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# WORK PROGRAM

**Number of persons attending** - 53

**Monday**

Males- 21

Females-11

**Workshop Chairpersons**

1. Ms. Margaret A. Mwebesa

**Workshop Facilitator**

1. Xavier Mugumya Nyindo -REDD+ Secretariat

**Workshop Presenters**

1. Ms. Margaret A. Mwebesa- Asst. Forestry Commissioner/National REDD+ Focal Point
2. Mr. Xavier N. Mugumya - Climate Change Coordinator/Alternate REDD+ National Focal Point- NFA
3. ElinaVaananen -UNEP-WCMC / UN-REDD Programme
4. Paulus Maukonen -UNEP-WCMC / UN-REDD Programme

**Workshop Rapporteurs**

1. Ms. Olive Kyampaire - National REDD+ Communications / Project Officer
2. BiingiAnnet
3. Mugisha Viola

**Workshop Registration and Secretarial Services**

1. BiingiAnnet

# Workshop Components

The programme included presentations from experts especially on the safeguard measures and multiple benefits of REDD+. The experts included the UNEP-WCMC, National REDD+ Alternate Focal Point. The presentations were followed by question and answer sessions; interactive discussions between participants on how to best define the multiple benefits of REDD+. The participants included the REDD+ technical members, the policy/strategy,MRV/Methodological safeguards taskforce members and members of the National REDD+ Secretariat.

#  Day One

#  Welcome & Opening Remarksto participants

In her welcoming remarks, the Assistant Commissioner, Forestry Sector Support Department/REDD+ National Focal Point, Mrs. Margaret A. Mwebesa thanked all the participants who created time to attend the workshop. She emphasized appreciation to the participants for continually responding positively to support the Uganda REDD+ process whenever called upon. She also appreciated the financial support from FCPF/World Bank. In a special way she acknowledged the presence of the experts from UNEP-WCMC all the way from UK, Ms Elina Vaananen and Mr Paulus Maukonen and also their support. She said that the workshop meeting was to advance work on Uganda’s safeguards and safeguards information on multiple benefits. The intention is that eventually the country will have good policy approaches and a set of positive incentives on REDD+. She also emphasized the key policy approaches and the objectives of the REDD+ process. She then invited the Climate Change Coordinator/Alternate National Focal point, Mr. Xavier Mugumya Nyindo, to make his presentation on the objectives of REDD+.

**Ms. Margaret A. Mwebesa**

Assistant Commissioner FSSD/REDD+ National Focal Point

# 1. Workshop Objectives and summary of the REDD+ process in Uganda

Mr. Mugumya led the session on the workshop objectives and the agenda of REDD+ process in Uganda and also gave a summary on policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

The objectives of the workshop included;

* **To share the progress made in various REDD+ work streams in Uganda, and build the capacity of participants to understand REDD+ and its additional benefits.**
* **To discuss the additional benefits that REDD+ can achieve in Uganda, and understand what types of stakeholder groups would be involved in taking this forward and what types of action could be taken to enhance these benefits.**
* **To consider the links between multiple benefits and Uganda’s safeguards and Safeguard Information System, and National REDD+ Strategy development.**
* **To understand how spatial and other analyses can support the identification of priority areas to implement REDD+ in a way in which enhances additional benefits.**

In the presentation, Mr. Mugumya emphasized one fundamental element of the REDD+ process that "REDD+ is about policy approaches and creation of positive incentives on issues relating to mitigation actions in the forest sector." These actions included activities that involve: *(a) reducing emissions from deforestation; (b) reducing emissions from forest degradation; (c) conservation of forest carbon stocks; (d) sustainable management of forests; and (e) enhancement of forest carbon stocks.* He explained that at country level, the forest sector has not been receiving the attention it deserves. However, if a country has chosen to undertake a REDD+ programme, it must deliver on four elements which are: **(1) a national strategy or action plan; (b) a national forest reference emission level and/or forest; (3); a robust and transparent National Forest Monitoring; and a system for providing information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the activities.**

**Mr. Xavier Mugumya**

**REDD+ Alternate Focal Point**

Mr. Mugumya noted that REDD+ programme is a three-phased approach as agreed to, during COP16 in Cancun, Mexico in 2009(as explained in Box 1 below). During these phases, the country will be adequately provided with financial resources as well as technical and technological support, in accordance with national circumstances and respective capabilities (Box 1).

**Box 1: Phases of the REDD+ Programme**

**Phase 1** includes “the development of national strategies or action plans, policies and measures, and capacity-building”

**Phase 2** denotes implementation of the REDD+ strategy, including any further capacity building. Phase 2 includes development and testing of the emissions measurement (or MRV) system, and could include initial payments for “results-based demonstration activities,” but is not a full pay-for-performance system.

**Phase 3** REDD+ signifies a fully implemented program with a pay-for-performance system. This includes accurate and detailed accounting of emissions reductions, with payment only for “results-based actions that should be fully measured, reported and verified.” If REDD+ is allowed as an offset, it is likely only phase 3 would allow sufficient quality to play in carbon markets.

***Source: Cancun Agreements (4/CP.16), paragraph 73***

He shared with the participants the REDD+ phase 1 components and subcomponents as shown in table 1.

**Table 1: Components and subcomponents of REDD+ Phase 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Components | Subcomponents |
| 1. Readiness Organization and Consultation | 1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements |
| 1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach |
| 2. REDD+ Strategy Preparation | 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change, Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance |
| 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options |
| 2c. Implementation Framework |
| 2d. Social and Environmental Impacts |
| 3. Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels |
| 4. Monitoring Systems for Forests and Safeguards | 4a. National Forest Monitoring System |
|  | 4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards |

**Component 1** involves putting together national management arrangements such as the necessary infrastructure, committees and task forces; it also involves wide stakeholder consultations and participation on issues pertaining to the REDD+ programme as well as outreach programmes.

**Component 2** is a broad consideration of all the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, underlying factors as well as finding solutions and converting them into options.

**Component 3** refers to the minimum requirements of the past performance and interpreting them against future performance of the REDD+ activities and then sharing them globally.

Presenting on the Forest Reference Scenario, he noted that whereas it is a standalone component, it nevertheless has extensive dependency on, and complimentary features with, other components. The outcome of the FREL/FRL exercise includes:

1. Estimation of historical data on emissions from deforestation and/or forest degradation and other relevant land uses and estimations of future emissions and removals, to produce a Uganda-specific baseline scenario of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions without additional REDD+ incentives;
2. Reviewed "national circumstances; and
3. Established reference levels.

It was noted that once the Country completes the preparation of the Forest Reference Scenario, it can submit it as a standalone. The Country must however have an idea of options, based on reviewed national circumstances.

**Component 4** relates to a National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS). Uganda is expected to have a functional and robust NFMS for the REDD+ Program. The NFMS must meet all its monitoring functions under national, regional, and international requirements and obligations, as well as meet all its Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) functions. There should therefore be supportive and strengthened institutional arrangements in place for NFMS development and for ensuring sustained continuity, robustness and functionality.

# Summary of the REDD+ process in Uganda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **R-PP Components** | **R-PP Sub-components** | **Status of implementation** |
| 1. Readiness Organization and Consultation | 1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements | Significant Progress – most of the arrangements in place (Secretariat, Committees, and M&E) |
| 1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach | Progressing well, Participatory Structures establishment began |
| 2. REDD+ Strategy Preparation | 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance | Preparations for activity implementation complete, closely linked to 3.  |
| 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options | Work commenced March 2016 |
| 2d. Social and Environmental Impacts | Preparations for activity implementation complete, work will commence this month |
| 2c. Implementation Framework | Preparations for activity implementation complete, several sub-components have began (benefit sharing, Grievance redress mechanisms, guidelines for subnational redd+) |
| **3. Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels** | Significant progress |
| 4. Monitoring Systems for Forests and Safeguards | 4a. National Forest Monitoring System | Progressing well, further development required, closely linked to 3.  |
| 4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards | Progressing well, further development required |

 **Questions, Reactions , Comments and Clarifications on REDD+ Overview**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| A participant made some remarks on the components and sub-components of REDD, which was about the REDD+ strategy and monitoring system for safeguards. He observed that focus was only made on the social and environmental impacts and asked at what level are they going to discuss the multiple benefits that pre-link the social and environmental | The social and environmental impact sub-component together with the information system for multiple benefits impact governance and safeguards, and are extremely linked. In a separate meeting we walked through the steps through which the country would complete the national safeguards and safeguards information system. Xavier highlighted that this week participants were to concentrate on a smaller component called multiple benefits. Multiple benefits are required by several components: the social and environmental impact, the implementation framework, the REDD strategy option team. Work on multiple benefits also provides relevant information for the national circumstances on the baseline. So it is not because we have ignored it is because they are so detailed that you have to take them piece by piece. This week is just on multiple benefits, we will touch on the impact on how to enhance these benefits, so other things will come in naturally. But the focus is because we want to concentrate on that one to provide the framework for other sub components also who we need to help. Xavier agreed that at a later stage he will share with participants the schedule of the roadmap so that to bring all on board. |
| Are the positive incentives that different actors play going to have a bearing on the sustainable delivery of those multiple benefits?In the monitoring framework for multiple benefits, is there going to be a component to continually study and document whether incentives remain positive among the players? | It is up to us to agree that for the last 100 years when the official forestry profession was going on in our country we have been working through a series of positive incentives and there has been change from over 75% forest cover at the beginning of the century to the current which is slightly less than 10%. During the course of this discussion and the subsequent discussions on safeguards, including for the strategy options, we will see what role positive incentives could play since the other incentives have been in existence for over a long time. The greatest intention for the climate change incentives, accompanied by policy approaches, is to see to what extent policy incentives and other approaches can be used together to deliver on the overall reduction of emissions.So the answer is yes, we should discuss and find a way in which the combination of positive incentives and other forms of incentives could be arranged. |
| What are our plans to use the outflow of this workshop in terms of informing the service providers? For instance in the event we are able to identify additional benefits, how will the company that is working on strategic options use the information that we generate from here? | Every single contractor is requiredby their contract to keep linking with the other sub-components, so that one is already included. So the Secretariat serves the contractors and links them to the stakeholders and the stakeholders want the relationship to be maintained.Our report from the workshop will be immediately available to the other teams, who will be supporting us. One of of their requirements is the deepening of the understanding of the benefits to integrate in their area of work.  |
| In your presentation you talked about designing good policy incentives for REDD, My question is, are there good laws in terms of legislation to try and reduce the emissions and deforestation that we are talking about? And how has the enforcement been of the legislation? | Yes there are very good laws in Uganda, and if they were well enforced, they would reduce deforestation and forest degradation, support conservation, promote sustainable management of forests and would even bring back some of the forests that we have lost. Now what we will be looking for in that process of delivering on the other four elements, we will be identifying the reasons why we are having consistent forest degradation and the underlying drivers that the laws have not been able to address, and how application of our laws and policies have not been creating the impact that we require. And so we invite you to remain with us in this part of the year. |

## 2.1 Introduction to the multiple benefits of REDD+ and linkages to other REDD+ processes

In her presentation, Elina commenced by thanking everyone for being so kind and for making her visit very comfortable, she gave introduction of what will be involved in the session; what do multiple benefits mean and why we are interested in them and also break into smaller groups where the participants are tasked to think about multiple benefits and what they mean for Uganda and the REDD+ process in Uganda and also think about how the benefits can be maintained or enhanced.

She acknowledged Xavier for having covered the REDD+ process and its activities. She emphasized that REDD+ is all about maintaining or enhancing carbon stocks. REDD+ countries may wish to consider the additional multiple benefits of REDD+, the things that go beyond carbon and include a wide range of other issues such as environmental benefits like biodiversity, to ecosystem services that help people maintain their livelihood and social wellbeing. She listed example multiple benefits of REDD+ as shown below

**Box 2: Multiple benefits of REDD+.**

* Biodiversity conservation
* Sustainable production of forest products
* Improved soil properties, reduce erosion, reduced nutrient leaching
* Maintain water catchments
* Maintain provision of ecosystem services
* Enhance community awareness and capacity
* Tourism and ecotourism opportunities
* Increased resilience to climate change
* Governance and policy coherence
* Increased resource efficiency
* Improved access to information
* Improved livelihoods and employment options
* Inclusivity and participation

However she mentioned that there are risks related to the REDD+ process and these include; reduced access to resources for forest users, lack of participation by local stakeholders, conflicts over land and conservation of natural systems. The Cancun safeguards, agreed by parties to the UNFCCC Conference of Parties, aim to reduce potential risks from REDD+ and also enhance potential benefits. She highlighted the approaches a country can follow to reach these safeguards. The approaches involved analyzing the benefits and risks of the measures, also helped a country to find out if its policies are in line with the Cancun safeguards.

**Comments and Reactions**

|  |
| --- |
| *Comments* |
| List is stating point for engagement but stated from “our” rather than “my” point of view |
| Needs unpacking in terms of defining category of benefit, specific benefit in each category (support to categorizing benefits) |
| The above becomes easy if we also capture the multiple benefits at different scales, including defining whose point of view |
| Need to recognize inter-temporal shifts of benefits within and across stakeholders |
| Benefits as listed are more specific to the sector of forestry, yet *cross-sectoral* benefits could be higher if understood e,g water, electricity, investor confidence, industrialization, employment generation, political security, let alone along their *value chains* |
| Common denominator to what a benefit is: *Value addition* |
| Policies exist - REDD+ provides the opportunity to implement them further (e.g. benefit-sharing guidelines restricted to tourism payments – need to go beyond). |

## 2.2 Group discussion: Review of multiple benefits identified

Members present were divided into 3 groups and were asked to review these benefits based on the questions in the box below.

**Box 3: Guiding questions for reviewing multiple benefits**

* What benefits are missing?
* How would you define the benefit?

**GROUP ONE PRESENTATION**

This group categorized the benefits into Economic, Environmental and Social. In each of the categories, the group was specific on what the benefits were, because it is the people that we engage in dialogue on the specific rather than general. They recommended keeping track of the dynamics of inter-sectoral (temporal) changes because of the power struggle. Examining the categories the group came up with, benefits were listed more specific to the forestry sector. Yet cross-sectoral benefits could be higher if well understood. The common denominator of what a category of the stakeholders short of that it is not a benefit.

Inclusion of each category of stakeholders can advance the specifics of the benefits much better than we talking. The group however aimed to make up a framework that can be built upon.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Economic | Environmental | Social/political |
| Global | -Pharmacological advancement | -Biodiversity conservation | -Regional and global conflict avoidance |
| National | -Cross sectoral benefits-Revenue to government-Cost savings  | -Erosion control-Water flow | -Research-Employment generation -Political stability |
| Sub-national | -Revenue generation-LED-Market niche e.g with endemics | -Water provision | - |
| Community | -Energy access and substitution-Medicinal -Eco-tourism-Local employment | -Flood control | -Social group formation and cohesion-social protection/safety net-Risk avoidance-Empowerment |
| Household | -Food security-Forestry enterprise e,g bee keeping | -Water-Energy | -Social protection-Risk avoidance |
| Individual | -Food security-Fodder for cattle |  | -Spiritual satisfaction |

**GROUP TWO PRESENTATION**

The group categorized the benefits according to Environmental, Economic, Cultural, Governance, and approached the question by looking at the broad categories and unpacking them.

Table 1: Environmental

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit | How would you define the benefit (Environmental) |
| 1. Biodiversity conservation
	1. Crop Improvement – reserve for plant genes
 |  |
| 1. Sustainable production of forest products
 |  |
| 1. Improved soil properties, reduced erosion, reduced nutrient leaching
 |  |
| 1. Maintain water catchments
 |  |
| 1. Maintain provision of ecosystem services (e.g. medicinal service of plants)
	1. Micro climate moderation
	2. Conservation of animal and plant species - antiquities
 |  |
| 1. Increased resilience to climate change impacts
 |  |

Table 2: Economic

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit | How would you define the benefit (Environmental) |
| 1. Biodiversity conservation
	1. Crop Improvement – reserve for plant genes
 |  |
| 1. Sustainable production of forest products
 |  |
| 1. Improved soil properties, reduced erosion, reduced nutrient leaching
 |  |
| 1. Maintain water catchments
 |  |
| 1. Maintain provision of ecosystem services (e.g. medicinal service of plants)
	1. Micro climate moderation
	2. Conservation of animal and plant species - antiquities
 |  |
| 1. Increased resilience to climate change impacts
 |  |

Table 3: Socio-cultural

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit | How would you define the benefit |
| 1. Sustainable production of forest products
	1. Sustainable traditional/ cultural values, practices – exorcising spirits, prayers
 |  |
| 1. Landscaping and demarcation
 |  |
| 1. Aesthetics/ Beauty
 |  |
| 1. Social Capital
 |  |
| 1. Safety net –Survival
 |  |
| 1. Equity
 |  |
| 1. Well being
 |  |
| 1. Empowerment
 |  |
| 1. Capability
 |  |

Table 4: **Good Governance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit | How would you define the benefit |
| 1. Participation
 |  |
| 1. Accountability
 |  |
| 1. Transparency
 |  |
| 1. Effectiveness
 |  |
| 1. Efficiency
 |  |
| 1. Equity
 |  |
| 1. Raising the profile of the sector
 |  |
| 1. Maintaining forestry in the national dialogue
 |  |
| 1. Governance and policy coherence
 |  |
| 1. Increased resource efficiency
 |  |
| 1. Improved access to information
 |  |
| 1. Inclusivity and participation
 |  |

**GROUP THREE PRESENTATION**

Group three was specific in its discussion, and acknowledged that relevant policies exist, even guidelines of benefit sharing through different policies. The group found that this provides an opportunity for implementing these policies first. The group noted the existence of benefit sharing and resource sharing arrangements but emphasized that they are restricted to tourism. As the resource envelope is limited, the REDD+ process translates into other things like building of social capital, making leaders accountable. The group saw this as an an opportunity to look through things like historical injustices, such as the Batwa who were being expelled from these forests when they were being gazetted. Therefore the process of REDD+ gives us an opportunity to think about how vulnerable groups have been impacted and also whether there is an opportunity to work better with them.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | **How would you define the benefit**  |
| Water Resources Support to Fisheries ( As part of water catchment) controlling soil erosion | Producing Agriculture and livestock  |
| Health  | Clean air, Clean water , Medicinal extracts  |
| Economic employment opportunities  | Trade in producing Economic securityFood security |
| Governance at all levels – especially at village beyond forestry | EmploymentBuilding of social capital at local levelSupport to implement of existing policies  |
| Cultural and aesthetic values  | Cultural attachment and traditional ceremonies and tourism  |
| Education and Research  | Forest and natural laboratories  |
| Pharmaceuticals  | Prunus AfricanaArtemimesia |
| Seed Bank/Gene Bank  | For future restoration  |
| Building Resilience of ecosystems  | To support corridors and connectivity; diseases, safety net |
| Addressing historical injustices  | Indigenous communities; benefit sharing; gender issues  |
| Energy  | Fuel Wood, support Hydro Power  |
|  BDS, economic employment activities  |  |

**Questions, Reactions , Comments and Clarifications on the group presentations on identifying multiple benefits**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| Group one |
| We agreed that the categories should be four.  | We included political category because we agreed that when there is employment within forestry, then the country becomes more stable hence the political category. |
| The framework provided by group one is a very good one which we can build on, because it provides a proper entry point for each category, rather than having a blanket list where you struggle to find where each entry point is.  |  |
| Looking at the framework presented by group one and looking at the international arrangement, I want to find out if there is any standard where it can be presented for example the FCPF where we can present benefits which consider different categories. With this framework presented by group one, can we package it and present as a Ugandan invention?  | There is no standard approach or template to present these kinds of benefits. The essential elements of identifying the multiple benefits of REDD+ if we proceed into REDD+ stream that exist for the strategy development is identifying what you what to achieve outside of carbon, and how will you integrate that into your strategy. So this process actually feeds into multiple work streams of REDD+. Here we are examining it from the point of view of identifying benefits and I would like to congratulate the group for jumping a step ahead to identifying who are the stakeholders, who are the beneficiaries and what does it mean to identify these benefits and enhance them. Finally, we need to consider what type of information would be used to measure success of achieving it. In Uganda we are in the process of identifying these benefits first before the National REDD+ process is completely developed. |
| Group two |
| The benefits we projected were almost inclusive of everything but what we had in mind was, are they understandable, so that is why we went ahead and tried to break them down in terms of social, economic and good governance, because some of them seem to be very broad. If benefits are not categorized, some of the issues may be missing. |  |
| You are talking about maintaining provision of ecosystem services, usually we get mixed up, I think from the beginning we need to be clear when we are talking about the products and services. I think we can add the word ecosystem services and products there to be able to accommodate discussed benefits. Because like medicinal services of plants medicine is a product but cleaning the air is a service.so we need to para-phrase that if we are to accommodate both.  |  |
| Relating to landscaping and demarcation, what examples are we talking about like boundary marking? Because we did discuss that in our group and we also noted that and we concluded that it could be a benefit but also a risk. |  |
| What was the group’s thinking in terms of governance, is REDD+ going to help showcase those aspects of good governance and then we affects the bigger governance at National or regional level, is that the kind of thinking?  | We were thinking that we want to use REDD+ to promote the things that already exist there, because governance may be there but we want to achieve good governance which is the positive part of it.Our thinking also was that these elements are going to be enhanced by using REDD+ to achieve these benefits. |
| Group three  |
| What we had originally was governance and policy, and we realized a lot has been done around policy and structures and but we still said that that is not enough, we need to go further. | Clarification from one of the group members  |
| I agree with group one framework, and I think even though there has been categorization at community level it should further reach national level  |  |

Elina called for the end of the discussions and also stated that the work produced by the three groups would be consolidated and a summary of the multiple benefits discussed is created. Xavier added that since there was general consensus that the format created by group one allows us to go deeper into the different sectors, that some reflection of group one’s work is permitted so that the other groups are able to try the same and compare the following day.

Margaret thanked everyone for their participation and called for the discussion for the review of the programme. The half day workshop was suggested by one of the participants. Paulus the Expert noted that there was an incredible amount of information being discussed and appreciated all the groups for going straight into the discussions. He suggested that if it was to be the case then he would be able to prepare sessions that give more content within a shorter discussion.

One of the participants stated that people are quite busy and therefore it would be best if three straight days are utilized and the meeting comes to an end. However Xavier interjected and stated that there is a lot to cover during the workshop and it cannot be fixed into the three days suggested. He also added that the participants can carry their work to the workshop and opportunity is given to them to return to their usual duties as the hotel conference room will be available until late in the evening. It was finally agreed that the workshop would be consist of five half days so as to give opportunity to the participants to tend to demands.

#  Day two

# 3.1 Review of the multiple benefits identified on day 1 by Paulus

The second day of the workshop started with a review of the previous day’s multiple benefits of REDD+ identified by the groups during the discussions and this was presented by Mr. Paulus Maukonen. He said a variety of new benefits were developed and added to the existing list of benefits by participants, including their definitions and descriptions of what was included within them. He used the framework designed by group one members which categorized the benefits according to their economic, environmental, social and political contributions to beneficiaries that ranged from global, national, sub-national, community and individual levels so as to compile all the benefits from different groups. He realized as they were compiling these benefits that there were some benefits that were cross cutting from political, social, environmental and economical and also among the beneficiaries. He took us through the content of the compiled benefits as shown in the table below;

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Economic | Environmental | Social | Political/governance |
| Global | -Pharmacological advancement: Animal /Plant health research – development of vaccines, genes- Prunus Africana, artemisia | -Biodiversity conservation |  | -Regional and global conflict avoidance |
| National | -Cross sectoral benefits-Revenue to government-Cost savings -Sustainable production of forest products-Food security- Export Revenue; International Networks; Foreign direct investments; Grants- Tourism and ecotourism opportunities-Increased government revenue- Increased resource efficiency- Raising the profile of the sector- Maintaining forestry in the national dialogue- Water Resources Support to Fisheries, Agriculture and livestock- Trade in producing, economic security, food security- Hydro Power | -Biodiversity conservation (Crop Improvement – reserve for plant genes)-Erosion control-Water flow-Seed Bank/Gene Bank - For future restoration-Building Resilience of ecosystems - To support corridors and connectivity; diseases, safety net | -Research-Employment generation- Increased resilience to climate change impacts- Aesthetics/ Beauty- Social Capital- Capability/ capacity- Health - Clean air, clean water, medicinal extracts-Education and Research - Forest and natural laboratories | -Political stability- Capability /capacity- Participation- Accountability- Transparency- Effectiveness & efficiency of governance- Maintaining forestry in the national dialogue- Improved access to information- Governance at all levels – especially at village beyond forestry - Employment, building of social capital at local level, support to implement of existing policies- Addressing historical injustices - Indigenous communities; benefit sharing; gender issues |
| Sub-national | -Revenue generation (Incomes)-LED-Market niche e.g with endemics- Improved livelihoods and employment options- Trade in producing, economic security, food security- Water Resources Support to Fisheries, Agriculture and livestock- Energy - Fuel Wood | -Water provision- Improved soil properties, reduced erosion, reduced nutrient leaching- Maintain water catchments- Conservation of animal and plant species (antiquities)- Micro climate moderation- Building Resilience of ecosystems - To support corridors and connectivity; diseases, safety net | - Improved livelihoods and employment options- Landscaping and demarcation- Social Capital- Equity- Capability/capacity-Education and Research - Forest and natural laboratories | - Landscaping and demarcation- Capability /capacity- Participation- Accountability- Transparency- Effectiveness & efficiency of governance- Improved access to information- Governance at all levels – especially at village beyond forestry - Employment, building of social capital at local level, support to implement of existing policies |
| Community | -Energy access and substitution-Medicinal -Eco-tourism-Local employment- Supply of biomass energy, fuel wood | -Flood control | -Social group formation and cohesion-social protection/safety net-Risk avoidance-Empowerment- Sustainable traditional/ cultural values, practices – exorcising spirits, prayers- Social Capital - Safety net –Survival - Empowerment- Capability /capacity- Participation-Addressing historical injustices - Indigenous communities; benefit sharing; gender issues | - Improved access to information- Governance at all levels – especially at village beyond forestry - Employment, building of social capital at local level, support to implement of existing policies |
| Household | -Food security (Food/ Wild fruits)-Forestry enterprise e,g bee keeping- Improved livelihoods and employment options | -Water-Energy | -Social protection-Risk avoidance- Improved livelihoods and employment options- Safety net –Survival- Empowerment- Capability /capacity |  |
| Individual | -Food security-Fodder for cattle |  | -Spiritual satisfaction- Safety net –Survival- Wellbeing- Empowerment- Capability /capacity- Health - Clean air, clean water, medicinal extracts |  |

He said there is a need to know who is responsible to maintain these services and who is benefiting from them.

**Guiding questions on the multiple benefits**

* What ideas and opinions do you have on the new designed framework? Should the framework be redesigned or the benefits regrouped?
* How should the cross-cutting benefits be structured, defined and featured within the framework?
* **Set 1: Questions, Reactions , Comments and Clarifications on Introduction to FRELS/FRLS**

| *Questions/ comments/reactions* | *Reactions/Responses/Clarifications* |
| --- | --- |
| A member appreciated the great step attained from yesterday’s work, but his concern was that it is very difficult to avoid the issue of cross-cutting benefits because there are certain commonalities between the different groups.He also suggested that they should find out the expectations of these benefits at each beneficiary level so as to bring them out more clearly.He brought out the issue of land tenure system to be considered, because the way how people benefit from these services depends on the land ownership arrangement. | Paulus explained that benefits can be assessed at different levels and from different points of view. Are you the beneficiary or the person delivering that benefit? He gave the example of governance, here the communities and individuals are the beneficiaries but the overarching political governance is made at the national level. |
| If the cross-cutting benefits are to be presented alone somewhere in the table, somehow they might be forgotten. Therefore let’s integrate these benefits in each category and make them bold to give them emphasis. |  |
| A member suggested that access to justice would clearly come out under the political category to individuals; because there are scenarios when there is environmental injustice and decisions take long to be reached at. |  |
| A member re-emphasized the point of equity and fairness and said it has to appear at all the levels because there should be fair distribution of these benefits at all the levels. He opted to bring it out in its on column to easily be noticed | He responded by saying finding a way to emphasize a point and make it specific to the beneficiary is important. |
| A member said that they had simply lost out on the issue of equity on the sharing of these benefits among the beneficiaries, more so the communities adjacent to the forest. | He explained that the issue of equity was explained under the social benefits. |
| On the issue of the political category, a member called upon REDD+ to intervene within the different political groups so as to bring them together as a way of achieving the benefits.  | He liked the idea of harmonizing the different groups through a common ground which does not have a political agenda to environment |

# 3.2 Short Presentation by Xavier on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: ecosystem services and human wellbeing

Xavier presented on a diagram from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) that provides a link to what has been discussed on human wellbeing and t benefits. The diagram categorized ecosystem services (that can be also conceptualized as benefits) into 4 sections which are shown in the table below. The arrows illustrate the relationship between these services (or benefits) and human well-being. The diagram gives us a good way of interpreting the individual constituencies under the regulating provisioning, supporting and cultural services and whether they are actually enhanced or threatened.



**Guiding questions on the multiple benefits**

* If this framework was a reasonable balance, would it support what you wanted to present?
* Would they adopt it later as they progress and also add in the missing content?

| *Questions/ comments/reactions* | *Reactions/Responses/Clarifications* |
| --- | --- |
| A member suggested that they maintain the structure they have. His concern was related to defining in detail these benefits to the point of measuring them, e.g measuring wellbeing by assessing income. | He reacted by saying that the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment work is a basis for them to enrich the conceptual framework that represents the benefits or even be the adopted framework to discuss the benefits of REDD+. |
| A member suggested that livelihoods be pulled out because it’s too broad and covers so many points. |  |
| Elena acknowledged the millennium ecosystem assessment framework and said would be a good basis to improve on their framework. |  |

# 4.Group discussion: Achieving multiple benefits and identifying relevant stake holders

Participants maintained groups of the previous day, and shared ideas and opinions on the questions in the Box below.

**Box 4: Guiding questions on achieving benefits and identifying stakeholders**

* Describe ways of maintaining or enhancing the benefits.
* Who are the beneficiaries, and how would they benefit?
* Which stakeholders should be involved in maintaining and enhancing the benefits, and what is their role?
* What information is needed to asses where and how the benefits should be maintained or enhanced?
* Where would you find this information?

**Group one presentation**

Group one revised the identified benefits of the previous day in terms of environmental, social, political and economic and came up with general measures that would address all the benefit identified on day one, and these are listed below:

MEASURES

1. Enabling Legislation (policies, laws, strategies, including REDD+ in the domestication of other conventions)
2. Incentive framework (incentive tax framework, subsidies, access to finance and insurance, offsets)
3. Equitable benefit sharing mechanism (collaborative management arrangements)
4. Enhancement and strengthening of capacity for implementation and enforcement
5. Efforts to seek political commitment and support
6. Enhance public financing ( trust funds)
7. Attract private investment
8. Strengthen public private partnerships
9. Integration of natural capital into the national accounting system (GDP)

The group zeroed down on four legislations and developed the table below in order to accommodate the selected benefits.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy** | **Beneficiary** | **How they benefit** | **stakeholders** | Information |
| **Enabling Legislation** | 1. Government
2. Private sector
3. Public
4. Marginalized groups
5. Research institutions
6. Global community
7. Development partners
8. Local community and individuals
 | 1. Attracting investment
2. Making investment more profitable
3. Environmental services
4. Inclusion
5. To carryout research
6. Enhancement of environmental services
7. Enhanced accountability
8. Enhanced compliance
 | **National**1. MPS
2. Cabinet
3. MDAs
4. Academia
5. Private sector
6. NGOs
7. Cultural institutions

**Local government**1. DLG
2. Sub county
3. Parish
4. NGOs and CBOs
5. Cultural institutions
 | 1. Information on legal and policy gaps
 |
| Incentive framework | 1. Private sector
2. Government
3. Community
4. Private land owners
 | 1. Government gets better financial returns
2. Improved natural capital
3. Improved GDP
4. Investment and employment
 | 1. URA
2. UIA
3. Civil society
4. Local community
 | 1. Information of feasibility of incentives
 |
| Equitable benefit sharing mechanism | 1. Marginalized groups
2. Forest adjacent communities
3. Communities with historical dependence on the forest e.g the Batwa
4. Forestry sector
 | 1. Improved access to forest good and services
2. Sustainable management due to flow of goods and services
3. National allocation/ funding to the forestry sector
 | 1. FSSD
2. NFA
3. District Forestry services
4. Civil society
 | 1. Existing benefit sharing arrangements
2. Information on revenue collection from the forestry resources
 |
| Enhancement and strengthening of capacity for implementation and enforcement | 1. NFA
2. FSSD
3. DFS
4. UWA
5. Environmental police
6. CBOs
7. Forest resource use groups
8. UTGA
 | 1. Enhanced knowledge and skills to improve efficiency in productivity
 | 1. Training institutions
2. CSOs
3. DFS
 | 1. Capacity gaps
 |

**Group two presentations**

Group two similarly identified four benefits and suggested the beneficiary groups and the stakeholders involved as shown in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | **Who are the Beneficiaries and how they benefit** | **Stakeholders to involve** | **Information Needs** |
| Energy Access and Substitution | * Households
	+ Availability
	+ Improved access
	+ Cheap alternative sources
	+ Improved Health
* Local Communities
	+ Availability
	+ Improved access
* Institutions E.g. Schools, Hospitals
	+ Availability
	+ Improved access
* Private sector
	+ Cheap alternative sources
	+ Reduced Cost of Production
	+ Investment opportunities
	+ Reduced Cost of Production
* Central and Local Government
	+ Reduced Expenditure on health
	+ Achievement of Government priorities/commitments
	+ Increased Revenues
 | * Households (Men, Women, Youth)
	+ Efficient Use, Sustainable Harvesting, adoption to alternatives
* Local Communities/leaders
	+ Byelaws, enforcement, Participation, Awareness,
* Institutions E.g. Schools, Hospitals
	+ Adoption, research,
* Private sector
	+ Switching to alternatives
	+ Efficient Production systems;
* Central and Local Government
	+ Legislation, enforcement, Participation, Awareness, research,
* NGOs/Civil Society
	+ Awareness, Research, Advocacy, Piloting and Promotion of alternatives
 | * Demand and Supply
* Available energy alternatives
* Resource availability eg Biomass
* Wastage and Efficiency of technologies
 |
| Food Security | * Individuals and Households
	+ Food availability
	+ Health and Nutrition
	+ Reduced Domestic Violence
* Local Community
	+ Social cohesion
	+ Reduced Conflict
	+ Employment opportunities
* Business Community
	+ Increased incomes
	+ Employment opportunities
 | * Individuals and Households
	+ Better production methods
	+ Improved post-harvest handling
	+ Food economy
	+ Food Storage facilities
* Local Community
	+ Community food storage Facilities
* Business Community
	+ Value Addition
	+ Marketing
	+ Agro-inputs
* Central and local govts
	+ Law enforcement, Market regulation, Policy, Agricultural Extension,
 | * Quality and Quantity of food Production;
* Seasonality
* Distribution,
* Soil productivity, Ecological Zonation,
* Post-Harvest Handling technologies and storage
 |
| Social Cohesion | * Individuals and Households
	+ Reduced Domestic Violence
	+ Wellbeing
* Local Community
	+ Reduced Conflict
	+ Harmonious co-existence
 | * Individuals and Households
* Setting Social Norms
* Participating in Government programs
* Local Community
	+ Upholding social norms
	+ Mobilization
 | * Social Cultural values
* Record of Conflict Cases
* Frequency of law enforcement agencies
* # of Social Activities
 |
| Conservation of Animal and Plant species | * Individual & Households
	+ Employment opportunities
	+ Health-from use of Medicinal plants and Animals
	+ Enhanced Agricultural Production-Pollinators
* Local Community
	+ Tourism and associated benefits e.g Revenue Sharing
	+ Aesthetic Values
	+ Improved Ecosystem values
	+ Improved Cultural values
* Research and Academia
	+ Scientific studies and Knowledge Generation
* Governments
	+ Recognition
	+ Revenues
* NGO and Civil Society
	+ Research publications
	+ Recognition
 | * Individual & Households
	+ Domestication,
	+ Use wisely,
	+ Use of Alternatives/Substitutes
* Local Community
	+ Awareness
	+ Conservation
* Research and Academia
	+ Generation of knowledge
	+ Information Dissemination
	+ Education and training
	+ Innovation of alternatives
* Governments
	+ Legislation
	+ Funding support
	+ Law Enforcement and regulation
	+ Institutional Management and oversight
	+ Climate regulation and control
* NGO and Civil Society
	+ Research
	+ Resource Mobilization
	+ Advocacy
	+ Management Support
 | * National RED list
* Inventory
* Surveys
 |

**Group three presentation**

Group three also deliberated on the questions presented and the output of the interactions is given below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | **Beneficiaries and how they benefit** | **Stakeholders that should be involved in maintaining and enhancing / Roles** | **What Information do you need to measure the benefit (indicator)** |
| Supply of Biomass Energy (charcoal, fuel wood) | * Households, Communities
* Urban poor (special category)
 | * Forest dependent communities
* Govt bodies
* CBOs, CSos, NGOs,
* Private sector / Entrepreneurs (e.g. improved stoves, efficient charcoal kilns, supply of alternative energy)
 | * Spatial data on biomass stock (forest inventories)
* Type and amount of used, cooking appliance (energy Intensity)- Energy surveys
* Spatial information on Population (National Census and household surveys)
 |
| Employment | * Youth/Women (SIGs)
* Communities
* Private sector (investment in energy technologies- renewable, alternative
 | * Forest dependent communities
* Govt bodies
* Faith based organizations
* Cultural institutions
* Private sector / Entrepreneurs (e.g. improved stoves, efficient charcoal kilns, supply of alternative energy)
 | * Livelihood source (Baseline / Impact studies)
* Investments made (Assessment of utilization of the proposed fund
 |
| Water | * Adjacent communities
* Private sector – water sales
* Government – Environmental regulations
 | * Households
* Adjacent communities
* CBOs, Csos, NGOs
* Private sector
* Academia
* Research organization
* Govt bodies
 | * Trends of water quality in specific catchment areas (Specific Studies)
* Trends in demand / utilization
 |
| Gene Banks | * Communities
* NGOs
* Gvt / Research organizations
* Private sector (pharmaceutical industry)
 | * Faith based organizations
* Cultural institutions
* Government departments (NARO, NFA)
 | * Genetic Diversity (NFA, FSSD, NARO)
* Composition and structure / Tracking usage (NFA, FSSD, NARO)
* Utilization /usage pattern (NFMS)
 |

**Questions, Comments and Reactions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| Group three |
| How do we attribute whatever changes that come with the opportunity of REDD+? How are we going to make the distinction between those interventions that are a result of REDD+ and those that are through other interventions? | We can use an economic approach to measure the difference in the attributions by REDD+ and by other interventions. Xavier also added that attribution can be measured through contractual output. The discussion concluded that the development of strategy options should identify the entities who are best mandated for their implementation, and that as the entire country is accountable for deforestation and forest degradation, attribution for addressing their drivers should also be shared. |
| I am hesitant to conclude that urban poor are the only ones who benefit from charcoal under the benefit of Supply of Biomass Energy, even other classes of wealth like the rich use charcoal. So the benefit it is bigger, not only looking at the urban poor.  | Urban poor was put there as a special category, we know that the urban poor are affected much more than other groups. As for them, they might not even afford charcoal. They go around picking pieces of wood and other materials so we just looked at it as a special category needing affirmative action.  |
| Where are the secondary benefits because everyone is discussing only the direct benefits? For example with a forest we can have water which can be used to generate electricity which is also a benefit.  |  |

**Recap and introduction for day three**

During this session Paulus reminded the participants of the exercises completed so far in terms of the content discussed since day one, such as identifying the benefits missing from the existing literature, defining them, describing ways of maintaining or enhancing them, identifying who the beneficiaries are and how they benefit, which stakeholders should be involved in maintaining and enhancing the benefits, stakeholders’ role and what information is needed in order to assess where and to what extent the benefits should be maintained or enhanced and where to find such information.

He tasked the participants to take the idea of using the information in measuring the delivery and achievement of the benefits, think about the specific questions that should be answered. He tasked the participants to gather that information in order to make it easy for the people involved in developing the final results or documents such as baselines.

#  Day three

# 5. Presentation by Paulus Using spatial analysis and conceptual workflows to identify priority areas for REDD+ multiple benefits

Mr. Paulus Maukonen went through the previous exercise that included discussions of the non-carbon benefits to achieve through REDD+, who will deliver them and how, who the beneficiaries are and how they will benefit and gave a hit on what will be discussed on the following day: what are the potential risks and barriers to deliver them.

He introduced the group work session to the participants; benefits are unevenly distributed within the context of the country. For example when you look at environmental services there certain areas within the country that have a higher risk of soil erosion or flooding and therefore interventions to protect against that risk of soil erosion, flooding should be targeting the areas with the highest risk, where it is most appreciate.

He asked the participants to keep certain questions in mind such as; what conditions are required to achieve success to delivering the benefits, are they bio-physical conditions for example, what are the social conditions, what is the political structure?

Where are the risks or barriers to achieving the benefits the highest, whether they are social, political or bio-physical?

How is the benefit currently distributed, and what stakeholder group do you want the action to target for example forest communities, specific social groups such as the urban poor.

What are the trades-offs or costs involved in implementing the benefit, for example the opportunity cost of implementing the benefit could be higher than the current state of the area. He presented a map that displayed the above information and answered the questions above.

**Questions, comments and Reactions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| Biodiversity mapping shown, I have been doing it for a long time and I find it better to use spatial habitat modelling. Because you will find that if you use only existing data, there are many gaps especially in the Northern and North Eastern parts of Uganda . Data will erroneously suggest low biodiversity, asthe civil unrest that have been there have made it difficult to carry out biodiversity inventories, so that is where habitat modeling based on each environmental value becomes important. For example in the data bank we used the module for birds where we found that the best bird predictors are rainfall and vegetation.  | I agree with this comment about habitat modelling being a source of a particular type of intervention. You can look at it from both sides. Finding new information through habitat modelling is a useful action.  |
| I appreciate the presentation but my comment is really the need to respect the dynamics of the country, if you consider those attributes that you have been talking about, you realize that Uganda as a country has issues of land tenure, topography, landscape, you find that we may need to appreciate the variations within the different regions to come up with actual options that could be adopted. I am just appreciating that really we need to have these factors at the back of our minds because you cannot just think that this is what will work for Uganda but that should go along with an analysis of the details in the different areas. | Considering sub-national and the local dynamics is a key factor to actually delivering something that is feasible. If you look at the countries that have been involved in REDD+, some take a sub-national approach, some will say that we want it in one particular area and what they have been finding is certain ecosystems, land tenure systems exist in that area. And therefore they find that at sub-national level it is not feasible because of the ethnic groups that exist. Therefore it all depends on your approach.  |
| A member agreed that in terms of spatial analysis, it is very important especially for the REDD+ process. But there are a few things we need to appreciate; first, I am hoping that as we continue with this work to show using GIS for example the interaction between the population and that natural vegetation or urbanization Vs conservation, and how trends will follow if it is business as usual and when we apply REDD+ interventions. Because stakeholders involved will want to see if it is economically and physically viable to implement REDD+ interventions Vs the other actions.  | I don’t want anyone constrained with the idea that mapping is the solution for everything. Economic analysis could be another approach as well as others. |
| Where we have had forest cover and now it is completely depleted and we need may be to restore, in Uganda we have some protected forests which are on paper but if you go on ground you find that they are heavily encroached, so I think it would be important to know where we had a forest that got depleted and requires restoration. |  |
| You have referred to carbon biomass in your presentation, are there other forms of biomass without carbon because the context is not clear. | Biomass; we can consider above ground biomass, below ground biomass you can consider he measure of the biomass in that area, carbon is only a component of it. When you actually compare the carbon component of the total above ground biomass generally people say that about half of it contains carbon, so it is not 100% biomass depending on the type of ecosystem, type of vegetation that is the general idea, that carbon is only a component of the total biomass. |

# 6. Group discussions: Using your desired output, create a workflow that would lead to your ideal output

In this exercise the groups were tasked to focus on getting key questions out of the benefits. This meant that the participants had to develop a tool, an analysis or output. We have a series of questions that could be answered and you create an output. The groups were presented with different coloured papers one representing data, one representing the kind of analysis and last one representing the kind of output the group wanted. Paulus advised the groups to first identify what they want as an output, and use the output to create an ideal workflow.

**Presentation by the groups**

**Group one**

****

**Group two presentations**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BENEFIT** | **DATA** | **ANALYSIS** | **OUTPUT** |
| Improved access to biomass Energy and cleaner alternatives  | * Population demographics
* Land use/tenure
* Demand and Supply
* Available energy alternatives
* Biomass
* Availability of improved energy use technologies
* Wastage and Efficiency of technologies
* Social Economic activities
 | Combine Population growth trends; Socio-Economic variations and Resource availability e.g. Biomass; distribution and adoption rates of improved energy use technologies* (GIS Mapping; Statistical Analysis)
 | * Map of energy supply and Demand areas
* Table of existence and adoption of improved Energy technologies
 |
| Improved food Security | * Population Growth
* Socio-economic activities
* Quality and Quantity of food Production;
* Seasonality
* Distribution,
* Soil productivity, Ecological Zonation,
* Post-Harvest Handling technologies and storage
* Gender roles and responsibilities
* Land Tenure systems
 | * Population trends & Projections,
* Land use changes,
* Soil/crop suitability,
 | * Map highlighting food secure/insecure zones, Distribution of arable land and infrastructure (roads, Markets, etc)
 |
| Sustainable Conservation of Animal and Plant species | * Global/National RED list
* Animal and plant populations
* Species, composition and distribution
 | * Distribution and trends of animal and plant species,
 | * Spatial distribution map of Biodiversity important areas
 |

**Group three presentation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Physical Environment** | **Gaps/ Challenges** | **How to address the Gaps/Challenges** | **Actions Needed to Address the Gaps/Challenges** |
|  | Climate conditions | Identify suitable species | Tree seedling nursery development |
| Know the appropriate time to seed, weed and harvest the trees |
| Species diversity and viability |
| Soil Conditions | Water and soil conservation management approaches | Appropriate management conditions |
| Semi-arid and Arid conditions with prolonged droughts and rampant fires | Manage fire hazard and water stress hazards | Development a fire and water (irrigation) management plan;  |
| Spatial analysis and mapping | Awareness raising on the risks of fires and associated management |
| **Political Environment** |  |  |  |
|  | Lack of Political will to promote tree planting | Lobby politicians for support | Civic education and evidence-based advocacy |
| Competing interests between agriculture and forestry | Opportunity-Cost Analyses | Dedicated land for fuel wood production |
| Boundary issues | Understanding boundary conflicts | Opening-up and marking local government boundaries  |
| **Economic Environment** |  |  |  |
|  | Opportunities derived from tree planting visa-vie other economic options | Benefit-cost and opportunity-cost analyses | Identify species that provide highest return to investment; exhibit high yields per unit areas and fast growth rates |
| Competing interests between enterprises | " do as above" | Understand the competing land-use options and develop appropriate interventions |
| Spatial analysis | Dedicated reserves |
| Site quality for selected species |
| Propose appropriate infrastructure and technology approaches | Infrastructure Maps i.e. roads, rivers, etc |
| Trade-offs | Conducting Opportunity-Cost analyses |
| Analyses of the contribution of fuel wood to GDP visa vie exploitation from natural conservation forest estates and other options. |
| Cost-benefit Analyses of using other sources of fuels/energy (e.g. petroleum, electricity, etc) |
| Private sector participation | Enabling environment e.g. access to financing, technology, and policy |
| Available income sources | Own capital (savings) or credit/loans |
| **Social Environment** |  |  |  |
|  | Ethnicity | Understanding cultural norms and ethnic behavior | Manage expectations |
| Culture belief and practices |
| Land Tenure | Spatial analysis | Conducting GIS mappings and overlays of different land tenure systems |
| Access to Land | Mapping and boundary opening | Land mapping and titling |
| Labor availability and distribution within and across the gender | Identify common labor sources | Equip skills to labor  |
| Population growth trends | Employment opportunities | Skills development |
|  | Demand for energy | Provide alternatives and energy saving technologies |

#  Day Four

# 7. Presentationby Elina Uganda’s approach to REDD+ safeguards and the national safeguards roadmap

Elina made a review of the country approach to safeguards, showing links with national strategy/action plan process. She asked the participants to discuss the risks and barriers to achieving the multiple benefits in a more detailed way.

**Questions, comments and Reactions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| Are the barriers in this concept like assumptions or it is much broader? | I think it can be a bit of both.  |
| Where is the interest because here you are looking at only negative externalities, do you want it at a micro or macro level? | I think it is up to the group. If you can identify many of the barriers then that still works. So it all depends on how you define your benefit? |

# 8. Group discussion: Identifying risks and barriers

**Box 5: Guiding questions on achieving benefits and identifying stake holders**

* What are the barriers to achieving the benefits identified?
* Should the benefits not to be achieved, what are the risks?
* What measures could reduce the risks and overcome barriers?
* How would you asses the probability and impact of the benefits and risks identified? E.g High/Medium/ Low

**Group one**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | **What are the barriers to achieving the benefits identified?** | **Should the benefits not be achieved, what are the risks?** | **What measures could reduce the risks and overcome barriers?**  | **Probability of the benefits and risks**  | **Impact of the benefits and risks**  |
| **MEDICINAL VALUE** | 1. Information gap on abundance, distribution and value
2. Limited capacity to process, preserve and package
3. Limited capacity to enforce existing laws and regulations
4. Abstract policies and laws on medicinal plants
5. Environmental change e.g climate change
6. Un sustainable harvesting
 | 1. Loss of livelihood options for those involved in sale of medicinal plants
2. Increased mortality/ decline in primary health care
3. Cultural value erosion
4. Decline in attachment of community to forests/ conservation value
5. Extinction of medicinal species
6. Decline in productivity of the forest ecosystem/ ecological value
 | 1. Research on abundance, distribution, value and sustainable use
2. Regulated public access
3. Establish a monitoring system
4. Research and acquisition of appropriate technologies for harvesting, processing, preservation and packaging
5. Develop and implement conservation, education and communication programme/ strategy on medicinal plants
6. Promote patenting of indigenous knowledge
7. Review policies and amend laws to address gaps
8. Strengthen capacity of institutions and agencies mandated to regulate use of medicinal plants
9. Implement and operationalize climate change intervention measures ( mitigation and adaption)
 | 1. Medium
2. High
3. Medium
4. High
5. High
6. Medium
 | 1. Medium
2. High
3. High
4. Medium
5. High
6. Low
 |
| **MANTAINANCE OF WATER CATCHMENTS** | 1. Conflicting land use options
2. Population pressure
3. Limited environmental consciousness
4. Limited capacity for enforcement
5. Poor governance of resources
 | 1. Disasters ( floods, drought, diseases, famine/ food insecurity)
2. Irregular water supply for domestic, industrial, power generation, irrigation)
3. Loss of livelihoods
4. Conflicts on water use
5. Poor hygiene and sanitation
 | 1. Land use planning and sustainable land use management
2. Implement the concept of integrated water resource management
3. Restoration of degraded water catchments
4. Develop strategies to reduce agricultural dependent population
5. Operationalization of environmental education at all levels
6. Develop and implement a sanitation, hygiene and trespass for communities living in the sector
7. Empower local councils to enforce by laws
8. Regular assessment of quality of catchments and governance
9. Strengthen horizontal and vertical coordination and collaboration
 | 1. High
2. High
3. High
4. High
5. Medium
 | 1. High
2. High
3. High
4. High
5. High
 |
| **SAFETY NET/ SURVIVAL** | 1. Increased population pressure
2. Poor governance of resources
3. Land use change
4. Conflicting land use
5. Low prioritization and allocation of resources for safety nets
6. Non deterrent sanctions and penalties
 | 1. Poor livelihoods
2. Increased crime
3. Increased vulnerability to disturbances
 | 1. Operationalize registration of community and private forests
2. Ecosystem based approaches should be implemented
3. Land use planning and sustainable land use management
4. Integrate natural capital into the national accounting system
5. Ensure that regulations are provided in a timely manner
 | 1. High
2. High
3. High
 | 1. High
2. Medium
3. High
 |

**Group two**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | **What are the barriers to achieving the benefits identified?** | **Should the benefits not be achieved, what are the risks?** | **What measures could reduce the risks and overcome barriers?**  | **Probability (barriers)** | **Impact** **(barriers)** |
| Improved access to biomass energy and cleaner alternatives | Cultural beliefs may limit substitution | -Continued degradation and deforestation --(Biodiversity loss)-Compromised health/nutrition-Domestic violence-Increased child labour (collecting f/wood) – school dropouts -Time poverty for women and children-Increased HH poverty | -Appropriate targeting -Improved implementation of ENR policies-Awareness creation-Provide subsidies on cleaner alternatives-Increased investment in innovations-Lobbying and advocacy | Medium | High |
| Availability of affordable technologies and/or cleaner alternatives (e.g. cook stoves, solar) | Very high | Very high |
| Limited awareness of available options | High | High |
| The (high) costs of alternatives |  | High | Very high |
|  | Inadequate political will |  |  | High | High |
| Increased food security | -Declining land per capita | Domestic violenceFamineMalnutritionReduced productivityPovertyDeath | -Land use planning-Reduced dependence on land | Very High | Very High |
| -Poor land management and farming practices | -Land use planning/land management-Improved farming practices | Very High | Vey High |
| -Outbreaks of pests and diseases |  | -Pest and disease control-Research and extension | Very High | Very High |
| -Weak implementation of ENR policies |  | -Lobbying and advocacy | Very High | Very High |
| Post harvest losses |  | -Improved storage-Value addition | Very High | Very High |
| Marginalisation of women |  | -Human rights awareness-Increased livelihood options | High | Very High |
| Sustainable conservation of plant and animal species | Limited livelihood alternatives | -Continued loss/Extinction of plant and animal species-Loss of opportunity for scientific research/discovery | -Lobbying/ advocacy-Alternative livelihood sources | Very high | Very high |
| Poverty | Alternative livelihood sources | Very high | Very high |
| Weak policy implementation | Advocacy and lobbying | Very high | Very high |
|  | Negative cultural practices | Awareness | High | High |

**Group three**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | **What are the barriers to achieving the benefits identified?** | **Should the benefits not be achieved, what are the risks?** | **What measures could reduce the risks / overcome barriers?**  | **Probability of the benefits / risks identified (high/medium/low)?** | **Impact of the benefits and risks identified (high/medium/low)?** |
| Supply of Biomass Energy (charcoal, fuel wood) | * Competing land uses
* Conflicting policy and institutional mandates that are not integrated
* Increasing demand – population growth
* Underdeveloped value chains
 | * Increasing degradation/ deforestation **(H)**
* Continued institutional conflicts **(M)**
* Increasing prices of biomass energy **(H)**
* Resource wastage **(H)**
* Vicious cycle of land degradation
 | * Improve Inter-sectoral coordination
* Promoting enterprises along the value chain
* Improve access to credit.
 | **Benefits;** 5 yrs=Low, 15 yrs=Medium, 40 yrs = High**Risk = High** |  |
| Employment | * Underdeveloped value chains
* Limited access to affordable credit.
* Competing land uses
* Failure to operationalize tree fund
 | * Increasing degradation/ deforestation
 | * Promoting enterprises along the value chain
* Improve access to affordable credit.
 | Benefit = HighRisk = High |  |
| Water | * Failure to appreciate a business case to encourage contribution to PES (depends on catchment)
* Redirecting PES funds to restoration and incentivizing communities **(H)**
* Increasing demand for forest products due to population growth **(H)**
* Climate change **(H)**
 | * Conflicts
* Reduced human welfare
 | * Ecosystem valuation and trend analysis
* Mobilizing and advocacy
* Managing the PES funds at Ecosystem level
* Structures for accountability and responding to key issues
 | Benefit = MediumRisk = High |  |
| Gene Banks | * Inadequate institutional capacity arrangements
* Failure to appreciate a business case to encourage contribution to Gene conservation to national dev. And security
 | * Loss of species and genes to restore /maintain forests (H)
* Emergence of new pests diseases (M)
* Vulnerability of climate risks (M)
 | * Create a business case for gene banks
* Mobilizing and advocacy – linking to food and income security
 | Benefit = MediumRisk = Medium |  |

**Questions, comments and reactions to the group discussions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| Some of the proposals are quite general, for example restoring of forests. | We had that discussion at the back of our mind too, so we were imagining we are discussing for a national strategy.  |
| The aspect of addressing limited livelihoods is something we have failed to address. In terms of actual activities, what are we doing, who are we targeting? | We have got the best policies but the implementation is poor.  |
| To what extent are you involving NPA and other relevant authorities in trying to address certain drivers? Because I think we can involve them in this process as we try to address those livelihood drivers. |  |
| I think that coordination has been raised a lot but nothing ever happens, so I think we have to understand how to make it happen and have results.  |  |
| You mentioned that we are not aware if or not we have a gene bank. If it is not there, how can REDD+ get involved and become an opportunity towards it. | Loss of genes is a security risk, it is a sustainability risk but if presented as a conservation issue, it may never be taken up by the decision makers whose priority is security. The gene bank exists in the Ministry of Agriculture Animal, Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) however it concentrates mostly on livestock and a few food crops, so we should broaden the mandate of the institution responsible for the gene bank. Since there are two important ministries, the security being the most crucial, I also agree that maybe we can also shift our discussion of forestry and climate change as a security issue may be then it will be easily taken up. |
|  | Your approach to the funds that could be de-touched from the government could be one option and may be a model that could be taken up. |
| I think coordination should not be with only the government but also include the private sector.  | Both private and government sectors are part of what REDD+ is and will work with.  |

#  Day Five

# 8. Presentation by Paulus: GIS draft maps multiple benefits of REDD+

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Questions/ Reactions* /*comments* | *Responses/Clarifications* |
| We have very constrained capacity and at the end of the day there is inefficiency. We have the numbers/results but the problem is that we fail to tell the story. | If we need for them to produce information, we need to support them.I think we need to find out what we have in terms of capacity and try to make an action plan, do we need to hire more, we need to train the existing people, we need experts, and we need to answer those questions. |
| Thank you Paulus for the work you have presented. I think that it is not the people who come up with such information to tell the story but for us the taskforces and other stakeholders to help tell it. |  |
| Relating to biodiversity research, the people focusing on mammals are the ones who are always getting the funding, however research into plants also needs funding. Plants support the animal populations. |  |
| We need to explore more which other variables don’t have data onand why? | I think we can borrow from other organisations like the World Meteorological Organisation that always share data which we can also utilize. |
| Why are we doing this mapping, I know it could be for REDD+ but what is out target audience? Why do we need it? How do we reach all these different stakeholders? |  |
| I think we need to like the maps with more information, such as a PDF for when someone clicks on for example a biodiversity hot spot and they get more information about the area. Important to produce maps that reach a broader group stakeholders, even those with no GIS background. |  |
| We are talking about a lot of information; however is it possible for the secretariat to discuss with other people and identify where that information is? | We can convert that into an action so that we set a schedule to liaise with you at the different organizations to pick the information. Our interest in REDD+ is not to get the primary data but is that the information is packaged in a way that we get positive incentive from there. |
| What is the real process, does it take a short time? With time can we achieve it in? | I would like to elaborate on what we did in Jinja. We were looking on how to generate information. What do we need for REDD+ we would map it out. In what form will that institution give us that data, so we came up with a roadmap on how to obtain that information.I think that is a good approach. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Closing Remarks by Xavier

He thanked the participants for sparing a whole week to attend the meeting.

He re-echoed the objectives of the meeting for the participants to understand the importance of their participation. He also thanked the experts Paulus and Elina for being part of the meeting.

**Appendices**

| **No.** | **Name** | **Specialization/****Expertise** | **Institution/****Affiliation** | **Telephone contact** | **Email contact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Stephen Mugabi | Policy /legal/Institutional Assessment (Environmental Safeguards) | DESS | 0701 3189130782 059 2940712 318 913 | mugabisd@gmail.com |
|  | Michael Mugarura | Climate Change Mitigation | CCD | 0783 215 882 | mugarura.michael@gmail.com |
|  | Dr. AdoniaBintoora | CRM/ Manager, Community Benefits and Wildlife Enterprises | UWA | 0772 622 638 | adonia.bintoora@ugandawildlife.orgbintoora@yahoo.com |
|  | Tom Rukundo | SEA/EIA | NFA | 0772 591 205 | rukundotomndamira@gmail.com |
|  | Doreen Ruta | Livelihoods | Private Consultant | 0772 449 047 | rdoreen2001@yahoo.com |
|  | Evelyn Atuhaire | Economist (Secretary) | FSSD | 0778 936 240 | eveatuhaire4@gmail.com |
|  | Muhammad Ssemambo | International climate change processes and issues | CCD | 0704 993 344  0754 643 512 | medi.ssema@ccd.go.ugmedi.ssema35@gmail.com |
|  | Byakagaba Patrick | Policy , Legal, Regulations and institutional frameworks | CAES - Makerere | 0782 563709 | byaks2001@yahoo.com |
|  | Olive Kyampaire | Communications/Secretary  | REDD+/ FSSD | 0772 587 560 | olive.kyampaire@gmail.com |
|  | Barbara Nakangu | Gender and Social issues | Makerere University | 0755 807 563 | barbara.nakangu@gmail.com |
|  | Henry Bazira | Policy analysis  | Water Governance Institute  | 0783 473 500 | watergovinst@gmail.com |
|  | Pauline Nantongo | Payment for Environmental Services including Carbon Trade | ECOTRUST-Uganda | 0772743562 | pnantongo@ecotrust.or.ug |
|  | Lufafa Robinson |  | MAAIF | 0774 491 194 | lufafarobin@yahoo.co.uk |
|  | Justine Namaalwa | Gender and Social issues | Makerere University | 0772962877 | namaalwa.justine@gmail.com |
|  | Herbert Tushabe | Biodiversity Databasing | Makerere University | 0777 564 2950703 046 791 | htushabe@gmail.com |
|  | Denis Mujuni |  | NAFORRI | 0752945818 | d.mujuni@yahoo.com |
|  | Hillary Agaba |  | NAFORRI | 0702508513 | hiagaba@yahoo.com |
|  | John Tumuhimbise | Renewable Energy | Energy | 0704694014 | jontumuhimbise@gmail.com |
|  | Mununuzi Nathan | Environmental management | MWE | 0759 644 936 | mununizin@yahoo.com |
|  | Xavier Mugumya | NFA Alternate Focal Point | REDD+ Secretariat | 0776 408 396 | xavierm1962@gmail.com |
|  | Margaret A. Mwebesa | AC Forestry/NFP REDD+ | REDD+ Secretariat | 0772470023 | margathieno@gmail.com |
|  | John Begumana | MRV Expert  | FAO/ REDD+ Secretariat | 07555028427 | johnbegu@gmail.com |
|  | Sergio Innocente | FAO-Technical Advisor  | FAO/ REDD+ Secretariat | 0752763508 | Sergio.Innocente@fao.org |
|  | Mugisha Viola  | Resource Management | REDD+ Secretariat | 07019519900785288315 | Violamarie23@gmail.com |
|  | ShielaKiconco | National Technical Advisor | REDD+ Secretariat | 0702 715 585 | Sheila.kiconco@gmail.com  |
|  | Evelyn Lutalo | Natural Resources  | NEMA | 0772 652 728 | elutalo@nemaug.org |
|  | Joseph OmaraSabiti | Land | Uganda Land Alliance | 0772 011 504 | jomara@ulaug.org |
|  | Cornelius Kazoora | Financing  | SDC | 0772 926 253 | sdc@infocom.co.ug |
|  | Robert Charles Aguma | Environmental Specialist  | MWE | 0772 380 340 | robertaguma@yahoo.com |
|  | Aaron Werikhe  | Research Officer  | NPA | 0774-693 761 | awerikhe@npa.ug |
|  | Omulala Samuel  | Environmentalist  | FSSD | 0774 614 288 | sunroman30@gmail.com  |
|  | David M Tumusiime | Environmental Management  | Makerere University | 0779 411 741 | tumusiime@caes.mak.ac.ug |
|  | Harriet Drani | REDD+  | IUCN | 0758 100 074 | Harriet.drani@iucn.org |
|  | Nyago Moses | Forest Conservation  | WCS | 0773 525 201 | mnyago@wcs.org |
|  | NakyenyuneCotilda | Forestry  | IUCN | 0758 586 255 | cotilda.nakyeyune@iucn.org |
|  | Polycarp Musime | REDD+  | IUCN | 0772 602 697 | Polycarp.musime@iucn.org |
|  | Elina Vaananen | REDD+ | UNEP-WCMC  |  | elina.vaananen@unep-wcmc.org |
|  | Paulus Maukonen | REDD+ | UNEP-WCMC |  | paulus.maukonen@unep-wcmc.org |
|  | BiingiAnnet | Forestry  | REDD+ Secretariat | 0779 828 913 | annetbiingi9@gmail.com |
|  | Edrine Mukwaya |  | REDD+ Secretariat | 0700 671 961  | edrinemukwaya@yahoo.com |