SCI-SLM Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Uganda (8-14 April 2011)

William Critchley

1. Introduction
This joint BTO report summarises the main issues arising during the mission to Kenya (for WHaTeR) and Uganda (for SCI-SLM) by William Critchley (WC). The mission also covered a reconnaissance trip for filming SLM/ Climate Smart Agriculture technologies, and preparation of fieldwork for four VU students (two working on SCI-SLM, one on WHaTeR, and another on value chains in traditional foods). This was a multi-purpose mission and a number of the elements were inter-related: thus costs of travel and accommodation/ subsistence were shared. WC is especially grateful to Maimbu Malesu and Alex Odour (SEARNET) and Anthony Chemweno (Ministry of Agriculture) in Kenya; Stephen Muwaya (SCI-SLM) and Stella Lutalo (PELUM) in Uganda who went out of their way to make this a very productive and fruitful mission.

2. Objectives
The aims of this mission were to:
- Visit one of the four selected communities (Banyakabungo) with the national coordinator, Stephen Muwaya
- Establish two CIS-VU students (Olaf Piers and Eva van der Ven) in the field – initially at Banyakabungo
- Review the characterisation process and next implementation steps
- Follow-up the opening of a SCI-SLM account to trigger the release of GEF funds
- Help prepare for next year's 3rd Annual SCI-SLM Steering Committee meeting

3. Activities

WC met up with Stephen Muwaya of MAAIF the new national SCI-SLM coordinator. SM is also Uganda's focal point for the UNCCD. While SM has been in place now for nearly 6 months, his right hand man, Tonny Kisambwe has left the team to undertake an MSc in Japan. Stephen Muwaya has an assistant – namely Angela Namyenya – who will be spending around half of her time on the Uganda country SCI-SLM project. Unfortunately WC was not able to meet her during this mission. However another key person, the District Agricultural Officer Ntungamo, Moses Sabiiti, was present and WC had the chance to meet him (with SM) both in the field and also in Kampala. Mose Sabiiti is key to the programme as two of the four selected SCI-SLM communities (RECPA and the Banyakabungo Cooperative Society) fall within his district.

Since WC's last visit to Uganda (in November/ December 2010: see TAG report 2010-4) there have been two main developments – other than the changes in personnel noted above. The first is that the Bandera 2000 (Izhanido?) Association from Kamuli District had been taken on a study tour recently which was closely tailored to their current enterprise of fruit growing and processing. The second development (that actually took place on the day that WC left Uganda) was the opening of the SCI-SLM bank account in Kampala, signalling that GEF funds can now begin to flow. It should be recollected that SCI-SLM Uganda has been operating for nearly five years using its own national counterpart funds.

SW and I drove to Ntungamo District with the two students, Eva van der Ven and Olaf Piers on the afternoon of Sunday 10th. After a night at the local hotel, we visited the Banyakabungo Cooperative society for the whole of Monday morning[1]. We were unable to meet the chair or vice chair of the group, but nevertheless had extensive discussions – and enjoyed a walk around the grazing land itself – with members of the association. The information that we received is summarised below in the form of an article that can be used for the SCI-SLM newsletter. Note that not all the information we received has been verified, and this piece will serve as a first, basic overview. The picture will become more clear when characterisation forms are filled in (by Moses Sabiiti with assistance from the students) and when the students themselves compete their field work: Olaf Piers is studying communications and Eva van der Ven is looking at the social organisation of the group.

Banyakabungo: communal grazing rules re-established on ex-government land

What follows here briefly describes what we saw – and were told – during the field visit, but also serves as an article that can be cut and pasted for the newsletter/ website:

The Banyakabungo cooperative society had been identified as a candidate for SCI-SLM several years ago. Its most important characteristic in terms of the project is that grazing land is being managed communally – and this is a recent development. All over Africa, ancient systems of communal land management are breaking down and individualisation – or exploitation and overgrazing – seem to be the trends. This case is an exception: could it be that lessons can be learnt by other communities about managing land as a harmonious group? It appears to qualify as a true social initiative – and possibly a technical innovation also. While the scheme began in 1997, it was only in 2003 that the association was permitted to gain title to grassland previously held by the Government. The current chair of the society, Mr Mbyreemire Richard, came up with the idea of managing it sustainably on the basis of 100 or so members taking part, each with one "stake" – that is one cow – as part of a jointly managed herd. The total area is 186 hectares: part of which has been planted to *Pinus patula* (?) trees, but the majority managed for grazing. It is not yet clear whether other animals are grazed alongside the core herd of 100 (we were told up to 400 may be present at any one time) but clearly even on this good pasture, a stocking rate of nearly one

---

[1] Note that Tonny Kisamwe and WC had visited this society in November 2010: please refer to report 2010-4

animal per hectare would be very high. The pasture is in reasonable condition – and we were assured, improving under judicious joint management. Apparently there are plans now to divide the land into four paddocks for a better system of rotational grazing. There is still much to be found out about the cooperative society, and that is one of the reasons that two Dutch students associated with the TAG-team are currently studying aspects of the initiative. We look forward to their reports on communication (Olaf Piers) and social arrangements (Eva van der Ven). In the meantime the District Agricultural Officer is completing the SCI-SLM characterisation forms so that the baseline can be drawn up. As soon as this happens, SCI-SLM methodology of monitoring and then exchange visits will commence.

Characterisation and Methodology forms

WC, together with Stephen Muwaya and the two students held a productive session looking carefully at the Characterisation forms (A, B and C) – noting the points uncovered in South Africa when WC had looked over them with Nono Shezi. The following is a summary of the points discussed in SA, reported in BTO 2011-1, and agreed during the meeting in Uganda

The forms are generally appropriate but we will need to have more experience before modifying them: the suggestion is to pool experience after further TAG visits and come up with prototypes in time for this year's steering committee meeting. Here follow a few important points regarding Form A (B and C are more straightforward, though please note Form B question I is repetition of Form A). Note that the Forms with annotations are attached as Annex Four.

- Form A: Eligibility check-list (c) the "assistance" here refers to money, advice and/or training
- Form A: Between Eligibility box and next section a descriptive summary is appropriate
- Form A: no need to fill in details in (1) Technical innovation if it's only a Social innovation: in that case there is room for the details of the SLM technology under 2 (b)
- Form A: no need to fill details in (2) Social innovation if it's only a Technical innovation

Form A: questions 1 (Technical Innovation) f (TEES test; thus "quality") and I (spread; thus "quantity"), and 2 (Social innovation) I (spread; thus "quantity") = the BASELINE situation so please take care with these, and they may require further investigation.

The baseline serves as a foundation upon which monitoring indicators can establish progress – and appropriate and "SMART" indicators are very important not just for SCI-SLM, but for the overall UNCCD process. For example simple indicators may be:

(a) how many extra hectares have been brought under sustainable management?
(b) how many more families/ communities have adopted SLM technologies?
(c) (to what extent) has the quality[2] of the SLM practices improved? and

---

[2] This may have to be done by a general assessment of the "quality" of the practice by a specialist, though should be supplemented where possible by measurements (could be soil

(d) how many new SLM practices have communities taken up in each community?

It was further noted that the Methodology form/ handout could be improved, but again we will wait until the upcoming steering committee before presenting a new version. Please note the following:
- Step 3: this should not just refer to "technical side of each community" but rather "technical/ social......"
- Step 3: this equates to Form A
- Step 4: these equate to Forms B and C

SCI-SLM Country implementation, Uganda: Next Steps
SM and WC talked about the Uganda country implementation of SCI-SLM:

- Uganda has confirmed its four focal community initiatives for this phase of the programme. These are:

  o RECPA, Ntungamo District (Tree planting and other activities)
  o Banyakabungo, Ntungamo District (Grazing land management)
  o Bandera 2000, Kamuli District (Fruit trees on the banks of the Nile)
  o NACIA, Nakasongola District (Rangeland reclamation)

- Time is now ripe to speed processes up: especially characterisation (steps 3 and 4), facilitation of each community's understanding (step 5), joint experimentation/ monitoring (step 6) and cross visits (steps 7 and 8).

- In terms of cross visits, there are two kinds:

  o First: intra-District which is basically a matter of communities visiting each other when their interests coincide. For example it is essential that RECPA and Banyakabungo visit each other (reciprocally) as they are close together and share the activities of tree planting and grazing (to a larger or lesser extent);
  o Second: inter-District visits which may take a community (based on its demand and requirements) to research stations or elsewhere, where specifically targeted learning can take place.

- It is important that an impact assessment is carried out as a result of each cross visit. A form/ exercise needs to be devised that captures basic, useful information. Obviously numbers, dates, locations, objectives of the visit should be captured - but the exercise with the visitors after the visit may include:

parameters; cover with vegetation; depth of forest floor; number of trees; yields etc) with indicators that can be followed up. Carbon measurements will be more difficult and expensive: this is import but *after* we have established these other parameters.

- What has been "learnt" by the visiting community (a ranking exercise)
- What has been "taught" by the visitors to the visited (perhaps a simple list)
- What do the visitors intend to do with the new ideas/ information (a list)

- Uganda is encouraged to build up its own page for the overall website.

- A skill-sharpening workshop for the end of May, focussing on representatives from the three Districts was agreed to be important; perhaps to be combined with a visit to the Bandera 2000 group where the students should, by that time, have relocated.

- Finally, a draft plan for the 3rd Annual SCI-SLM workshop was drawn up by SM in collaboration with WC. This is presented in Annex Five.

ANNEX One [SCI-SLM]

Characterisation Forms A,B,C <mark>*with annotations highlighted*</mark>

SCI-SLM Summary Baseline Data Form A <mark>*to be done in all cases*</mark>

Characteristion of Technical and/or Social Community Initiative/Innovation

Date: *Team members:*   *Interviewee(s):*

Name of Community/ Location…..:…………………………………………..

Composition of Community…………………………………………………..

Technical Initiative/Innovation……………………………………………….
and/or
Social Initiative/ Innovation…………………………………………………

Eligibility check-list

a. Genuine community? ……………………………………………………
b. Their own technical SLM innovation and/or social innovation?……..
c. No/ little outside assistance?..<mark>*money &/or assistance*</mark>
d. TEES and/or SRI test compliant? …………………………………….

<mark style="background-color:#00ff00">[Descriptive Summary: ....]</mark>

1. **Technical SLM innovation** <mark>*only if a technical innovation(though may be both social and technical)*</mark>

   a. Type: category and brief description………………………………………
      ………………………………………………………………………..
   b. When was it started?...
   c. What was the trigger for/ motivation behind the innovation?...................
   d. Who was the main source of the innovation?.....................................
   e. Is it: A new idea?...
             A modified tradition?...
             An adapted recommendation?..
             Other?...
   f. TEES-test (explain)
             Technically effective?..<mark>*detail if possible*</mark>
             Economically valid?..<mark>*and expand form*</mark>
             Environmentally friendly?..<mark>*as necessary*</mark>
             Socially acceptable?..<mark>*to allow comment*</mark>
   g. Extra Investments?
             Labour?...
             Cash?...
             Any outside assistance?..
   h. Benefits realised?
             Production?...
             Economic?...
             Environmental?...
             Social/ cultural?...
   i. Problems faced?...
   j. Solutions?...

k.   Area under SLM in this community initiative?...................................

l.   Spread of innovation?.. *this is baseline info*

      To how many other communities?.. *ditto*

      Method of spread?...

m.   Current links with extension/ research/ NGOs?...................................

n.   Documentation/ monitoring (dates)?...

2.   **Social innovation** *only if social innovation (though may be both social and technical)*

    a.   Type: category and brief description……………………………………

    b.   Associated SLM technology? *If it's only social innovation here is where you fill technical SLM details and you can/ should expand this section considerably*

    c.   Is the associated SLM technology an innovation?

    d.   When was the social innovation started?...

    e.   What was the trigger for/ motivation behind the social innovation?............

    f.   Who was the main source of the social innovation?...................................

    g.   Is it:

        A new social arrangement?...

        A modified tradition?..

        Other?...

    h.   SRI-test

        Sustainable?..

        Replicable?...

        Inclusive?...

    i.   Extra Investments?

        Labour?...

        Cash?..

        Any outside assistance?.. *ie other than cash*

    j.   Benefits?

        Social/ cultural?..

        (of the associated SLM measures)

        Production?...

        Economic?..

        Environmental?..

    k.   Problems faced?

    l.   Spread of initiative?

        To how many other communities? *This is baseline information*

        Method of spread?

    m.   Current links with extension/ research/ NGOs?

    n.   Documentation?

SCI-SLM Summary Baseline Data Form B <mark>*fill in for all*</mark>

Characterisation of Community

Date: *Team members:*

Name of Community/ Location…..:………………………………………..

Technical Initiative/Innovation (refer to form A)……………….……….
and/or
Social Initiative/ Innovation (refer to form A)……………………………

Details of overall community

     o. Type of organisation (village; common interest group etc)

        ………………………………………………………………………..

     p. Official status? (registered etc)

     q. Composition of community

        i. Number
        ii. Male/ female
        iii. Age structure

     r. Management structure?..

     s. When was it started?...

     t. Was someone local responsible for starting this community organisation?.....

     u. Was an outside agency responsible for starting this community organisation?...

     v. Is the community linked to other communities? If so, how?...............

     w. Benefits of the initiative to the community? <mark>*This is actually repetition of A1/ A2*</mark>

        Production?...

        Economic?..

        Environmental?..

        Social/ cultural?...

     x. What problems are faced (organisationally or technically or other)?

SCI-SLM Summary Baseline Data Form C

Characterisation of Community Members <mark>*take 1, 2, or 3 typical members: a new form for each*</mark>

Date: *Team members:*

Name of Community/ Location (refer to form A and B)………………………………..

Details of community member *representative of the community*

 y. Name……………………………………………………………………

 z. Address……………………………………………………………………

 aa. Age …………………………………………………………………..

 bb. Male/ female ……………………………………………………………

 cc. Involvement/role in the initiative?

 dd. Status in family? ....

 ee. Status in community/ relative resource ownership?
   ....

 ff. When joined the community? ....

 gg. Education level? ....

 hh. Main occupation? ....

 ii. Current benefits of the community initiative to this individual?

    Production? ....

    Economic? ....

    Land under SLM (ha)? …………………………………………..

    Other? ....

Annex Two

Proposal for 3rd SCI-SLM Annual Steering Committee Meeting: Uganda, 2011

1. Detailed discussions were held with Stephen Muwaya, SCI-SLM's national coordinator about the 3rd Annual Steering Committee meeting, which was been proposed for Uganda in 2011.

2. The suggested dates are for the end of August/ beginning of September: more precisely (with outlined programme as follows):

Mon 29 Aug: Arrival of participants in Kampala – lodging at meeting hotel

Tues 30 Aug: Steering Committee meeting in conference room of hotel (Kampala)

Wed 31 Aug: Delegation travels upcountry, with various brief stops to view sites of
                 professional interest. Lunch at Masaka; overnight Mbarara

Thurs 01 Sept: Visit to two SCI-SLM communities close to Mbarara, namely:

          a)   Rwoho – a social initiative with tree planting (and more)
          b)   Banyakabungo – a social and technical initiative with livestock

          Overnight Mbarara after wrap-up and social evening

Friday 02 Sept: Return to Kampala for overnight stay and departure
                  or direct to Entebbe for departure that afternoon/ evening

3. A number of issues were raised and discussed between Stephen Muwaya and WC: these included the number of people from Uganda who might be appropriate to participate (keeping the overall total around 20–24), an appropriate opening guest of honour, the need for participants to have internet access, the most suitable dates (please note there is little flexibility for either SM or WC), travel distances, accommodation, budget etc.

4. One key point is the suitability of the communities for an international visit. These are two of the four Ugandan key communities and they are situated close to each other. By the time of the SCtee they will both have been characterised, have carried out visits and been visited, and will have been studied by TAG-students in some detail. We hope this will provide a useful learning point for the international community.

5. The next step is for this proposal to be reviewed by Maxwell Mudhara and Mohamed Sessay for their comments and, it is hoped, approval in principle – upon which it can be budgeted and referred to the rest of the SCtee team who we hope will also be happy with the proposal.