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Abstract

Good governance is critical to the success of Integrated and Conservation and Development projects (ICD). In 2008 and 2010 the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) invited parties to enhance implementation by conducting governance assessments and implementing capacity building programmes in protected areas.

With the aim of improving the success of ICD projects, this research evaluates the governance of the Multiple Use Project (MUP), an ICD project implemented in south west Uganda, by assessing local community perceptions of governance. The study was undertaken in twelve parishes adjacent to Bwindi Impenetrable National Park. Despite 20 years of implementing ICD projects in the area, there have been limited governance assessments.

Using a qualitative approach and conducting interviews and focus group discussions, we found that there were several key governance elements that local communities perceived were lacking including equitable benefit sharing, involvement, effective communication and feedback processes. In addition, a number of administrative issues were identified. Despite these challenges, communities recognized the value of protecting natural resources and demonstrated their desire to be actively involved in the management process. This thesis provides recommendations for the Uganda policy makers on improving the effectiveness of ICD projects by embedding the principles of good governance that are perceived to be lacking.
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1- Introduction

The Integrated Conservation and Development (ICD) approach was implemented at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (hereafter Bwindi) in south west Uganda as a mechanism for reducing the conflict between local communities and conservation authorities. The conflict arose when local people lost access to the forest after the park gazettement in 1991 (Blomley et al. 2010; Baker et al. 2011). Various ICD interventions have been implemented including the multiple use programme (MUP), revenue sharing of income from gorilla tourism, agricultural development and alternative livelihoods programmes to achieve this goal by involving local communities in national park management. Later the model was devised whereby ICD aims to reconcile conservation and development (Blomley et al. 2010).

In 2010 the Conference of the Parties (COP 10) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) set the conservation through poverty alleviation agenda in 2011-2020 strategic plan. Currently Uganda as a signatory of CBD is trying to achieve conservation goals together with poverty alleviation and a Darwin Initiative funded project was set to help achieve this goal. However linking conservation with poverty alleviation is more than effective national park management, but requires that issues of governance, human rights, equity and power are addressed at the highest levels (Fisher 2008). Recent studies have indicated that ICD has been key to improving local people’s attitudes towards Bwindi over time, although it does not appear to have changed conservation behaviors, and law enforcement is a more effective driver to reduce unauthorized resource use. Findings show that Bwindi’s ICD tended to benefit wealthier community members rather than the poorer households who are assumed to be undertaking illegal activities (Blomley et al. 2010).

One of the keys of ICD success is good governance (Hughes 2001, Buscher & Dietz 2005). Good governance includes the effective participation of informed local communities in natural resource management, transparency and having access to information, negotiated agreements between communities and authorities on natural resource use, fair
compensation for the costs of conservation and equitable benefit sharing that addresses the needs of the poor and marginalized (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2012). While Uganda has a strong conservation policy framework based on the principles of good governance, embedding these principles within the operational activities of national parks can be challenging. Furthermore ICD monitoring and evaluation efforts tend to focus on conservation and rural development impacts, such as whether the ICD approach has reduced unauthorized resource use or improved the socio-economic wellbeing of local beneficiaries. While this is important, a lack of monitoring on governance issues limits our understanding of successes and failures of ICD and the performance of ICD practitioners in delivering policy directives set by the Ugandan government (Blomley et al. 2010, Baker et al. 2013).

1-1 Aims and objectives

1-1-1 Aims
This study is aiming to assess how the communities perceive the governance of ICD projects implemented around Bwindi during the last 20 years. First; by exploring the communities’ definition of good governance and how they perceive the governance of current ICD projects, second; to identify challenges to the implementation of MUP according to local beneficiaries. This research framework is based on the conceptual model of MUP as a mechanism to reconcile conservation and development that was developed by Blomley et al. (2010) (Figure 1). This model did not explicitly include governance as a condition or assumption to MUP success, whereas this research is to evaluate MUP within the context of local community perceptions on governance of MUP.

1-1-2 Objectives
ICD success is often based on the following key factors (Blomley at al 2010) – that local people

a) are involved effectively with natural resource management
b) receive an equitable share of benefits
c) receive fair compensation for the costs that they incur from the national park
The objectives of this research are:

1- To explore local communities perceptions on the governance of Multiple Use project

   Questions:

   i.  Do local communities perceive MUP as an opportunity to receive equitable share of benefits by accessing forest resources to meet local demands?
   ii. Do local communities feel involved and valued in MUP?
   iii. How successful is MUP is targeting the right beneficiaries?
   iv.  What affects people’s participation in MUP?

2- To investigate local communities perception on the governance of ICD projects around BINP in general

   Questions:

   i.  Do local communities feel involved and valued in ICD projects from decision making to project design, implementation and monitoring?
   ii. Do local communities feel that they receive an equitable share of benefits and free of corruption?
   iii. Do local communities feel a sense of ownership in ICD projects?
   iv.  How do local communities describe “involvement” in ICD projects?
   v.   How do local communities describe the best participation in the management of ICD projects?
What is local communities’ perception on the benefits of MUP?

How local communities perceive MUP?

Do local communities feel involved and valued in MUP?

Costs of illegal activities are less than benefits of MU programme

Community collaboration with Park authorities increases

Law enforcement is effective and leads to deterrence of illegal activity

Illegal activities decline

Conservation and development interests reconciled

Research focus

State/Condition

Assumption

Diagram key

Figure 1 The conceptual model of Multiple Use Programme (Blomley et al. 2010)
2- Background

2-1 Integrated Conservation and Development

Integrated Conservation and Development projects (ICD) aim to link social development and conservation goals (Hughes 2001). This approach was first introduced by Word Wildlife Fund (WWF) in 1980s and developed in 1990s in response to the problems associated with the traditional “fortress conservation” approach of 1960s to increase local communities participation and involvement (Blomley et al. 2010). The conservation parties began to recognize the ethical rights of people who are living close to protected areas as they are the ones who are paying the price of conservation because their livelihoods depend on the natural resources (Brandon and Wells 1992). The ICD approach soon became very popular and millions of dollars was spent to fund ICD projects by International organizations (Kellert et al, 2000).

ICD is based on three main assumptions (Hughes 2001):
1- Human pressure on biodiversity will be reduced by “Alternative livelihoods” and therefore conservation outcomes will be improved.
2- Local people are one of the biggest threats to natural resources in their area.
3- ICD offers a “sustainable” alternative to the traditional protected area management approach.

The concept of ICD had different interpretations for different people and in response to the critiques and reviews has changed over time (Table 1).
Table 1 An overview of the evolution of ICD approaches in the last three decades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The evolution of ICD approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitution and/or compensation (1985–c 1995)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer zone communities offered livelihood alternatives to reduce pressure on natural resources and investment in infrastructure to generate support for conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit sharing (c 1995–c 2000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit sharing mechanisms (e.g. for tourism revenues), interventions to add value to natural resources and mechanisms for community participation in decision making to give Communities’ a ‘stake’ in conservation, plus substitution and/or compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power sharing (c 2000–onwards)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities empowered to have greater control/authority, and thereby promote equitable sharing of costs and benefits with external stakeholders and within communities, plus some of the above to enhance benefits/reduce costs (where necessary).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blomley et al. (2010)

2-1-1 Common critiques of ICD projects
ICD projects aim to address both conservation and rural development objectives with a win-win strategy. However there are very limited reports available to show that whether these objectives have been met (Brooks et al. 2006, Blomley et al. 2010). Lack of an evidence base makes it difficult for policy makers and practitioners to target funds into ICD projects proven to be successful.

2-1-1-1 Understanding the complex dynamics of natural resource use
Many ICD project implementers are failing to understand the social and economic dynamics of the resource use in the areas they are trying to work in, and therefore the real threats to biodiversity are not recognized and not correctly addressed (Berkes 2004, Fisher et al, 2008, Lele et al. 2010). Not understanding these complexities may lead to development outcomes which are not necessarily fulfil conservation objectives (Kellert 2000, Sievanen et al. 2005). Many ICD project have been based on unrealistic and untested assumptions due to the effort and time required to understand the complexities and the projects are selected and implemented by the organizations instead of local people based on the availability of the funding and institutional opinions (Hughes 2001, Blomley et al. 2010).

Furthermore studies have shown that most of the ICD projects implemented based on incomplete information and therefore are not able to target the right beneficiaries or not
compensate the lost livelihoods adequately and have little or no impact on the conservation and development objectives to change conservation behaviour. For example the poorer households are missed and left out and wealthier community members are the ones who benefit from ICD projects (Nielsen and Treue 2012, Blomley et al. 2010, Vyamana 2009, Fisher et al, 2008, Wells and McShane 2004).

2-1-1-2 Invalid ICD assumptions
Not only the implementations are based on unrealistic assumptions which are quite similar disregarding the difference in the socio economic characteristics of each area, but also the basic assumptions of ICD are proven to be violated in different cases (Kellert at al. 2000). For example ICD assumes that “Alternative livelihood” reduces the human pressure on biodiversity without considering that poor people often take these alternative livelihoods as “additional” to reduce risk by diversifying their livelihoods (Sievenan et al. 2005, Blomley et al. 2010).

2-1-1-3 The importance of governance and power
The effectiveness of ICD project has a strong correlation with the governance scores in regional and national levels (Garnett et al. 2007). One recent critique of ICD is that many of the ICD projects fail to address the issue of governance, human rights, equity and power (Hughes 2001).

Many ICD projects are unwilling or fail to realize the importance of strengthening internal capacity of local organizations to effectively negotiate with national and international institutions and to make consensual and transparent decisions (Borrini-Feyerabend 2004, Fisher 2008). Lack of good governance or weak governance may lead to corruption and therefore discourage or prevent participation (Smith and Walpole 2005, Sandker et al. 2009).

However the relationship between conservation and development can not be ignored and protected are management has a fundamental role in sustainable development (Adams et al. 2004). By permitting the sustainable use of natural resources and involving the
communities in the management process conservation projects can achieve better results and higher conservation impact in long term (Brooks et al. 2006, Baral et al., 2007).

2-1-2 Key concepts of governance
“Governance” has become an important term and been widely used in literature since 1990s. However it is generally used with different meanings depending on the context (Kitthananan 2006). The general concept of governance is defined as “The institutions and processes used by right holders and stakeholders to make and influence decisions, and to exercise authority and responsibility in society” (Wilson 2002).

2-1-3 Relationship between governance and management
There is a strong relationship between the governance and management of protected areas. However both terms should be clearly defined (Table 2).

Table 2 The difference between management and governance of protected areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>...is about...</th>
<th>what is done in pursuit of conservation objectives the means and actions to achieve such objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>...is about...</td>
<td>who decides what to do how those decisions are taken who holds power, authority and responsibility who is (or should be) held accountable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2012

2-2 Study site
Bwindi Impenetrable national park (hereafter called Bwindi) is located on the eastern edge of the Albertine Rift Valley in south western Uganda (Figure 2.1). It is one of the largest Afromontane forests in east Africa (Bitariho 2013). With the size of 32000 ha, Bwindi considered as one of the most important biodiversity areas and is listed as a biodiversity hotspot. It has a very rich flora and fauna and is the home of almost half of the Mountain gorilla population in the world (Namara 2006, McNeilage et al. 2006). BINP has been managed as a protected area since 1932 (Blomley et al. 2010). It was legally established as a National Park under total protection through the Act of Parliament in 1991, and was listed
as UNESCO World Heritage site in 1994 (UNESCO). Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) is the owner of the BNIP as a government body. High population density of more than 300 people/km$^2$ and very poor agricultural practices has put a big pressure on Bwindi (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2002). 90 percent of people depend on subsistence farming and getting income from selling surplus crops (Baker et al. 2012). Some of the people who live here are among the poorest people in Uganda, which has increased their dependency on natural resources (Baker et al. 2012, Korbee 2007, Blomley et al. 2010).

![Figure 2 Location of Bwindi Impenetrable National Park](image)

**Figure 2** Location of Bwindi Impenetrable National Park

### 2-3 ICD implementation around BINP

Gazetment of Bwindi as a National Park, put a huge pressure on adjacent communities, especially poor households who were highly dependent on the forest resources including timber, firewood, medicinal plants, basketry materials, bamboo and other resources. As a
result, households’ income was reduced and tended to the reduction of local levels of food security (Blomley et al. 2010). This caused serious conflicts between local communities and park staff (Baker et al. 2012, Bitariho 2013). On the other hand the budget cut back due to economic reform in 1980s tended to the reduction of staff and therefore the policing approach in conservation became ineffective (Namara 2006). Therefore Uganda Wildlife Policy included community participation management approach as one of the key strategies of UWA management systems with the mission of: “To conserve and sustainably manage the wildlife and protected areas of Uganda in partnership with neighbouring communities and other stakeholders for the benefit of the people of Uganda and the global community” (Uganda wildlife policy 1999).

Bwindi is the first national park in Uganda where collaborative management was implemented (Namara 2006). ICD strategies were implemented in the area as early as 1987 based on the new participatory approach and with the aim of reducing conflicts between local people and park staff (Baker et al. 2012). The first approach which was adopted by CARE was Development Through Conservation (DTC) projects to reconcile conservation and development (Blomley et al 2010). The approach has shifted to Conservation through Poverty Alleviation CTPA approach in the recent years as biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction have become important goals internationally and the link between two goals was recognized by Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Millennium Development Goals (Roe 2010). Uganda recently has established a Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (U-PCLG) as a part of International Institution of Environment and Development’s (IIED) international PCLG initiative. Currently a Darwin Initiative funded project “Research to Policy – Building Capacity for Conservation through Poverty Alleviation (CTPA)” is aiming to “improve the effectiveness of ICD interventions in linking conservation and poverty alleviation by better understanding who continues with unauthorized resource use –despite ICD- and why” (Roe 2012). Based on the research findings U-PCLG will try to influence the government policy in both national and local level to make a closer link between rural development and biodiversity conservation through poverty alleviation (Roe 2012). During the last 20 years several ICD projects have been implemented around Bwindi that some of them are listed below (Blomley et al. 2010):
- Providing access to forest resources (Known as Multiple Use Programme)
- Tourism
- Revenue sharing
- Agricultural development
- Conservation education awareness
- Capacity building
- Problem animals control
- Conservation Trust Fund
- Promoting public health
- Support for infrastructure development

2-4 Multiple Use Programme

The aim of MUP is to provide sustainable use of minor forest resources to local people. It was established after several assessments, workshops and piloting in three parishes around Bwindi, which resulted in conducting Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which is a written agreement between park staff and Authorized Resource Users (ARUs) (Wild & Mutebi 1996). Each parish has a Resource Use Committee (RUC) which works directly with park management and MUP is administrated in the parish level (Bitariho 2013). Each parish contains several villages which are the smallest administrative units in Uganda’s government structure (Bitariho 2013). Currently MUP has 634 registered members according to UWA list of whom 180 are female (28%). Three main resources are allowed in MUP including Medicinal plants, Basketry materials and Beekeeping (Wild & Mutebi 1996). ARUs are chosen based on their skills, register and after confirmation from UWA they will receive identity cards which are valid for 5 years. ARUs are only allowed to go to harvest in certain harvest zones and certain harvest seasons which is set to be twice a year (Figure 3). They should harvest in a group of ARUs and be escorted by park rangers. Beekeepers do not need to have rangers with them when they are going to check their beehives, however they should inform park staff and carry their identity card with them at all times when in forest (Wild & Mutebi 1996).
3- Methods

The data were collected using a qualitative methodological framework of data collection and analysis. Qualitative data enables researchers to gain a deep understanding of processes, relationships, motivations and perceptions, provide background information and generate ideas. It is a powerful tool to investigate concepts such as values, attitudes and belief systems (Drury 2011).

I used two methods to collect the information about ICD projects.

a) Semi structured interviews which are good in situations that the researcher knows the topic but does not know enough about what responses are likely to get. I used it to explore reasons of inactivity and individuals perceptions about MUP.
b) Focus group discussions have almost the same structure as Semi structured interviews but being within a group, gives the opportunity to have discussions and it gives a more in-depth view of the community’s perception about the topic to the researcher. I used them to explore various community groups’ perceptions in the ICD implementations in their area (Newing 2011).

3-1 Interviews

3-1-1 Interviews Sample selection
According to the list of 634 resource users provided by UWA, and after a verification process with village level local government representative or chairman Local Council 1 (LC1) chairmen by ITFC staff, two categories of active and inactive resource users were identified, of whom, 169 people were inactive due to various reasons including old age, death, moving away, disability or prolonged sickness or removed because of unauthorised resource use and other. 68 resource users were listed as “Lost Interest”. All of them were selected to be interviewed to explore the reasons of losing interest and to identify the links between losing interest and MUP governance and implementation based on research questions. They were distributed in twelve parishes. Also 68 active respondent were selected randomly by using excel rand function from the list of active resource users who were using the same resource and were located in the same parish, because MUP is managed at the parish level and each resource is under certain rules and the availability of the resources are different in different user zones.

We could not identify or locate some of the names on the list after discussions with local community members. Therefore a total of 107 respondents out of 134 were interviewed from the list of Resource Users provided by UWA.

3-1-2 Questionnaire
A semi-structured questionnaire was designed (Angelsen et al. 2011, Corbin & Strauss 2008, Oppenheim 1992) (Appendix 1). The questionnaire consisted of eight sections. The first five sections were designed to explore socio-economic characteristics of the respondents
including homestead information, livelihood, basic necessity survey (Davies 1997) and wellbeing. Section 6 included questions about MUP and respondents experience in MUP. Section 7 included questions to explore respondents’ perceptions about MUP, and section 8 for the governance to explore sense of ownership and involvement and respondents’ experience of national park meetings.

All the concepts like wellbeing, ownership and involvement were clearly defined according to CTPA research and shared with research assistants (Appendix 2).

3-1-3 Pilot study

The questionnaire was reviewed by my supervisors from Imperial, IIED and Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC) research staff, and then refined in accordance with their feedback before the pilot interview and the translations in Rukiga, which is the local spoken language around Bwindi, and was cross checked with my ITFC field assistants and ITFC staff.

The questionnaire was piloted by conducting 7 interviews in Kitojo parish which was recommended by ITFC research staff as one of the oldest parishes that joined MUP in 1996. The interviews were recorded for double checking the translation. The pilot respondents were chosen from the list of active resource users who were not already on our selected list. The main problem was the number of questions and the fact that the interview would take around two hours which was very long and I could see clear signs of tiredness in the respondents after 1.5 hours. Since some of the questions were added from the CTPA questionnaire which was ongoing at the time of my fieldwork to provide data for other aspects of CTPA Darwin project, some were removed (children’s education status table) and some questions were simplified (household members table and governance) to shorten the time. Also for question 7.2, the picture of people sitting in a meeting was added for better illustration of decision making. Moreover the basic necessity survey was added from CTPA questionnaire to enable me an assessment of family economic characteristics. All the verifications were repeated for the changed parts including translation checking and the modified questions were piloted with 2 more people. The time of the interview was reduced to one hour with the maximum of 1:20.
3-1-4 Interviews procedure

For each parish we would conduct a meeting with Parish level local government representative or chairman Local Council 2 (LC2), for a brief description of the project and getting help to identify and locate the respondents, arrangement of the programme and getting contact details for local guides if applicable. Respondents were informed at least 24 hours before and we would set a time to meet each respondent on a certain date.

The interviews were conducted with one of three field assistants depending on their availability. The assistants were ITFC staff however two of them were born and living locally. Most of the times we were accompanied by a local guide who would direct us to the respondent’s’ houses.

All respondents were given a brief introduction of the project objectives and purpose of the interview. All respondents were assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of the interview.

Some interviews were recorded for double checking the translations and in that case respondents were informed and were asked for the permission. A small gift including a bar of soap and two packets of salt were given to each respondent at the end of interview in accordance with ITFC’s procedures.

For each household, the GPS location and data on size and construction quality of the house, kitchen and latrine were also recorded (Appendix 3) to be added to the socio-economic profiles of respondents.

3-1-5 Data analysis

When the interviews started, it became apparent that the categories assigned by ITFC of ‘inactive’ or ‘lost interest’ did not reflect the situation on the ground. Many survey respondents had been registered for MUP by UWA although had never received an identity card, which meant that they could be arrested if found by law enforcement rangers in the national park. It was not that they had lost interest in MUP, but were unable to be an active
MUP member. However, there were respondents with identity cards but who had not been to the forest in the last year. Therefore, to be able to explore governance issues of MUP, I categorized people into four groups depending of having card and their last forest visit (Figure 4). First, people were divided into two groups of those who have a card and those were registered by UWA but never given a card. Within each group people were divided into two sub groups, those who went to the forest in the last year and those who have not been to the forest in the last year. The period of one year was chosen based on MoU harvest seasons and the minimum frequency of once a year in some parishes.

![Figure 4 - The redefined structure of respondent groups](image)

We also interviewed one respondent, who had a card and claimed to be active, but his name was not in the UWA resource users list, therefore we excluded his interview from our analysis.

Data on size and construction quality of the house, kitchen and latrine were scored based on the size and building materials quality and each household was given one number as the overall score to indicate the household wealth. GPS coordinates were used to locate the household of each respondent in order to calculate distance from household to the park boundary using ArcGIS.

Data analysis was undertaken based on our own categories (not the UWA list).
The data analysis was done in two qualitative and quantitative parts. Using Microsoft Excel 2007 and R Studio for quantitative analysis and the qualitative data were analysed using grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin 1994) and were coded and sorted using Nvivo 10.

I applied Chi squared test for categorical variables and t-test for continuous variables and Mann-Whitney for not normally distributed variables to determine:

A) What associates with having the card?

B) What associates with being active among people who have card?

I also used General Linear Model for binomia data to be able to explore the interaction of explanatory variables and their relation to my categorical variables.

The list of explanatory variables is shown in Table 3. We only used observational socio economic score data for defining family wealth. In case of exploring the relationship between different explanatory variables, I used the CTPA database where applicable because of the bigger sample size (n=248) and therefore more reliable results.
Table 3 - List of explanatory variables and the related hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypothesis/questions related to card</th>
<th>Hypothesis/questions related to activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Only 28% of all ARUs are female (n=634). Does gender associate with receiving the cards?</td>
<td>Does gender associate with inactivity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Are the majority of card holders within a certain age groups?</td>
<td>Is age associated with people’s resource dependency and activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>People with higher education are more likely to have cards</td>
<td>People with higher education are more likely to be busy doing something more beneficial and thus being inactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (wellbeing score, basic necessity survey and Household wealth score)</td>
<td>Wealthier people of the community are more likely to benefit from ICD (Blomley et al. 2010) and therefore have cards</td>
<td>Wealthier people in the community are more likely to have other engagements and thus are inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in the household</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Larger household are more dependent on small incomes and each person has more free time for harvest so are more active?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding a position in the community</td>
<td>Position holders with better connections and access to ICD benefits are more likely to have a card</td>
<td>Position holders are wealthier and thus less likely to be dependent on MUP so are less active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resource users in the family</td>
<td>People with more than one ARU in the family are more likely to have connections so they are more likely to have a card</td>
<td>People who have ARU family members are more likely to be inactive since they can access the resources via them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from park boundary</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>People who live far from the park are more likely to be inactive due to the walking distance involved in harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance experience (Involvement and Ownership scores)</td>
<td>People who have card are having a higher sense of ownership and involvement in MUP</td>
<td>People who are active are having a higher sense of ownership and involvement in MUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (whether they recommend MUP to others or not)</td>
<td>People who have card are more likely to recommend MUP to others</td>
<td>Active people are more likely to recommend MUP to others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-2 Focus group discussions

3-2-1 Sample selection

Four community structures were selected for the discussion sessions for having representatives of all community groups

- Resource Use Committees (RUC): They are parish level committees responsible for the management of MUP
• **Stretcher groups**: Community structures whose main function is for health emergency services and also provide other small scale services like credit and saving schemes and funeral and burial services. They have strict rules, regular meetings and almost every community member is the member of a stretcher group (Wild & Mutebi 1996).

• **LC1**: Village level local government structures

• **Human Gorilla Conflict Force (HUGO)**: Voluntary groups who work with park authorities collecting crop raiding data and helping community to chase out forest animals from community lands

HUGO and RUCs were randomly selected using rand function in Excel from the list provided by ITFC. The full list of LC1 and stretcher groups were not available, so the information was collected in the field with the help of LC2 chairmen for each parish and then random selection were applied to chose from the list. Because electricity was not available in the field, random selection was done manually so that each stretcher group and LC1 was given a number, each number was written on a piece of paper, and one piece of paper was taken out of a hat. The total of 19 Focus Group Discussions (FGD) was conducted. 4 LC1 and 5 in each of the other groups.

### 3-2-2 Questions and pilot

The questions were written based on our objectives to explore community’s definition and experience of different aspects of governance including ownership and involvement in ICD projects (Appendix 4). It consisted of three sections. Part one, to explore the meaning of involvement and ownership by local communities; Part two, to explore local communities experience and perceptions of ICD management and governance; Part three, A structured set of questions that explored trade-offs between different components of a hypothetical ICD, based on an economic choice experiment (Olsen 2009) to explore what level of participation communities perceive as an effective strategy. The questions were reviewed by my supervisors from Imperial, IIED and ITFC research staff, and then refined in accordance with their feedback. The questions were piloted in a group of 8 respondents including ITFC field staff and villagers in Mushanje parish.
3-1-4 FGD procedure

For each parish we would conduct a meeting with chairman LC2 (Parish level local government representative), for a brief description of the project and getting help to getting the list of stretcher groups and LC1s and their contact details, then we applied random selection and informed the selected chairpersons. For each group discussion we asked for the invitation of 6-8 members and we emphasised they would be selected from different groups (age, gender, livelihood, social, wealth groups) to be representative of the whole community. Participants were informed at least 24 hours before the meeting and would set a time to meet each group on a certain date.

All of the FGDs were done by myself and one field assistant from ITFC.

All groups were given a brief introduction of the project objectives and the purpose of the discussion. The discussion sessions were recorded as well as making notes throughout the session. The group were informed and were asked for the permission before start the recording. All participants were given a small amount of money as travel allowance in accordance with ITFC’s procedures.

The data were then coded for qualitative analysis. Only part two and three were analysed in this thesis. The results of choice experiment were scored based on participants’ ranks.
4- Results

4-1 Demography of respondents

During the field work we found that there are 18 people who have not received their card and therefore their reason of inactivity was not losing interest (Figure 5).

According to our definition of activity, most respondents were active resource users (57%). There were 22% of respondents who had cards but had not been to the forest in the last year (i.e. inactive) and 16% who had been registered by UWA but never received a card. The remaining five respondents had not received their cards but they claimed to be going illegally to the forest either without card or with others’ card (n=107) (Figure 6).

Out of 107 respondents, 75% were male, and the majority were in the 21-40 age group (Figure 7). Considering that 28% of the whole list of ARUs are female (n=634), this ratio was representative.
Figure 6 - Distribution of respondents within 4 groups
(The numbers above each bar are the actual numbers)

Figure 7 - Distribution of respondents within different age groups

Most survey respondents were in frontline parishes that bordered the national park, although 3 respondents were in a secondary tier parish (Figure 8).
Figure 8 - The proportion on different respondent groups in each parish
4-2 Factors affecting people’s chance to receive the card

4-2-1 Wealth

Using basic necessity score as an indicator of wealth, there was a significant association between having card and basic necessity score (Mann–Whitney–Wilcoxon test; \( W = 682.5 \), p-value = 0.02804, n=107) Which means wealthier people are more likely to have a card. Although there is a significant correlation between basic necessity score and household wealth score based of the CTPA database (Kendall’s test; \( \tau = 0.128 \), p=0.009, n=248), the association between wealth score and having card was not significant (Figure 9).

![Figure 9 - The difference in household wealth score between two groups](image)

(0=No card, 1=Have card)

4-2-2 Holding a position in the community

There were three categories of positions in the community given by survey respondents, which comprised religious positions, local government and being a member of a village committee. I used general linear model for binomial data and there was a significant relationship between holding position and having a card (p value = 0.0329, n=107). Including basic necessity score as the second explanatory variable in the model, there was still a
significant relationship between having card and the two explanatory variables (p value = 0.0344, n=107). Therefore, survey respondents with a position in the community were more likely to have been registered by UWA and received an identity card than villagers with no position in their community.

Holding a position in the community showed a significant relationship with household wealth score (Mann–Whitney–Wilcoxon test; W = 646.5, p-value = 0.004396, n=248), indicating that wealthier members of the community have received their MUP card and were able to collect forest resources, and that poorer members of the community had not received a card and were unable to collect forest resources.

4-2-3 Involvement in designing and implementing MUP
There was a significant relationship between higher involvement score and having card (X-squared = 8.0821, df = 3, p-value = 0.04435, n=107), which suggests that people who have joined and been involved since the beginning of the project have had more chance of receiving cards.

4-2-4 Age groups
There was a significant association between age groups and having a card (X-squared = 7.9759, df = 2, p-value = 0.01854, n=107). The higher proportion of people who are between 41-60 are holding cards comparing to other age groups. (Figure 10)

![Figure 10 - Distribution of card holders within different age groups](image-url)
4-3 Factors affecting people’s activity status

The only factor that predicted activity status among card holders (n=85), was total number of people in the household (p value=0.0213) Using general linear model for binomial data. Active people have a larger family size (mean=7.36) compared to inactive people (mean=5.41).

4-4 Reasons for inactivity and discouragement

4-4-1 The expectations were not met

4-4-1-1 Insufficient resources

54% of all respondents claimed that the resources they are getting are not enough (n=107), either for household use, or to sell and make benefit. They mentioned various reasons for not getting enough resources depending on which resource they are allowed.

No.43, Female, Active weaver: “Sometimes we can not get enough resources and at the end of the year we can not weave anything”

No.76, Female, Active weaver: “There are not enough resources for people to make profit. We go once a year. Sometimes what you have brought is enough for only one mat or less and the energy you put is not equivalent to what you get.”

4-4-1-2 Insufficient income

20% of respondents (21 people) mentioned that they have been busy doing something else which is more important or more beneficial for them.

No.14, Male, Inactive herbalist: “I had a lot of engagements. Personally other activities I joined, outweighed MUP”

No.66, Male, Inactive beekeeper: “Pit sawing income is higher than honey. It is hard to get 20000 at once from honey, but I get it from pit sawing.”
4-4-1-3 Marketing issues

9 people (8.4%) mentioned that they have no market for their products.

No.45, Female, Inactive herbalist: “I registered because I thought people would come to me for medicine but no one came, so I ignored it.”

No.86, Female, Inactive weaver: “we have no market for our products. We have the trainings, the skills, and have made a lot of products, but failed to sell them.”

4-4-1-4 Other expectations

8 people (7.4%) mentioned that they had other expectations including other resources, free materials and help from park, job or just having the opportunity to hold the card.

No. 108, Male, Inactive herbalist: “They said they would allow only those with IDs, that’s why I registered.”

No.57, Male, Active beekeeper: “different people had different expectations at the time of registration. Some thought they could get some land or some other resource. These people were withdrawn and lost interest and lost in MUP”

No 34, Female, Inactive weaver: “The aim of joining was to get some money and free stuff like cooking utensils. I thought they would fund us, give us money and domestic animals.”

4-4-2 Governance and implementation issues

4-4-2-1 Card issuing problems

22 respondents (20%) claimed that they did not have ID cards. They either never received it (n=17), or their cards were not renewed (n=5). However their names were still in the list of authorized resource users from UWA.

No. 18, Male, No card weaver: “I never received the card. I want to be active. I asked the chairman, the answer was that our names are among the ones who have received their
cards. I was left in confusion if he had used another name. Any person would use my name to harvest when I'm not aware.”

4-4-2-2 Communication problems
17 people (16%) mentioned human and distance related communication problems with MUP leaders.

No.35, Female, Inactive weaver: “From the time of registration, I didn’t go to the forest because they didn’t come back to give instructions and trainings. They didn’t come back to tell us anything after registration, I am still waiting.”

No.30, Female, No card Herbalist: “I wasn’t staying close to people who are in MUP. That’s why I think I was not considered. I would miss the meetings because no one would inform me.”

4-4-2-3 MUP leaders’ corruption
9 people (8.4%) blamed MUP leaders’ corruption as a reason of their inactivity.

No32, Male, No card weaver: “Currently I don’t have enough money to help me to get to MUP again. The chairman would always get money from us to go to the meetings and I could not afford it. That’s why I am not active anymore.”

4-4-2-4 Administrative issues
7 people (6.5%) mentioned that they either never registered themselves (n=4) or registered for other resources (n=3), However their names were in the list of ARUs.

No.36, Female, No card weaver: “I never knew my name is in MUP….I don’t know if there are any group of people authorized to go to the park.”
No.40, Male, Inactive beekeeper: “If they had selected me among the people who go to the forest to harvest other resources I would go, but not for beekeeping as I don’t have enough beehives....In one of the meetings, I attended and they recorded my name, but not for beekeeping, only for bamboo harvest and I have never heard that bamboo harvest allowed yet.”

No 6, Male, Active herbalist: “They interchanged us. The ones who registered as herbalist were allowed to harvest weaving materials and etc. So it confused us.”

4-4-3 Other reasons of inactivity
14 respondents (13%) mentioned health problems or age as the reason of their inactivity. Figure 11 summarizes the reasons of discouragement.

4-5 MUP values
20 people (18.7%) mentioned that they value the project because it helps to protect the forest which brings different sorts of benefits to the communities, promotes sustainable use and preserves the forest for future generation.
No98, Male, Active weaver: “MUP is good because they have thought us using the resources sustainably so that younger generation can also benefit”

No12, Male, Active weaver: “I appreciate the work of park, because with Park's money, we now have school and health centre which has made life much easier that without park was not possible.”

The most frequent direct values of MUP which was mentioned by respondents were:

4-5-1 Economic values
Mentioned by 91 respondents (85%) that they either get some money –although very little sometimes- or could get money if they had a chance to be active.

No107, Male, Active weaver: “I have achieved what I wanted. We are getting the resources; I have even got the income I expect. I sell trays for 5000 and baskets for 4000. On average if you get all the resources, you can make 8-10 products.”

However 4 respondents claimed that they have not benefitted and the programme is of no value.

No104, Male, Active weaver: “All people are losing out because what we were given is not really what we wanted. Like timber, meat, firewood and building materials.”

4-5-2 Resource and product access
90 respondents (84%) mentioned that MUP is important because it lets them access valuable resources from the forest.

No15, Male, active herbalist/weaver: “MUP is giving us the resources which we were going to miss if the programme was not established ....If they close the project, people would suffer and the products are needed there is no way to get them from communities.”

Among all respondents 3 people claimed that the resources are important for them and they are going to the forest illegally to harvest them.
No.92, Male, Active herbalist: “we never benefited as we wanted, so it is not worth it, because of limitations in harvest season and resources and zones. So as we are neighbours we always go illegally and take what we want”

4-5-3 Social values
29 respondents (27%) mentioned social values of MUP including getting popularity among the community and being part of a group

No9, Male, Active herbalist: “has gained very many friends when I heal their family. Now I am famous and prominent man in my village.”

No22, Male, Inactive weaver: “It merges different people from different villages and that is very important because you get to learn a lot of things from them.”

4-5-4 Cultural values

Very few respondents (9; 8.4%) mentioned the cultural value of MUP.

No.8, Male, Active herbalist: “Project is helping everyone around. If they stop it, the skills will die. I want to continue the skills even in next generations.”

Figure 12 summarizes the values of MUP mentioned by ARUs.
4-6 MUP rules

61 respondents (57%) admitted that they are happy with MUP rules especially being escorted by rangers, because of four primary reasons:

- It guarantees security
- Helps to protect park
- Reduces illegal activity
- In case of any illegal activity they will not be blamed

No.12, Male, Active weaver: “When we go there with rangers and armed men, it is a kind of protection. So if someone missed, they look for them and find them. Also if they go alone, people would do what makes them happy and destroy the forest.”

However 44 respondents (41%) mentioned the disadvantages associated with rules including:

- Limited harvest seasons
- Limited harvest zones
- Limited harvest time
- Difficulties arranging with rangers
- No provision for people who lose the harvest day
Limited allowed resources

No.14, Male, Inactive herbalist: “Season of harvesting was not enough. During harvesting, some people would propose the time to rangers but rangers were not available. In case some ARU was sick, would miss and no one else were allowed to go instead of him.”

4-7 Ownership

29 respondents (27%) mentioned that they have no sense of ownership for MUP.

No.39, Male, Active weaver: “The park people didn’t give the chance to get what we wanted and my participation couldn’t influence the meeting and decision of the park. We don’t participate in any rules and regulations, so ownership is all by park”

However, 34 respondents (31%) claimed that they feel of ownership of MUP.

No.17, Female, Active weaver: “We love it very much and I don’t want ever to leave it. Maybe if I grow old. But now I don’t want to leave it. And they teach us to encourage our children to love MUP so after we die, they continue with it.”

4-8 ICD ownership and Involvement experience of local communities

9 out of 11 groups mentioned that the best management option would be collaborative decision making and implementation which involves all stakeholders throughout the project. However, the majority of the groups claimed that they are not considered in the decision making, they are only informed and most of the times even the implementation is not what they have been told.

No community group felt that they had been able to influence the decision making or complain about the implementation, because they either don’t know where to go or there is no proper feedback system in place.

“The same people who are implementing the projects are the ones we should report to. So nothing has changed.”
4-9 Participation preferences

The results from focus group discussions showed that the communities prefer all of them to be involved in decision making about which project they want to be implemented (Table 4). Communities also prefer to be involved in the implementation by doing collaborative work with donors (Table 5).
Table 4- The summary of participation preferences related to the revenue sharing project selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project selection</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A                 | External Organization | - They do not know communities priorities  
- They do not implement the right choice (i.e. wrong breed of goat) | 0 |
| B                 | Local government | - They are selected among the entire village and can easily identify community’s problems.  
- They are part of the community. They know everyone in the village  
- There could be some disagreements on LC1 choices.  
- They are corrupted  
- Distribution of LCs are not like neighbours of the forest.  
- Not evenly distributed among the whole community  
- LCs are very selfish | 3 |
| C                 | Community leaders (Stretcher groups) | - Are selected by community, every month they have meetings, if they make mistakes they fail to be selected again.  
- They make decisions in community meetings,  
- They do things in a more transparent way  
- More than one stretcher group in one village, they can not easily agree on one thing.  
- They can be corrupt | 3 |
| D                 | Selected group | - They capable people who are selected from entire community.  
- Can communicate with the donors effectively  
- They can be corrupted  
- No need of making another group  
- Who should you select? Is affected by where the majority lives | 5 |
| E                 | Voting | - Everyone votes and respect the majority Idea  
- In case the project fails, all take responsibility and there is no one to be blamed  
- Brings chaos and conflicts if the decision doesn’t satisfy everyone.  
- Things can go one side if one community has more members | 23 |
Table 5 - The summary of participation preferences related to the revenue sharing implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A External Organization | -They should monitor and evaluate the project  
-Can find contractors in case of construction  
-It is the only one with no chance of corruption and has worked (i.e. CARE)  
The money would not taxed and reduced passing through local government  
-They can implement the selected project with no corruption | -They might not be from the area, can not monitor and do the right thing.  
-They are not always in the area to assist when necessary  
-They don’t know the right beneficiaries | 7 |
| B Local government | -If they implement what community has already agreed on, they can do it as a team  
-LC is the government arm and can not be neglected  
-They know everyone in the village | -They are corrupted  
-They pay themselves and benefit their relatives  
-They are few scattered members | 1 |
| C Community leaders (Stretcher groups) | -They are more trustworthy and can distribute benefits among the members fairly  
-They have tight rules and punishment in place.  
-If have representatives from all stretcher groups is a uniform representation.  
-Even LCs are members | -More than one stretcher group in each village, and one can be in more than one LC1 which makes it hard to distribute benefits.  
-Can be easily corrupted  
-Can bring segregations along clans and tribes.  
-Some members are not from the area  
-If they are not beneficiaries themselves, they do not care about the quality of implementation | 7 |
| D Selected group | -No problem comes in with this group  
-Each sector of the community have a representative  
-They should work effectively otherwise they won’t be selected next year  
-If they are selected from different stretcher groups and get the ideas from people before meetings | -Some groups won’t be considered | 15 |
| A+D | -Group can ensure org for the improvement of the project,  
-Community can not implement alone  
-Collaboration can assure the success of project implementation | | 21 |
| B+D | | | 6 |
| A+B+C | | | 6 |
| A+B | | | 3 |
| A+C | | | 3 |
5- Discussion

For collaborative governance of ICD projects we can define three main functional pillars (Borrini-Feyerabend 2012):

- Body in charge of developing technical proposals
- Decision making body
- Body in charge of implementation

It is important to find out the mechanisms of how each of these three groups work, who takes the responsibility, and how they relate and communicate to each other (Figure 13). One organization can have the authority, but it is required to consult with other stakeholders and rightholders and involve them in the process. The question is how and to what extent?

Figure 13 – An example of a collaborative management influenced by a collaborative governance (Borrini-Feyerabend 2012)
Some governance issues can be associated with different parts of the above cycle which can affect the success of ICD projects. According to the results from focus group discussions of this research, local communities neighbouring Bwindi believe that the governance of ICD projects is lacking key elements that have resulted in their lack of a sense of ownership and, consequently, they perceive projects as unsuccessful. There were some key elements that local communities perceived were lacking.

5-1 Who is going to benefit?
ICD aims to benefit the poorest members of the community, but my results showed that wealthier community members and those with more connections have had more opportunities to benefit from ICD projects. This supports Blomely et al. (2010) findings. With MUP, wealthier and well connected people have had more chance to receive their cards and therefore to be active in the programme. Furthermore the MUP registration process tended to target more males than females and, as the majority of people with cards were aged between 41-60, is without old and young members of the community. There is also an issue of corruption that can be related to transparency of authorities or implementers of the projects. Community members lack trust to the leaders of the projects and, because of this, they feel that this corruption does not allow them to get an equitable share of benefits. However it is interesting that this lack of trust is mostly related to local government while the Park has been relatively successful in obtaining the trust of local communities compared with local government. This can be used as a good foundation for improving the attitudes of local communities.

5-2 Involvement and sense of ownership
Sense of ownership of ICD projects is one of the essential factors that can guarantee the sustainability of the project. It has three main characteristics (Lachapelle 2008):

- Ownership of a process (Having a voice and the voice is heard)
- Ownership of an outcome (Having influence over decisions)
- Distribution of the sense of ownership (Range of people who are affected by the process and outcome)
The findings of my study show a strong link between the amount of involvement in the project planning and sense of ownership of the project, accordingly considering it as successful. The more that people are involved with project planning, the more ownership they feel of a project. As an example, Mpungu RUC, who were involved in MUP from the pilot stage and participated in the designing of the project, had the highest sense of ownership, the best attitude toward MUP and valued park more when compared with RUCs from the four other parishes. As a result, it is clear that effective participation can lead to a higher sense of ownership, which is critical for long-term ICD success.

Communities defined involvement as a process which starts from decision making to implementation and monitoring, but their main emphasis was in participating in the act of choosing a project and decision making about how it is going to be implemented. They believe that if they want a project themselves and be clear about available funds, they are able to implement and monitor it locally. There was a significant difference between communities’ attitudes toward ICD projects when they themselves had decided about what they wanted, started the process and applied for the funds later and those who were given a project without consultation. However they mentioned that they can best function in collaboration with external organizations who have the knowledge, otherwise they would not know how to do it alone or they would make mistakes. This clearly supports Barber’s idea about the link between knowledge and power (Barber 1984):

“Give people some significant power and they will quickly appreciate the need for knowledge, but foist knowledge upon them without giving them responsibility and they will display only indifference. ...people are apathetic because they are powerless, not powerless because they are apathetic.”

However the majority of the population of this study claimed that they had not been able to influence the decisions because they either did not know how to do it or they believed that they could not change the policies. This supports Namara (2006) who mentioned that people around the Park are given the answer that this is a rule by the government and only parliament can change it and rural communities know that changing a rule by Parliament would take a long time. People also mentioned that even when they have
given suggestions or complained about the failure of the projects, in most of the cases they were not listened to. This supports the finding of Tumusiime and Svarstad (2011) that local communities are not able to influence the decisions.

According to local people, most of the projects are not participatory and implementers never ask them what they need. They also express that the project is discussed at sub-county level so several villagers are not part of the decision making process. This supports Baker et al. (2013) who, in a governance study on Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust (BMCT), found that while successes had been achieved, the project identification stage at the local village level had not been achieved.

5-3 Communication and information flow
Baker et al. (2013) reported that while BMCT had successfully achieved a great deal of success in implementing ICD projects, there was an issue with communication and information flow in ICD projects. My study also shows that there are communication limitations in many ICD projects including MUP. This can affect the success of ICD projects in different ways. For example in MUP, people who have more connections due to their position in the community have a better opportunity to receive their cards and to be active, whereas people who live far from other resource users have less chance to be informed about meetings and other activities. Therefore, not everyone is benefiting equitably. Miscommunication can also lead to false expectations. For instance, people who had expected other things rather than the allowed resources (for example household utensils, livestock, log for beehives or bamboo) were registered but later withdrew themselves because their expectations were not met. However some of these issues could have been solved at the time of registration. This problem raises more when management is done in larger scales, such as at parish (which includes several villages) or sub county (which includes several parishes) level. In this case, representatives fail to have regular meetings, fulfil their responsibilities (i.e. RUCs), pass information, or/and communicate directly to local villages that leads to the missing out of people (Bitariho 2013, Baker et al. 2013).
The RUCs seem not to be well managed and well governed and therefore they are not playing their role of linking UWA to resource users properly (Bitariho 2013). This has led to lack of transparency and therefore has increased the probability of corruption among committee members by the resource users who fail to communicate to RUCs. However local communities have well organized and well governed village level administrative structures of stretcher groups which are very successful in managing community projects, having regular meetings, and applying strict rules. According to local communities, they have successfully implemented community projects like road construction that all community members participated in.

According to Bitariho (2013), the reason why UWA does not consider the stretcher groups as functional units for ICD projects is because these groups are numerous and therefore hard to monitor. However according to local communities, UWA currently fails to monitor the implementation of projects, because they are implemented locally but monitored in higher scales, so UWA does not obtain information from the actual implementation at the village level.

Lacking an efficient feedback system from UWA to local communities is another important governance issue which was clear in all ICD projects. For example in MUP, people did not know where to ask for their cards. Also in other ICD projects people either did not know where to go, or said that it was hard for them to communicate with the right people to get feedbacks and express their ideas.

5-4 Administration issues

There has been several administration issues that have made people feel that the Park has forgotten them in the recent years and has abandoned MUP. Most of the cards were issued during 1990s and, in recent years, people reported that UWA has not issued the new cards. This could be a reason why most card holders are within a certain age group.

The list of resource users that UWA has was found to be out-of-date, which can be the result of miscommunication with local communities. There are also people who have valid cards but their names are not on the UWA list and this makes the situation more complicated to manage.
Most of the local representatives are chosen for a certain amount of time, but then the re-election has failed to happen and they have remained in their post for a long time, which can cause bias in choosing beneficiaries and lead to corruption (Baker et al 2013). The results of my study support this finding given the fact that local communities have mentioned that the action committee for each ICD should be re-elected every year otherwise they would all get corrupted even if they are among most trusted people (Stretcher groups leaders).

5- 5 Values of the project by local communities

Although some people mentioned that what they wanted was not given to them in MUP, for example log for beehives and bamboo, most value the programme and the resources that they do obtain. Furthermore, even those who never received an identity card had a positive attitude towards MUP, as they stated that they would recommend MUP because it benefits the community. A few people admitted that they obtain resources illegally, which shows that accessing forest resources is valuable for communities around the Park. However without benefitting enough from the project, people would lose interest. Many respondents mentioned that the resources they get are not enough either for their own use or for selling. Considering the high population of the area and limited number of ARUs, we can argue that the resources do not fulfil the community demands, which is one of the conditions mentioned in Blomley et al (2010) conceptual model of MUP (Figure 1).

Very few people mentioned the cultural values of the resources compared to economic importance and resource access. This indicates that people are looking for tangible benefits to improve their livelihood either by getting the materials for free or by selling the products. If they do not obtain the resources, they tend to lack interest and therefore quit participating in MUP project (Bitariho 2013).
6- Limitations of the study

A challenge to social research is that the research process (including the research topic and interviewers) can influence the results because both are the similar forms of human relationships (Drury 2011). Unfortunately I was not able to hire one field assistant and worked with 3 different field assistants due to their availability, and this could have an effect on the process of data collection. Although my approach was to make sure that all field assistants asked questions in the same way, assistants’ personalities and experiences would clearly influence the responses and it is better to avoid working with more than one assistant.

Furthermore the ethnicity of interviewers has an impact on the responses they get. I noticed that, as a white student from abroad, respondents would mention school education as a basic necessity more frequently, comparing to the CTPA survey which were using local interviewers. Also the objectives of the project, which were explained at the beginning of interview, could affect people’s responses to some questions. Several people mentioned MUP as their source of income. They also mentioned MUP frequently among the meetings they have attended, but this frequency was very low in the similar questions in CTPA study. I had an opportunity to compare one specific respondent’s answers to similar questions in CTPA and MUP surveys and found several miss matches which raises the concern on how we can reduce these kinds of human related biases in social studies. However, some of them are inevitable due to the complexity of human relationships and the observer’s influence. The best way to minimize these sorts of biases is to use indirect observational approaches.

7- Recommendations

There should be capacity building programmes to enable local communities to develop ICD project proposals in small scales of village and parish levels.

Offtake of resources in MUP should be increased by a sustainable amount to encourage local communities to participate in the projects. People want MUP and recommend it. So it is recommended to replace inactive members with people who are eager to join.
Communities should be given voice and responsibility in the monitoring and implementation of various ICD projects. This can be achieved by capacity building and by working together closely with external organizations.

Ensure that community representatives are re-elected on time to reduce the chance of corruption.

It is recommended to give stretcher groups support, training and funding to empower them for taking responsibilities to facilitate ICD at the local level. Their good governance structure and the level of local communities trust on them, ensure the success and sustainability of ICD projects.

Before implementing a project the final decisions should be clearly discussed in general meetings and responsibilities shared considering local communities participation and making sure a good monitoring and feedback session is in place and easily accessible by local communities
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1  Semi structured questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: __________</th>
<th>Interview Ref # ________________</th>
<th>GPS Northing ________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer names: ____________________________</td>
<td>Easting ________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent type: (circle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive ARU Active ARU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe household location: LC1: ____________________________ Parish: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density of neighbours nearby: (circle)</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>few/some</th>
<th>many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main type of surrounding land: (circle)</td>
<td>farmland</td>
<td>forest</td>
<td>village/centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest village/trading centre (circle)</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest road for vehicle use (circle)</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basic information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1- Interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Name</strong> (optional) ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Gender</strong> (circle) Male/Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Age</strong> (circle) +60 41-60 21-40 Below 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Ethnicity</strong> (circle) Bakiga Batwa other ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 What is your position in the community?</strong> ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 How long have you lived in this village?</strong> (circle) &lt;5 years 5-10 years &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.6 Have you ever been interviewed before?</strong> (circle) Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 What is your level of education?</strong> ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2- Homestead information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 What is your marital status? (tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Married If married,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Single (never married) Number of wives ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Co-habiting Number of households ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Widow/er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Divorced and separated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 How many people currently live in your household (including person being interviewed)?

2.3 Of whom how many of them are your children? ________________

2.4 Do you have any children that have left home? YES/NO. If yes (number): ________

3. Livelihood

3.1 List the current 3 most important income-generating activities to your household (most important first) - such as farming, livestock, tourism-related activities, forest resource utilization, village market sales etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income-generating activity</th>
<th>Who in household does this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 What was your main source of income at the time of joining MUP?

Discuss the reason of change if different:

4. Basic Necessity Survey

4.1 Show respondents the cards:
   a. Which of these items do you think are basic necessities - things that everyone should be able to have and no one should have to go without? (tick boxes below)

4.2 Show respondents the cards again:
   b. Which of these items does your household currently have? (tick boxes below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Basic necessity items</th>
<th>Items household has</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stove (three stone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built latrine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water source within one hour walk from household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-meat food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road for vehicle use within one hour walk from household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion points:

5. Wellbeing

5.1 If 1 is the worst and 5 the best, what number best represents your life at the moment? (circle) 1 = worst; 2 = somewhat bad; 3 = average; 4 = fine; 5 = best

5.2 Discuss reasons for score with links to natural resources if appropriate (for example, they need household building materials or fuelwood)

Engage the respondent in discussion about their goals, desires and ambitions for their future.

5.3 What are your main aspirations in life?
6. MUP Project

6.1 When did you join MUP?

6.2 (For inactive members) how long ago did you start losing interest in accessing the Forest resources?

6.3 In which resource/zone MUP are/were you allowed?

6.4 Are any other family member/s an ARU? YES/NO. If yes (resource/zone): __________

6.5 How often are/were you allowed going to the forest, and what rules do/did you need to follow? (Discuss if they think it is convenient)

6.6 In what ways do these different people benefit or lose in MUP? (Hints: Economic, Cultural, Local/tourist Income, Social acceptance, etc)

Yourself

Family

Resource User group (society)

Village

Other(name)

6.7 to 6.9 For inactive members:

6.7 Discuss all the benefits and costs they have mentioned above and how they relate to their decision not to be active?
6.8 Are there any other reasons for not being active anymore?

6.9 Do you still obtain the resource? Yes/No (If yes discuss the possible sources)

6-10 How long ago did you last go to the forest?

7. Perception

7.1 How are people first chosen to participate in MUP? (Discuss if they think it is convenient and fair)

7.2 How can you best describe current MUP management using these categories? (Choose from the cards) Card No: .........

1. External people make the decisions and implement the policies
2. Eternal people make the decisions and discuss with local communities for implementation
3. External people discuss with local for decision making and implementation
4. Collaborative decision making and implementation by local community
5. Collaborative decision making and implement done by local communities
6. Local communities make the decisions and implement the projects

7.3 Which one is the best option? Card No: .......... Discuss:

7.4 What were your expectations about the MUP when you first joined?
7.5 What are your current perceptions of MUP?

7.6 Were you involved in designing and implementing of MUP?
1) A lot  2) Some  3) A little  4) None

7.7 What level of ownership of MUP did you feel?
1) A lot  2) Some  3) A little  4) None

Discussion points:

7.8 Do you recommend it to people to become MUP member? (circle) Yes  No

Discuss:

7.9 If you could write some guidelines for MUP to improve it, what would you include?

8. Governance

8.1 Have you attended any National Park meetings? (circle) Y / N If yes:

What kind of meeting? 

Who held the meeting (no prompts)?
How was the meeting conducted? (circle)

I was....... excluded somewhat involved fully involved

Discuss with guiding questions:

Were there opportunities to ask questions and express their views? Did they feel listened to? Were the meetings too short / long? Cover everything they wanted? Was the purpose of the meeting clear and was this achieved?

9. Interview close

9.1 Any comments or questions on anything that we have discussed?
Appendix 2  CTPA description of key terms

Conservation Through Poverty Alleviation Research Phase

Governance questions – Description overview

May, 2013

This overview of the methods is to help the field research team to have a unison way of asking questions. It is intended as a guide to the field team to have the same way of interpreting governance questions. Concepts such as involvement, ownership, participation and wellbeing are hereby described in the context of this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>Operational definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>High attendance of meetings by members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very active in asking questions during the meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An excellent representation of all sectors of their communities from the wealthy/educated to the poor/marginalised and of different resource user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The group was proactive in the activities with the invitee e.g UWA or Conservation partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members were listened to and their views were taken up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members got feedback of their questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A follow up of decisions taken after the meeting/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Modest/average attendance of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The members were moderately active in the meetings but got a few feedbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The members were a reasonable representation of all sectors of their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of some achievements in terms of decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Invitation was extremely biased to only be a select representation of its community. Not invited for the meeting but accidentally found it taking place and attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not attend the meeting to the end because of very limited concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very limited or no decisions taken or reached by the invitees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very limited follow up of meeting outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/excluded</td>
<td>No attendance of meetings or activities or attendance but not allowing you to contribute anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Views not completely listened to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No decisions taken up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not see any benefits from the meeting/s at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Much care and maintenance for ICD projects established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong stewardship for the ICD projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving projects from their initial state-Adding value to the projects established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability of ICD projects even when the implementers are no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
longer having a hand
A great feeling of something belonging to me
A strong zeal to report any disaster or catastrophe e.g fire outbreak

Some
A feeling that a project is shared between the beneficiary and the implementers-50/50
Modest care for ICD projects- e.g i can save the forest from fire but move slow
Some level of stewardship but not much
Some ability to report any bad doing or disaster e.g fire outbreak

A little
A little feeling that a project does belong to me
A little care and maintenance for ICD projects
Little concern for the established projects and may not move it forward

None
Completely no care and maintenance of ICD projects- examples would be; not contributing to broken services (water taps), expecting an organization to pay for something given to the community
A feeling that a project belongs to someone else not me e.g making repairs etc
Completely no concern to report any disaster or bad happening e.g fire outbreak, breakages etc
No project sustainability

**Participation.** It is good to measure what people themselves think, but then to also understand ourselves what they mean. Below is a description of participation levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Excluded</strong></th>
<th><strong>Somewhat involved</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fully involved</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invite members of the community, but when they reach there, UWA doesn’t allow them to ask questions, or provide any answers—thus they don’t respect your presence in the meeting. Sometimes people might not be invited for the meetings or any other activities</td>
<td>Come, but only allowed to ask one or two questions out of the 5 that you wanted to ask. Where UWA keeps the time short and doesn’t allow all the answers to be expressed</td>
<td>Invited prior and express your views, ask questions Feedback given to the concerns or questions UWA or conservation organisations follow up on the concerns raised by people and are fulfilled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wellbeing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Worst</strong></th>
<th><strong>Somewhat bad</strong></th>
<th><strong>Average</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fine</strong></th>
<th><strong>Best</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The lowest level of socio-economic status e.g no basic necessities of life and no income</td>
<td>Can meet some of the basic needs of life but conditions</td>
<td>50/50 conditions of life (Not bad, not good). Can afford to</td>
<td>Can meet both basic needs and most of the perceived needs. Lives a</td>
<td>A very good social and economic lifestyle. Can meet all needs (basic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source. This person lives on the mercies of other people e.g. squatters or a destitute</td>
<td>of life still bad. He/she still lacks the capacity to meet all his needs and his/her income sources are limited</td>
<td>meet basic needs but cannot meet all perceived needs of life. He/she still hopes to get a good life.</td>
<td>good life e.g. can take children to good schools, can get enough food for the family, has stable friends etc.</td>
<td>perceived) eg can take children to expensive schools for excellent education, can eat any food the household needs, has great friends and high level of social networks from relatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3  Socio economic profile data sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of H/H</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Water tank (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Gated/fenced (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation Socioeconomic Data Form for Resource Users

- **Village:**
- **H/H:**
- **Parish:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Kitchen (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Latrine (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Roof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water tank (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Gated/fenced (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4  Focus Group Discussion questions

Aim of the discussion:

A- Perception Questions

“Ownership”

1- What does it mean when you say “something belongs to someone”? How do you describe the meaning of “Ownership”/“Belonging”?

(After talking to my translator to define the meaning in local language, I will start with belonging and then move on to ownership. I will use ‘belonging’ when talking about the forest and use ‘ownership’ when discussing ICD projects; exploring ownership of ICD is the focus of FGD; I will start with these questions on belonging, as a good ‘warm up’ then most of the discussions will be on ownership of ICD and how local people are involved in the ICD decision-making process)

Guiding and basic questions like:

- What will you do if someone tries to do harm to things that belong to you?
- How do you take care of what belongs to you?
- What do you consider when using it?(i.e. sustainability)
- What will you do if someone tries to do harm to things that belong to you?
- How do you describe forest resources belonging to someone or some group?
- Who does the forest belong to currently?
- Has this belonging changed over time for different groups of people?
- If so, why?
- Is there anyone or any group who the forest definitely doesn't belong to?
- If yes, why?
- Do you think who the national park belongs to is right and proper, now, and if not why not.
- Do you feel that you belong to the region? To the forest? To the park? Why/why not?
- Is there a difference between owning something and it belonging to you?
- What will you do if someone tries to do harm to things that belonging to you?
- How do you take care of what you own?
- What do you consider when using it?(i.e. sustainability)
- Is there any difference between something owned by your community and something owned by you?

2- Does your community feel ownership of ICD projects? (The specific project will be chosen to discuss before the FGD depending on who is contributing and what they do)

- Yes: What does the community do as one of the owners of ICD projects?
- No: Why you do think the community does not consider itself as one of the owners of ICD projects?
- Is this ownership different between different groups of your community? How?
- How do you think things can change to improve the current situation for your community to feel ownership of the ICD?

“Involvement”

3- When do you feel that you are fully involved in decision making?

❖ Is your community involved in the management of forest resources? (LC1 Village system)
  - Yes: What does your community do to get involved with management decisions?
    In what ways have you affected the management of forest resources?
  - No: Has your community ever tried to influence the management decisions? Why do you think it was successful or unsuccessful?

❖ Is your community involved in the design and implementation of ICD?
  - Yes: What does your community do to get involved with management decisions?
    In what ways have you affected ICD (and which ICDs?)?
  - No: Has your community ever tried to influence the management decisions? How? Why do you think it was successful or unsuccessful?

“Participation”

4- In what ways could your community participate in forest resource management?

- In what ways could your community participate in ICD projects?

5- Where do you feel you sit on this spectrum: (Discuss the details) (Using cards)

  • External people make the decisions and implement the policies
  • Eternal people make the decisions and discuss with local communities for implementation
  • External people discuss with local for decision making and implementation
  • Collaborative decision making and implementation by local community
  • Collaborative decision making, then the implementation is done by local communities
  • Local communities make the decisions and implement the projects

6- How does your community participate in MUP?

  • Yes: How are people chosen? How has it affected people’s attitude towards park management? Do other people want to participate? What are the reasons that prevent/discourage people from getting involved in MUP
  • No: Do people want to participate? What are the reasons that prevents/discourages people from getting involved in MUP?

B- Participation Preferences

(This is performed as an activity. The advantages/disadvantages of each option are discussed)
A number of ICD projects are going to be implemented in a community. There are some options for each stage of project. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each option, and the one you prefer. You can add a new option which you think is the best.

1- Implementing a goat project in your village

Project outlines: Choosing a breed of goat; then giving some families two goats each. When these goats have their young, the young goats will be passed on to other members of the village who will also pass on their first offspring.

Options:
- Project management and decision makings is done by an external organization or Community (Discuss if there is an optimum external/internal management combination using the spectrum in question 3, and the rights and responsibilities that each option will provide)
- The goats are sourced from local community or outsourced

2- Allocating some funds from revenue sharing programme for conservation and development projects

Outline: Some funding is available to spend on a community development project. The money is given to the relevant authorities and the decision is made on how to spend the money.

Options:
- The money is spent by the donor organization/local government or it is spent by the community leaders or to a group selected by community
- The decision on how the money is to be used is made by the donor organization/local government/community leaders/a group selected by community/voting among all local people
- The donor organization/local government/community leaders/a group selected by community are the ones to manage the process of implementing the project

3- Implementing some strategies to control crop raid in your area

Outline: Due to recent crop raiding incidents, a solution is required to reduce the damage and loss occurring by animals. An NGO is going to help to implement a crop damage control programme. There are different strategies available for implementation.

Options:
- The implementation strategy will be chosen by NGO/local community/collaboration between NGO and local community leaders/specific people whose crop has damaged
- The implementation is done by NGO/local community/collaboration between NGO and local community/specific people whose crop has damaged

4- Implementing a tree planting project in your community

Outline: A tree planting project is offered by an NGO in your area. Some tree breeds are chosen to plant in certain areas to provide substitution on non timber forest products for the community.

Options:
- Project management and decision makings is done by an external organization/Community (Discuss if there is an optimum external/internal management combination using the spectrum in question 3, and the rights and responsibilities that each option will provide)
- The trees are sourced from local community or outsourced
- The NGO/Local community leaders/ a group selected by local community/collaboration of NGO /local community will decide who uses the products sourced from the project.