

The following are the major lessons the participants gained from the workshop:

- ACM requires usage of a wide range of skills/ expertise
- Process documentation
- Need constant monitoring
- ACM is a continuous learning process
- Difficulties in finding common ground in the communities
- Do not caste plans in concrete
• ACM an improvement of CFM
• ACM as essential for NRM can be applied in desired situations
• Continuous consultations and recording proceedings
• Very resource demanding
• Listening/ Responding to feedback
• Conflict resolution and participatory monitoring tools are required
• Exposure to Adaptive CM tools
• Community participation is essential
• ACM can be applied in any field not only forestry
• Developing a participatory problem tree
• How to facilitate
• How to do process documentation for the group
• How to deal with conflicts
• How to mobilise communities
• Communities should equally participate in ACM
• Continuous process of planning, learning and action for facilitators and communities
• Visioning
• Planning Implementing ACM, participatory
• Conflict resolution
• Action plan
3. What participants liked most about the workshop

- Sharing experiences was enriching
- Active participation
- Help community know their resources
- Demonstration of some concepts using illustrations and role plays
- Acquiring facilitation skills

4. What participants did not like about the workshop

- Participants did not keep time
- Early morning rains
- Long distance to walk to lunch
- Difficulties for non-resident participants to travel to the workshop venue.
- Work was too much for a single facilitator to handle
- The inability to complete the visioning process during field work
- Limited time to grasp important information and concepts

5. The major challenges participants anticipate in applying ACM in Uganda:

- To find enough funds and time for ACM
- Having no solution to the challenges found in the community
- Difficulties in reaching consensus about a common vision by the community
- Difficulties in mobilising stakeholders
- Due to financial and human resource limitation, it may be difficult to sustain the process.
- ACM process is tedious and long and it may be difficult to sustain the interest of the various stakeholders and
- The Public may perceive ACM as another failed programme
3. Closing remarks

Mrs. Concepta Mukasa thanked the facilitator (Tendayi) for a job well done. She added that the five days have not been a waste. She hoped that when ACM implementation begins women will fully participate in the management of forest resources in Uganda.

The Dean Prof. Tweheyo thanked the participants for the well attended workshop. He hoped that ACM is a better management approach than collaborative forestry management (CFM) which has so far failed to halt environmental degradation.

Prof. Banana congratulated the participants for having completed the 5-day training in ACM successfully. He thanked the facilitator for the good work. He reported that the Commissioner was supposed to open the workshop but due to other duties she did not come in person but was ably represented by Mr. Oluka.

The Guest of honour was Mr. Kyaroki, the President of Uganda Forestry Association and member of steering committee of the Gender, Tenure and Community Forestry project thanked participants for sparing time to come and attend the training workshop.

He informed the participants that he was part of a team that started CFM in the defunct Forest department. CFM has not performed well over the time because of the limited tangible benefits that accrue to communities.

He said that the advantage of ACM over CFM is the opportunity of going back to the drawing board when things do not work and the continuous participatory research. He noted that participants had gained a lot of knowledge and skills. Though challenges are anticipated they can be solved. He urged participants to go and share this knowledge with others so that ACM can take shape. He wished everybody a safe journey and declared the workshop closed at 17:24 hours.

A representative of the participants, Mr. Amos Sebyala gave a vote of thanks to the facilitator, Dean and Guest of Honour.

The dean gave out CDs containing ACM notes to the participants, after which they were hosted to a Cocktail. During the cocktail certificates of attendance were awarded to the participants.
## Annex I: ACM workshop Programme, Uganda 28 March – 2 April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic / Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830 – 0900</td>
<td>Workshop Launch</td>
<td>E. Arinaitwe/ Birabwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants’ registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900 – 0915</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Prof. Banana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0915 – 0930</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930 – 1015</td>
<td>Official Opening of Workshop</td>
<td>Ms. R. Musoke Commissioner FSSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015 – 1030</td>
<td>Participants’ expectations</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030 – 1100</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 – 1130</td>
<td>Workshop objectives, Road Map/ workshop process</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130 – 1145</td>
<td>Workshop Rules</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145 – 1200</td>
<td>Workshop committees</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 – 1300</td>
<td><strong>Natural Resource Management Approaches</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Top-down approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bottom-up approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRM as a complex issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How resource managers can manage in the face of complexity and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unpredictability – learning by doing/ social learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 – 1400</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 – 1500</td>
<td><strong>Introduction to Adaptive Collaborative Management</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Background and history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key pillars, concepts/elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ACM differences and similarities with other participatory research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ACM case study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Common challenges in using ACM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plenary Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1600</td>
<td>ACM Case Study</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 – 1700</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break (Working Tea)</strong></td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>• Processes/tools necessary for a successful and sustainable ACM process</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830-0845</td>
<td>Recap and Welfare committees report</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845-0945</td>
<td>Process Documentation</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0945-1030</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1100</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1200</td>
<td>Putting in place effective Institutions (both organizations and rules/regulations to support resource management activities)</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment training/building the confidence for marginalized groups/passive communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>• Getting started</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Team and partnership building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Community entry and mobilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Break</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>• Understanding local context and starting points</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Context studies, diagnosis and baselines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1600</td>
<td>Conceptualizing change</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break (Working Tea)</strong></td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1730</td>
<td>Participatory Action Planning</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830-0845</td>
<td>Recap and Welfare committees report</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845-0930</td>
<td>Action Research Planning</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1030</td>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1100</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1200</td>
<td>Supporting implementation of planned actions, Participatory monitoring, evaluation and adjustment</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>• Empirical Research Inputs to PAR</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deeper analysis of the system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Break</strong></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>Impact Assessments</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other ways for enhancing joint learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brainstorming on issues for presentation during the market place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1600</td>
<td>Preparation of tool presentations by various groups</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>Tea Break (Working Tea)</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>Presentation of various participatory tools in a market place</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 – 1800</td>
<td>Agreeing on what the field visit can focus on and planning for the field visit</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800-0900</td>
<td>Traveling to the field</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-1200</td>
<td>Field work</td>
<td>Prof. Banana/ Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td>Traveling back from the field to the workshop venue</td>
<td>Prof. Banana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>Preparing process documentation reports/ presentations</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1530</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530-1630</td>
<td>Presentation and plenary discussions</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830 -0845</td>
<td>Recap and welfare committees’ reports</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845 – 1030</td>
<td>Preparation of action plans for implementing ACM</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030 – 1100</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1300</td>
<td>Presentations of action plans and plenary discussions</td>
<td>Consultant/ Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>Effecting the comments in the action plans</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1530</td>
<td>Tea break</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530-1600</td>
<td>Workshop evaluation closing remarks</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900 -1800</td>
<td>Documenting the ACM workshop Proceedings</td>
<td>ACM team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex II: Pair wise Ranking – Women’s group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ignorance 1</th>
<th>Lack of firewood 2</th>
<th>Small farm lands 3</th>
<th>Lack of tree seedlings 4</th>
<th>pests and disease of trees 5</th>
<th>lack of permission to access reserve area 6</th>
<th>drying of land by some tree species 7</th>
<th>Drying of water sources 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>Ignorance 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of firewood 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small farm lands 3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tree seedlings 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pests and disease of trees 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of permission to access reserve area 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drying of land by some tree species 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying of water sources 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex III: Summary of Problem Trees of the Three Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Main Problem identified</th>
<th>Direct Causes</th>
<th>Indirect Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No markets</td>
<td>Communities highly taxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government has no vision for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No extension workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inflation and high cost of commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage of land</td>
<td>High population growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laziness</td>
<td>Indifference. They don’t care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diseases</td>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Lack of alternative income generating activities</td>
<td>Poor leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of organization (No cooperation/ cooperatives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage of land</td>
<td>Increasing population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of markets</td>
<td>Poor Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low levels of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No training opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Few agricultural extension officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women don’t want to attend training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Laziness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Lack of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyangoma Christine</td>
<td>MTGC/ Masaka</td>
<td>0703393136</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ntina1989@yahoo.com">ntina1989@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katwesige Issa</td>
<td>MWE</td>
<td>0782432548</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Isa20781@yahoo.com">Isa20781@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Tizabalika</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>0772501333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atnakadaama@yahoo.com">atnakadaama@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukasa Joseph</td>
<td>POMAT (MPIII)</td>
<td>0772540935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmukasa@yahoo.com">jmukasa@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebyala Amos</td>
<td>DFS – Musaka</td>
<td>0772543273</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sebyalamos@yahoo.co.uk">Sebyalamos@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyinza Herbert P.</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>0772966397</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herbuy@gmail.com">herbuy@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebungwayo Denis</td>
<td>Unetlora</td>
<td>0772431368</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sdmiiyingo@yahoo.com">sdmiiyingo@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibesigwa Mukasa Rukava</td>
<td>Rakai D &amp; G</td>
<td>0702382006,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tibesigmv@yahoo.com">tibesigmv@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0772888053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Birabwa</td>
<td>Makerere University (MUK)</td>
<td>0772633646</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bettybirabwa@yahoo.com">bettybirabwa@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bettybirabwa5@gmail.com">bettybirabwa5@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Birakwate</td>
<td>MPIGILG</td>
<td>0772426894</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pollybirakwate@yahoo.com">pollybirakwate@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Bukenya</td>
<td>MUK</td>
<td>0772893233</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bukenya@forestmak.ac.ug">bukenya@forestmak.ac.ug</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Muloki</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>0772601623</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnabirye@yahoo.co.uk">mnabirye@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepta Mukasa</td>
<td>AUPWAE</td>
<td>0772407446</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmconcepta@yahoo.com">mmconcepta@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euzobia</td>
<td>Makerere University</td>
<td>0772338977</td>
<td><a href="mailto:euzobia@yahoo.co.uk">euzobia@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arinaitwe</td>
<td>School of forestry Makerere University</td>
<td>0772421370</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abwoli.banana@gmail.com">abwoli.banana@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Abwooli Banana</td>
<td>School of forestry Makerere University</td>
<td>+263</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tendayim07@yahoo.co.uk">tendayim07@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>776360974</td>
<td>or <a href="mailto:tendayim09@gmail.com">tendayim09@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendayi Mutimukuru-Maravanyika</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petride Mudooza</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>0752692590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex V: Mbazzi Community Residents who participated in ACM Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Florence Busulwa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>W. Ssengendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maria Lukwago</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Namusoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hamidu Ssuli</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>J. Kimbekka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Ssali</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Godfrey Salongo Ssali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kibuyimbwu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kanakulya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Michael Ssettaba</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>T. Nakalembe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Andrew Musitwa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kakwanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Claudio Butuki</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Isma Mugweri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Florence Musitwa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nantambi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Annet Nyanzi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Francis Kinalwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tina Nakisekka</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mutebi Eid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Herisa Babirye</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Frederick Kasirye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>John Muhengyeli</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ferista Nanvubya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fred Kiyingi</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Milly Namawejje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sauda Nanteza</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Topista Nakalembe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fatuma Nakyeyune</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Margaret Nakyazze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eliazaali Sewakiryanga</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Jane Nanfemu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Besi Mukunguzi</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Zaltuna nakigozi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Abdul Sseguija</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Topista Mbuliro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B. Nakanwagi</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Salongo Sempa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nabaggala</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>D. Namutende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Juliet Namuleme</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Leo Lwebuza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jeo Mutebi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Gorreti Nafuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jeo Nakamba</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Alice Nampeera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Justine Mbatudde</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>May Nanyombi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Joan Nambi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>