# PARTICIPATORY INDICATORS OF SUCCESS OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROGRAMS IN UGANDA

**BUYINZA MUKADASI***

Department of Community Forestry and Extension, Makerere University,
P.O.BOX 7062 Kampala, UGANDA

## ABSTRACT

*In Uganda, a large diversity of community initiated forest management systems have evolved recently in response to severe degradation of forests and grazing land and biomass shortages. Forestry professional, forest user group and farmers were organized in June 2004 to develop commonly agreed indicators of the performance of Community Forestry Program in Uganda. Indicators, such as access to fuel wood, incidence of forest fire and amount of community funds raised through the sale of forest products are commonly agreed at local level. Women participation in forestry related meetings and taste of drinking water in the watershed area are also important. Equitable benefit sharing by the community forest users serves as an indicator of better access to forest products. Socio-economic changes such as women participation in forest related decision-making, income generated from community forests, and equity of benefits from community forests also, reflect the program success.*

***Keywords*** *: community forestry, indicators, women participation,Uganda*

* *Contact address*: Tel: +256-41-543647; Fax: +256-41-533574, *E-mail*: buyinza@forest.mak.ac.ug

## PENDAHULUAN

In Uganda, the concept of Community Forestry Programs (CFP) was adopted in the early 1980s as a major strategy to manage the country's forests. It was expanded nationwide following the government's 1989 endorsement of a 25 years master plan for the forestry sector. The plan emphasized community forestry as a major program and was expected to absorb almost half of the total budget allocation to forestry through the year 2010 (MWLE 2001a). As of June 2004, Uganda had already handed over one million ha of forestlands to over 13,238 Community Forest User Groups (CFUGs), involving 1.49 million households (MWLE 2001b). Community forestry programs operate from a policy that stresses local participation in developing and managing all accessible forests through transferring management responsibility to the local community if they are willing and able to assume the responsibility. Over 80% of the population in Uganda lives in rural areas (UBOS 2002) and the majority depend on forests for fuelwood as a source of energy for cooking and heating. Forests supply timber, fuelwood, fodder, grasses, leaf-litter, foods and other minor forest products, necessary for daily household use and agriculture production. Community forestry program aims to fulfill the basic needs of forest products such as fuelwood and fodder of rural people, and encourages them to become self-sufficient in such products.

Community forestry and all terminologies associated with it denote different relations between forest management and community involvement in different countries and may vary from manipulative participation to a full role in decision-making (Buyinza 2002). Community forestry initiatives come in many different forms, involving different combinations of users, resources and institutional arrangements. Successful community forestry requires adequate frameworks, policies, tenure regimes and markets, forest management packages, know-how, viable community institutions and congenial relations with the forest service and local partners (MWLE 2001b).

The introduction of CFP in Uganda was born out of the realization by the Forestry Department (FD) of the futility of its efforts at protecting the nation's forest resources without the committed and willing involvement of the local community (Buyinza & Nabalegwa 2007). The FD also recognized the inadequacy of the policy under which it was operating as well as the inadequacy of the Forest Act and Regulations. Although the policy and legislative environment remained the same at the start of the program, the commitment to change approach within the FD as the commitment within government to see that the negative trend in forest degradation is halted and eventually reversed, made it possible to implement community forestry programs. The long-term demand by the local communities to allow them to manage their own forest facilitated the process.

The first CFP interventions were realized in 1990, however, over time different types of CFP have emerged. These range from activities by individual households, via women and men user groups to those involving a community as a whole. The definition of community forestry remains fluid and any participatory approach to forest management involving communities is reported as a CFP. Its locus, rules, powers and structures are still in transition. Concepts such as community forestry, community-based forestry management, social forestry, joint forestry management, collaborative forestry management and participatory forestry management have been used in discussing CFP involving local partners.

The first formal recognition of the role of local communities in forest management in Africa was in 1926 (Wily and Mbaya 2001). The common forms of community involvement include: Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM); Joint Forest management (JFM), with Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) or Collaborative Natural Resource Management (CNRM) as its variants; and Community Based Forest Management (CBFM). In CBNRM all natural resources are considered and are managed by the community. In JFM, communities manage forest resources in partnership with the Governments or the private sector as pioneered in India and now practiced in some parts of Africa. In CBFM the communities wholely manage the forest resources on their own as found in Tanzania. The supply of non-industrial goods and services from natural forests declined to levels that attracted the attention of forest dependent communities, governments, environmentalists and related stakeholders. Conflicts on resource use emerged, and governments found themselves incapable of managing large forest tracts. In some cases these two provided the motivation for involving more stakeholders in managing these resources as in JFM and CBNRM. In some cases the resource was found better in the hands of local communities as in CBFM.

The common models of CFP in Uganda vary with the extent of decentralization and devolution of power, and with defined responsibilities, rights and

ownership (MWLE 2001b). These forms include: Ownership and authority retained by the state; cooperative management, in which the community roles and powers are limited; contractual partnerships, in which communities' roles are more substantial but are still inequitable involves rights based on temporal agreement or contract in combination with a management plan, for a period of 5 to 15 years; consigned management, in which the community has all operation powers except an ultimate authority; Special agreement, in which community members operate on their own land areas and managed forest-and woodland-based micro-enterprises under a trust; community based forest management; in which jurisdiction is fully devolved and sometimes includes ownership of the estate.

Despite the success, there are indications that the poor may have not benefited from the CFP. Leadership is one of the factors that made the CFP successful and the succession of leadership is seen as a potential problem in Uganda's community forestry programs (Buyinza 2002). At present, CFP's success is an issue for debate because the measure of success varies depending on how it has been defined. Success of forest user groups in Uganda is closely related to expression of user satisfaction with the results (Gombya-Ssembajwe & Banana 2000). User satisfaction is essential where users are invited to work voluntarily in program management.

The use of indicators is a common phenomenon in the assessment of performance of a program (Buyinza 2002). The perspective of success varies not only from one individual to another but also from one community to another i.e., success, like beauty depends largely on the eyes of the beholders. Further, the emic perception of success is often different from the etic perception of the same phenomenon. Community forestry may be about trees for a forester; and it may be about bio-diversity for an environmentalist. However, both of these may be less meaningful to the local people. The local perspective is the key to community forestry (Buyinza 2002, MWLE 2001a) because they are the main beneficiaries of the community forestry program. As a main beneficiary, local people's (emic) perspective for measuring performance of CFP should always be the main focus.

To strengthen stakeholders' capacities to efficiently implement criteria and indicators may require the following (Kaudia 2000, Wily and Mbaya 2001):

a) A dynamic and participative forest policy integrated with other sectors and implemented in support of forest management.
b) Forest legislation which facilitates the implementation of criteria and indicators to promote improvement of CFP and forest management plans.
c) Availability of technical and financial resources which permit governmental and non-governmental institutions to implement and supervise adherence to established forest policies.
d) Implementation of a national plan which aims at strengthening the capacity for conducting research and transferring knowledge, skills and technology. Investment in forestry research, training and education and in technology transfer.
e) Norms that regulate forestry practices in such a way that the implementation of sustainable forest management will be assured.
f) Providing means to stakeholders and local governments to strengthen their involvement in, and support to, CFP.
g) Maintenance of information systems on recording on the productive capacities of forest ecosystems.

h) Mechanisms for horizontal co-operation in CFP.

i) Access to information technology where possible. Much thought has been devoted of late to enabling the use of criteria and indicators as tools not only for monitoring and evaluating community forestry but also for integrating them into the `normal' workflows of forest management, such as processes of delegation, assignment, the transfer and leasing of forests, finance, institutional capacity development, etc. More work needs to take place in this area, and a greater exchange of experience should speed up progress.

There are as yet unharnessed opportunities to use sub-regional and regional institutions to facilitate capacity building for the effective execution of criteria and indicators in the area of data collection, data bank creation, processing and analysis. Another step along the same route would be to promote and support regional and sub-regional workshops to facilitate information exchange based on the experience of different processes.

Finally, it is important that criteria and indicator implementation is a continuous; it would be important also to go a significant distance along this path before any assessments of the benefits were made. Premature assessments, as is often the case, would lead to the wrong conclusions. It is important that the utility of criteria and indicator-based information systems be evaluated in order to assess their efficiency in supporting CFP. Like so many other things related to managing complex forest-people systems, these assessments must be iterative and support learning for improvement, because that is what, in essence, criteria and indicator set out to support to accomplish.

This study was designed to provide information on the local perspectives on indicators of the performance of CFP. The study borrows the definition of the program's success perceived by local people as "any forestry program that provides maximum benefits to local residents by fulfilling their forestry needs such as fuelwood, timber, fodder, foods and leaf-litter". The study focuses on documenting indicators and identifying ways of measuring the indicators as perceived by the local people to measure the success of the community forestry program in Eastern Uganda.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

A one-day research workshop was organized in June 2004 by the Department of Community Forestry and Extension, Makerere University Uganda to prepare a list of indicators for determining the performance of CFP. The workshop's main purpose was to generate a set of indicators for measuring the performance of Uganda's CFP as perceived by local people especially those living adjacent to the forests in the Albertine rift valley (Figure 1). Out of the 34 registered FUG, 13 participants (four female and nine male) from the FUG adjacent to forests Mt. Elgon National Park and five representative from the National Forest Authority (NFA) were invited and participated in the workshop.

A systematic random sampling technique was applied to select FUGs to participate in the workshop. The country was divided into seven geo-ecological regions, areas with similar climatic patterns, vegetation communities, edaphic conditions and biodiversity richness. Two participants were invited from each region. The two participants were randomly selected from the identified geo-climatic region. After the participants' self introductions, the purpose and objectives of the workshop were explained. The participants were divided into two working groups, which were balanced in terms of geo-spatial size, gender, and ethnicity.


Figure 1. Outline map of Uganda. Black dots show the forests of the Albertine Rift

Each group was given a set of questions related to defining, from an emic perspective, a successful community forest, and ways to measure these indicators to make sure they properly understood the point for discussions. Each participant was asked to make an assessment as to what constitutes a good performance of a community forestry program. To help the participants think about indicators, they were asked to assume that the program was successful. They were encouraged to think about the indicators as comprehensive, practical, and easy to use. The local term "sign" for indicators was used to make sure all participants understood the meaning of an indicator in the same way.

The learning cycle was identified as an ideal tool for translating general policy statements or goals into concrete actions. There were four stages in the continuous cycle, namely; plan where the field team (forestry staff and villagers) decided on the problem they wish to address and set a learning goal; the field team puts their planned program of activities into action; the forest manager encourages the field team to reflect regularly on the results of their activities, both in the field and back in the office; and conclude. Everyone involved draws lessons from reflection and if necessary, begins the cycle again by planning more activities. The final conclusions were processed and made into new procedures, and operational guidelines that were widely shared and discussed.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The criteria and indicators of success of CFP vary between countries, the forest types and the management constructs. These indicators are in-turn influenced by the governments' attitude towards participatory forestry, the extent of political will, commitment and public support. So far, the majority of CFPs are established permissively through formal agreements, MoUs or charters between the community and the dominant forest authority, the state. It is rare for communities to autonomously declare management regimes in which the state's role is largely advisory. The FUGs and forest committees are empowered to promulgate village by-laws under which the villagers manage, monitor and evaluate the performance of community forest. The new policies

and legislation in Uganda explicitly enable communities to be recognized as forest owner-managers with the mandate to manage the forest autonomously. In such instances, the communities are involved in fully-fledged forest management according to defined work plans, criteria and indicators to measure the performance of the CFP. The local government officers play a facilitating role and provide technical backstopping in planning, surveying and further developing indicators for monitoring and evaluation of CFP.

The participants listed self-sufficiency in forest products and physical condition of the forest as basic factors for considering the program a well functioning CFP. Based on these factors, they discussed and developed a list of indicators and also suggested ways to measure them. The list of indicators agreed on by the participants to determine the performance of a community forestry program are presented in Table 1.

Access to fuelwood, fodder and timber, forest condition, plant diversity in the forest, amount of community funds, and occurrence of landslides were used as indicators of the CFP performance by several authors (Falkenberg & Sepp 1999, Scott 1998). The participants also agreed on these as indicators to measure the program's performance. The forest products, such as fuelwood, timber and fodder are the

Table 1. Indicators and ways to measure the indicators

| Participatory indicators | Ways to measure the indicator |
|---|---|
| Access to fuelwood | Percentage of users obtaining fuelwood; amount of fuelwood collected in a year |
| Access to fodder | Percentage of users obtaining fodder; frequency of fodder collection in a year |
| Access to timber | Percentage of users obtaining timber; volume of timber collected in a year |
| Incidence of forest fires | Number of forest fires occurring in a year |
| Amount of community funds | Annual income from the forest |
| Women's participation in forestry related meetings | Percentage of women in forest user group committees; percentage of women participating in users' assembly and forest user group committee meetings |
| Use of compost | Percentage of users collecting leaf-litter in a year; Frequency and amount of compost used in farm lands |
| Trees on private land | Number of trees available on farmland |
| Condition of Forests | Occurrence of natural regeneration in the forest; tree canopy status; shape of trees in forests |
| Plant diversity in forests | Types of plant species available in forests |
| Availability of wildlife in forests | Frequency of appearance of wildlife in the area<br>Number of livestock killed/attacked by wildlife in a year |
| Availability of NTFP in forests | Number of users collecting NTFP; Frequency of collecting NTFP |
| Greenery in the area | Percentage of naked hills and barren area covered by vegetation |
| Occurrence of landslides | Frequency of landslides occurring in a year |
| Water sources | Number of springs/vo lume of water available in the area; travel time for fetching water; use of water for irrigation |
| Availability of water | Duration of water available in the area |
| Taste of drinking water | Cleanliness and chilliness of water |

common products derived from community forests and they are considered as major benefits to the local communities. Community funds are important for local development, however, in many cases, FUG funds are being used for community development works such as temple construction, road maintenance, and school building renovation.

Moyini and Muramira (2002) argued that counting the number of people benefited, and the annual incomes derived from community forests are effective measures of access to forest products and the amount of community funds, respectively (Moyini & Muramira 2002, Falkenberg & Sepp 1999). Their findings suggest that frequency of landslides in a year, occurrence of natural regeneration/crown cover/tree shape, types of plant species available in the forest, and the percentage of denuded hills and barren area covered by vegetation as effective indicators for occurrence of landslides, forest condition, plant diversity, and greenery in the area, respectively.

The incidence of forest fire, number of women participating in forestry meetings, use of compost in farm land, trees on private land, number of wildlife in the forest, and taste of drinking water are perceived as additional indicators and therefore, these are recommended to be included in assessing the program's performance (Jacovelli & Caevalho 1999). The local people previously used to go and set fire in forests, but at present if someone sees fire in the forests, they inform others and go collectively to control the fires. Counting the number of forest fires occurring in a year, percentage of women participating in forest users' assembly and forest user group committee meetings, percentage of users collecting leaf-litter, number of trees on farmland, frequency of wildlife appearances in the area, and cleanliness and chilliness of water are suggested ways to measure the indicators (Table 1).

Restrictions on grazing and collection of firewood and green wood is very critical although it is difficult to prescribe any strict rules, especially regarding the extractable limits and the modes and rates of extraction and the stage at which this can occur. However, about a third of the current marginal annual increment (MAI) could be considered for extraction assuming that one third of MAI will be in the twigs and small branches and two thirds would be in the main trunk and large branches. Over extraction of seeds, flowers and fruits will affect long-term forest regeneration and sustainability. There is therefore a need to generate information on yields as well as sustainable modes and rates of extraction of NTFPs. The self initiated forest management systems have evolved in response to local needs and are compatible with the local socio-economic situation. The protection and sharing of benefits is seen to be equal rather than equitable. For long-term sustainability of institutions, gender and equity issues have to be addressed.

The participants observed that fire was the biggest threat to community forests and an enemy of the forest, however it is believed that fire enhances forest growth if it is burnt in a controlled way. Women are recognized as an important resource for the program's success as they pass on their knowledge to younger generations and also take care of the forest in a better way than do men. This finding is consistent with those of Mupanda 2002; Onyango 1996; and Falkenberg & Sepp 1999.

The impact of protection and management on forest regeneration is assessed in comparison to nearby community forestry plantations and unprotected lands. It is revealed clearly from our studies that the longer the period of protection, the

better the regeneration, i.e. more trees in the lower DBH classes (about 91% in Mbale district in 10cm diameter class). There is selective promotion of economically important species like Teak in the northern part of Mbale district, and the tree species' diversity is higher in the regenerating forests as compared to plantations and unprotected forest.

The standing biomass and age of the forest relationship is a fair indicator of the impact and effectiveness of protection. Maximum growing stock is in the forest found on northern hills of Mt. Elgon with >100 years of protection (160 – 270 t/ha) while in areas with shorter periods of protection it ranges from 5 - 32 t/ha. Degradation occurs when extraction levels exceed the annual biomass production. In Mbale district, the extraction levels vary from 0 - 50% of biomass production to more than the sustainable level of 36% (MWLE 2001b). However, in most locations, communities extract only about 25% of the Mean Annual Increment (MAI). In areas which extract more than the current MAI, the extraction could be termed as unsustainable. However meeting firewood requirements is one of the critical goals of management, and it is necessary to develop simple methods to help communities make decisions on the quantity of fuelwood to be extracted.

Data regarding traded goods, such as sawlogs, sawn timber and charcoal would normally be more accurate than that for un-traded goods for subsistence use. However, it was noted that less than 10% of the wood removed from forests is recorded and documented in the appropriate way. Thus, the majority of the removals are not recorded and it becomes unwise to rely on data provided by the National Forest Authority or the District Forest Service. The annual growth of each type of forest is provided in Table 2.

During the workshop, it was clear that leaf litter was perceived as an important product from the community forest and is used as manure, which is one of the major sources of soil nutrient in the hills of Uganda (Jacovelli & Caevalho 1999, Scott 1998). The participants perceived trees on private farmlands as an important reason for judging the performance level of CFP, because it reduces the pressure on public forests in areas where most people are heavily dependent on forests for their daily supplies of forest products.

Table 2. The annual growth of each type of forest

| Land cover | Area (ha) | (%) | Stock ('000 ton) | % | Stock (t/ha) | Growth (t/ha/yr) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ? Plantations (soft &hardwood) | 35,000 | 0.2 | 4,000 | 1 | 114 | 16 |
| ? Tropical high forest (intact & degraded) | 924,000 | 5 | 164,000 | 35 | 177 | 15 |
| ? Woodland | 3,974,000 | 19 | 126,000 | 27 | 32 | 5 |
| ? Total forest | 4,933,000 | | | | | |
| ? Bushlkand (low woods & farm fallow) | 1,422,000 | 7 | 14,000 | 3 | 10 | < 1 |
| ? Subsistence farmland | 8,401,000 | 41 | 112,000 | 24 | 13 | 2 |
| ? Other land* | 5,709,000 | 28 | 48,000 | 10 | 8 | 0-1 |
| ? Total land** | 20,465,000 | 100 | 468,000 | 100 | | |

* Grasslands, wetlands, commercial mono-crop (tea, sugar, tobacco), built up areas, rock
** Excluded water bodies of 3.69m ha. Source: MWLE (2001b).

Participants resolved that the taste of drinking water had improved, as it was clean and cooler after improvement of forest conditions and therefore, it needs to be considered as an indicator for the program's performance. Some of the participants stated that *"clean and chill water had a better taste in drinking than unclean and warm water. Such water gives more satisfaction while drinking when someone is thirsty"*. They believed that improvement in the taste of drinking water meant improvement in water quality that might help to reduce water-related diseases in the area.

"Demonstration factor" has proved to be an important force in the spread of CFP. Ecological conditions, social factors, community dependence, political support and institutional arrangements could be attributed to the large-scale spread of CFP. The committees under CFP have the same structure and function as dictated by the central Government order. But the CFPs have a diverse structure as well as functioning modes. These systems have evolved over time in tune with the local socio-economic conditions. The selection procedure for example could be by consensus or election and the term of the members varies from one year to three years. However participation of women is minimal in all of FUG.

The committees have unique sets of rules and regulations especially with regard to grazing and firewood collection. Grazing being considered as one of the dominant factors leading to degradation, the committees either have banned grazing in the initial three years or there is restricted grazing. This has adverse impacts for the landless and marginal farmers with livestock holdings who have no private source of biomass. The methods of protection are unique and it varies from social fencing to paid guards or patrol systems. In all places, first time offenders are warned and repeat offenders are fined. However in some villages, repeat offenders are socially boycotted and their goods as well as implements confiscated. The regulations on firewood collection are very strict as compared to those for NTFPS.

The standing biomass and age of the forest relationship is a fair indicator of the impact and effectiveness of protection. Maximum growing stock is in the forest found on northern hills of Mt. Elgon with > 100 years of protection (160 – 270 t/ha) while in areas with shorter periods of protection it ranges from 5 - 32 t/ha. Degradation occurs when extraction levels exceed the annual biomass production. The extraction levels vary from 0 - 50% of biomass production to more than the sustainable level of 36% (MWLE 2001b). However, in most locations, communities extract only about 25% of the Mean Annual Increment (MAI). In areas which extract more than the current MAI, the extraction could be termed as unsustainable. However meeting firewood requirements is one of the critical goals of management, and it is necessary to develop simple methods to help communities make decisions on the quantity of fuelwood to be extracted.

Data regarding traded goods, such as sawlogs, sawn timber and charcoal would normally be more accurate than that for un-traded goods for subsistence use. However, the participants noted that less than 10% of the wood removed from forests is recorded and documented in the appropriate way. Thus, the majority of the harvested forest products are not recorded and it becomes unwise to rely on data provided by the National Forest Authority.

The participants agreed to subdivide the forests into blocks based on major differences in vegetation type and forest condition, delineate the blocks on a sketch map using identifiable natural features, and

then estimated the area of each. These blocks became the basic unit for future monitoring. The recommended indicators and basis for classification of performance of the community forests is outlined in Table 3.

It is difficult to suggest any standard prescription given the variation in vegetation type, precipitation, soil fertility, grazing and extraction pressure from location to location. Thus, Adaptive Forest Management (AFM) needs to be explored. For this purpose there is a need to promote participatory forest monitoring. Generally, the condition of community forests in Uganda varies considerably over a short distance therefore it is important to take account of this variation as much as possible to reduce the standard deviation of estimates of ecological criteria. Communities could be trained to monitor a few key parameters periodically through simple methods. Based on the analysis of parameters to assess the status of vegetation or impact of a practice, the communities could modify their practice. For example, in Buginyanya village of Mt. Elgon National park, the vegetation is very dense with a closed canopy suppressing the grass growth. People could open up the canopy by pollarding or selective removal of trees.

## CONCLUSIONS

Access to fuelwood, fodder and timber, amount of community funds, greenery in the area, and availability of water in the sources were agreed indicators for measuring the performance of CFP. In line with these, many other studies have reported access to fuelwood, fodder and timber, greenery development, amount of community funds, incidence of forest fires, and water sources as indicators for the

Table 3. Vegetation type and condition categories for community forestry

| Vegetation type | Condition Class | Characteristics |
|---|---|---|
| Grassland | Degraded | Very sparse to sparse grass cover (<50%)<br>Extensive exposed soils |
| | Stocked | Moderate to high grass cover (> 50%)<br>Soil mostly covered with vegetation |
| Shrubland | Very degraded | Low stocking of shrubs (< 10,000 per ha)<br>Very sparse crown cover (< 20%)<br>Soils mostly covered with vegetation |
| | Degraded | Low stocking of shrubs (< 10,000 per ha)<br>Sparse crown cover (20 - 50%)<br>Soils mostly covered with vegetation |
| | Stocked | Moderate stocking of shrubs (> 10,000 per ha)<br>Moderate crown cover (50 - 75%)<br>Few or no seed trees present (< 100 per ha) |
| | Fully stocked | Moderate stocking of shrubs (> 10,000 per ha)<br>High crown cover (> 75%)<br>Adequate seed trees present (> 100 per ha) |
| Mixed forest | Very degraded | Very sparse crown cover (< 20%)<br>Extensive exposed soils |
| | Degraded | Sparse crown cover (20 - 50%)<br>Soils mostly covered with vegetation |
| | Stocked | Moderate crown cover (50 - 75%) |
| | Fully stocked | High crown cover (> 75%) |

Note: Adapted from Howard & Davenport 1996.

programs' performance (Onyango 1996, Mupada 2002). There appears to be a consensus between the local people and the scientific communities on the listed indicators; hence indicating some commonalities between the local and scientific perspectives of success of community forestry programs. Some indicators such as taste of drinking water, women's participation in forestry meetings, trees on private lands, and use of compost are new indicators for measuring the success of community forestry program. Increase in number of trees on private lands, and women's participation in forestry meetings are often reflected in the studies however, they are not used as indicators to measure the program's success.

The fundamental characteristics of a participatory approach to assessing the performance of community forestry programs are as follows: There is a constant focus on the outcome, or goal, that is, new arrangements for forestry that promote equity and local decision-making and can change people's lives; there is an open-ended learning process. The outcome, or goal, is known, but the way to reach the goal cannot be decided in the forest manager's office in advance. Flexibility is built into the program design, and regular review enables it to move forward with experience; local people participate in the learning process alongside the field staff as partners. New relationships and capacities are built as the process moves along; learning and knowledge must lead to action and to change. They must help the participants understand their present situation and find ways to create a better one; to maximize learning, everyone has to embrace error, though this is often difficult; local people's perspectives and ideas are incorporated into conventional forest management practice, but there is no compromise on the sustainability of the resource; there are clear learning goals or outcomes that ensure the process can be organized into an efficient program with clearly deliverable goals that can be measured and monitored; a participatory approach emphasizes learning.

Progress monitoring meetings should be organized at agreed intervals over the project period. The learning and changes brought about should be captured against the CFP projected outputs indicators and necessary adjustments made to ensure smooth implementation. This will include half-yearly progress reports to be presented to project participants at respective meetings for appraisal and evaluation. Reports, interviews and discussions with target groups and records for the various activities and data of the projects would among the monitoring tools to be used. A mid-term and project end evaluations by external evaluators is incorporated in the project design. The reports will be submitted to the donor at the time of evaluation and the donor may at any time carry out its own evaluation. Measures to monitor and stamp out poaching of forest resources will be considered to avoid potential conflict among stakeholders.

After the formation of Community Resource Management Units (CREMU), individual groups who form the membership of each CREMU should be facilitated to put in place self monitoring mechanisms according to the plan of action. During progress monitoring meetings, the experiences and lessons learned should be documented and analysis made with a view of getting a package of experiences that we could share with relevant organizations and institutions. Issues of importance need to be identified and disseminated to relevant stakeholders. The experiences and knowledge generated by the CFP would be shared locally, nationally and with stakeholders world wide. This should be in form of

reports, and documentaries where possible as well as articles if need be.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to the Uganda Forest Working Group (UFWG) for the financial support and all civil society organizations that participated in the national workshop.

## REFERENCES

Buyinza M. 2002. Forestry Work in Villages: A guide for Field Workers. Makerere University Press, Kampala, Uganda.

Buyinza M & Nabalegwa M. 2007. Gender mainstreaming and community participation in plant resource conservation in Buzaya county, Kamuli district, Uganda. *African J. Ecology* 45: 7-12.

Falkenberg CM & Sepp S. 1999. Economic Evaluation of the forest sector in Uganda; A study carried out as part of the Forest Sector Review. Kampala, Uganda.

Gombya-Sembajwe WS & Banana AY. 2000. Community-Based Forest Resource Management In East Africa. UFRIC, Kampala, Uganda.

Hoefsloot H. 1996. Collaborative Management on Mount Elgon; An account of first experiences (for publication). The IUCN Tropical Forest Conservation Program.

Howard PC & Davenport TRB (eds). 1996. *Forest Biodiversity Reports*. Kampala: Uganda Forest Department, Ministry of Natural Resource, Kampala, Uganda.

Jacovelli P & Caevalho J. 1999. The private forest sector in Uganda – opportunities for greater involvement. A study carried out as part of the Forest Sector Review, Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment.

Kaboggoza JS. 2000. Forest resource-based conflicts in Uganda In: UFRIC: Community-based Forest Resource Management in Eastern Africa UFRIC-MUK Kampala.

Kaudia A. 2000. Effective communication skills in community forestry development. Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Nairobi.

Mupanda E. 2002. *Towards Collaborative Forest Management in the Conservation of Uganda's Rain Forests*. In url: www.earthwatch.org/europe7limbe7collabformgMt.htm#heading153, 06.02.03

MWLE (Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment). 2001a. The Uganda Forestry Policy 2001. Kampala, Uganda.

MWLE (Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment). 2001b. Forest Sector Review, 2001. Kampala, Uganda.

NEMA (National Environmental Management Authority). 2001. The State of the Environment 1998. Kampala, Uganda.

Oluka-Akiteng. 1999. Overview of Natural Resource conflicts in Uganda. In: Natural Resource based conflict management FTPP-ESA workshop proceedings, Nairobi.

Onyango G. 1996. *Collaboration Between Public Agencies and Adjacent Communities in Managing and Conserving Natural Resources*. A Working Paper Prepared for the UNEP/World Bank African Forest Policy Forum, Nairobi-Kenya. Unpublished.

Scott P. 1998. From Conflict to Collaboration: People and Forest at Mount Elgon, Uganda. IUCN East Africa Regional Office, Nairobi Kenya.

Scott PJ. 1994. *Bamboo utilisation on the slopes of Mount Elgon*. Consultancy Report for Uganda National Park/The Mount Elgon Conservation and Development Project.

UBOS (Uganda Bureau of Statistics). 2002. Provisional Population Census Results. Entebbe, Uganda.

Wily LA & Mbaya S. 2001. Land, People and Forests in Eastern Africa at the beginning of the 21st Century. The impact of land relations on the role of communities in forest future. Forest and Social Perspectives in Conservation. IUCN/NRI.