



CCRA IN UGANDA

David Kureeba

Coordinator Forests and Biodiversity, Focal person for;

Global Forest Coalition member groups in Africa, CCRA project coordinator and Resource person.

At National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)/FoEUganda.

P.O Box 29909 Kampala Uganda

Office Phone: **+256-414-530181**

Mobile: +256-775-349-283, +256-705-363-302

Email: kureebamd@yahoo.com

Alternate email: kureeba@gmail.com

ABOUT NAPE

- ✗ National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)/ Friends of the Earth Uganda, is a member of GFC and hosts the secretariat for Africa GFC member groups.
- ✗ It's a lobby and advocacy organization whose interventions are aimed at sustainable management of environmental resources for the benefit of all. More information refer to www.nape.or.ug



ICCRA PILOT IN UGANDA

- ✗ NAPE, was one of the first countries to conduct CCRA.
- ✗ The methodology was developed by GFC/members which was used as a guiding tool during the assessment.

The main objective

- ✗ The aim of the Indigenous Community Conservation Resilience Assessment was to perform a bottom-up assessment of the resilience of the initiatives and biocultural approaches of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to conserve and restore biodiversity and the legal, political, socio-economic, financial, technical, and capacity-building support that could be provided to sustain and strengthen these initiatives and approaches.



WHERE WAS THE ASSESSMENT DONE

Figure 1: Location of Uganda in Africa



COMMUNITIES WHERE THE ASSESSMENT WAS CONDUCTED.

- ✗ Done in Kihagya, Butimba in western Uganda.
- ✗ Bukaleba in eastern Uganda.
- ✗ Kalangala in central Uganda.

Why those sites?

- ✗ Kihagya and Butimba are community sites threatened by oil mining in the Albertine Rift.
- ✗ Bukaleba in eastern Uganda is threatened by green resources and bioenergy project.
- ✗ In Kalangala the communities are threatened by oilpalm establishment for cooking oil and later agrofuels.



HOW WAS IT CONDUCTED?

- ✗ Consulting the relevant communities and seeking their free prior informed consent for the process.
- ✗ Implementing the strategic visioning.
- ✗ Choosing the assessment sites, 4 communities were visited
- ✗ Developing the preliminary baselines.



ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- ✗ The assessment looked at a wide range of issues in a community, these included; social, economic, political, ecological set up of the communities among others.



IN KIHAGYA COMMUNITY

- ✗ These communities depend on agriculture.
- ✗ They have a rich culture they annually perform rituals in the same forest.
- ✗ They practice agriculture within their community land.



CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED

- ✗ The emerging oil industry has increased community vulnerability to land ownership.
- ✗ There are many immigrants coming to the community because of oil.
- ✗ The tenure of Kihagya is customary, which leaves the land susceptible to grabbing.
- ✗ The forest land has no boundary yet. This leaves an open gap for encroachment.
- ✗ Emerging religions.







STRATEGIES ON ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES

- ✗ Boundary planting.
- ✗ Developing by laws.
- ✗ Forming a communal land association.
- ✗ Strengthening the community cultural beliefs against the emerging religions.



BUTIMBA COMMUNITY

- ✗ These communities depend on agriculture and fishing from Lake Albert in the Rift Valley.
- ✗ They have well established community structures.
- ✗ Part of the community is threatened by the proposed construction of the oil refinery.
- ✗ They live on customary land.
- ✗ Encroachers to the forests and agricultural land.



STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGES

- ✗ Processing the title for the land on which communities are living.
- ✗ Communities established tree nursery beds to plant medicinal and fruit trees on their land.
- ✗ Having engagement with government and the developers to ensure adequate compensation for the land that will be taken by the refinery site.









KALANGALA COMMUNITY.

- ✗ Kalangala is a community whose main activity is fishing. It is engaged also in growing of crops and rearing of animals for domestic use.
- ✗ Government in 2009 introduced the growing of oil palm, which affected the rudimental way of life.
- ✗ Part of community land was grabbed for oilpalms.





IN BUKALEBA COMMUNITY

- ✗ This is eastern Uganda. These communities are affected by Green Resources, a company involved in growing commercial trees for charcoal production.
- ✗ About 832 families are affected but they are fighting back to regain their territory.
- ✗ These are farmer groups and fishing communities.



STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGES

- ✗ Engaging government to give back the land.
- ✗ Negotiation with the developer to allow communities to practice 'taungya' farming system.
- ✗ Already 39 out of 345 hectares have been returned to communities.
- ✗ Currently are forming community by laws to address the immigration rate in the area for fishing and job seeking hence becoming residents in the community.



STRATEGIES CONTINUED.

- ✗ Strengthening community capacity on land rights.
- ✗ Gender participation in processes of land negotiation.
- ✗ Fighting bad fishing practices.
- ✗ Demarcation of wetland areas in Bukaleba community.





NAPE research team during the assessment.



NEED FOR THE PROJECT

- ✗ Target 12: it's the ICCA's explicit objective of preventing the extinctions of indigenous species such as threatened, rare, endemic....in Uganda long horned cattle. The Bahagya protected their forest which is home to species of birds like Enkombe(Dove) and local herbs, threatened for extinction.
- ✗ Target Nine: Invasive species (*Lanterna* invasive spp).
- ✗ Target five: Loss of habitats; If it were not for local communities and ICCAs (although not yet fully recognized), with Uganda's current investment policy, most high value habitats would now be gone. In Kihagya, the bio-resources are still visible.









CONCLUSION

- ✗ It's unfortunate that ICCAs which are living links between biological diversity and cultural diversity have not been recognized in Uganda.
- ✗ Tenure continues to be a challenge especially when it comes to customary landownership. In Uganda, this is one of the issues that requires immediate attention by government if indigenous and local communities are to meaningfully contribute to environmental conservation (Aichi targets).
- ✗ Government in Uganda has not yet recognized ICCAs.
- ✗ Literacy levels still low on either side (government and ICCAs).



RECOMMENDATIONS

- ✗ There is need for capacity building (both communities and leaders).
- ✗ There is need to conduct more assessments to come up with more issues and a national advisory group, that would also participate in engagement meetings.
- ✗ Uganda has not yet recognized ICCAs and the rights of indigenous people. Therefore, there is urgent need for the government to recognize indigenous communities and ICCAs.



RECOMMENDATIONS CONT...D

- ✗ Formulate local/community level associations managing ICCAs. This should also be supported by the national efforts in ensuring that they improve the quality of their governance.
- ✗ There is need to reform/repeal the bad laws and policies that made the indigenous people internally displaced / refugees on their own land, which laws and policies flout the inalienable and perpetual rights to their territory and access to bio resources. And also the laws that violate the rights of natives to assemble ie TPOML.



Obrigado pela atenção

Gracias por su atención

Merci d'avoir écouté

Thanks for listening

