



**HYDROCONSEIL**

Consulting Engineer: water supply,  
environment, public services

**PROTOS – Cross-cutting evaluation 2010  
Implementation of IWRM strategy and integration of  
climate change policy**



**Case Study – Uganda**

**FINAL REPORT – MARCH 2011**

**FUNDING: DIRECTION GENERALE DE LA COOPERATION  
AU DEVELOPPEMENT (DGD, BELGIQUE)**

Title: Cross-cutting evaluation 2010, Implementation of IWRM strategy and integration of climate change policy – case study – Uganda  
Status: final report  
Client: Protos / Uganda office  
Delivery date: 15 March 2011  
Consultant: HYDROCONSEIL (France)  
Revision number: 2  
Authors: George de Gooijer (Mr) & Isaac Kabongo (Mr)  
Coordination, editing & quality control: Bruno Valfrey (Mr)  
Do you have any questions or remarks on this document? Please write to [georgedegooijer@me.com](mailto:georgedegooijer@me.com) or [valfrey@hydroconseil.com](mailto:valfrey@hydroconseil.com)

## Table of Content

<b>A. Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
A.1. Purpose of the mission .....	5
A.2. Method used .....	5
<b>B. Actors involved .....</b>	<b>6</b>
B.1. PROTOS office .....	6
B.2. DWRM.....	6
B.3. LAGBIMO.....	6
B.4. Mpanga CMO.....	7
B.5. NGOs .....	7
<b>C. Observations on IWRM.....</b>	<b>9</b>
C.1. About PROTOS projects.....	9
C.2. National level .....	9
C.3. Basin level: Lake George Basin.....	10
C.4. Catchment level: Mpanga Catchment Management Organization.....	10
C.5. Local (sub county) level .....	11
C.6. Studies .....	12
<b>D. Observations Climate Change .....</b>	<b>13</b>
D.1. National Level .....	13
D.2. Catchment Level.....	14
D.3. Local Level.....	14
<b>E. Conclusions and suggestions .....</b>	<b>15</b>
E.1. National context .....	15
E.2. Capacity .....	15
E.3. Structure / Governance.....	15
E.4. Content of IWRM.....	16
E.5. Climate change .....	16
E.6. Learning & knowledge management .....	16
<b>F. Annexes .....</b>	<b>18</b>
F.1. Persons met .....	18
F.2. Documents and other sources of information .....	19
F.3. Program of the mission .....	19

## Abbreviations

AFD .....	French Development Agency
AfDB .....	African Development Bank
AMCOW .....	African Ministers' Council on Water
AU .....	African Union
AWF .....	African Water Facility
CMO .....	Catchment Management Organisation
DAC .....	Development Assistance Committee (within OECD)
DFID .....	Department for International Development (UK)
DWRM .....	Directorate of Water Resources Management
EUWI .....	European Union Water Initiative
IWRM .....	Integrated Water Resources Management
JESE .....	Joint Effort to Save the Environment
LAGBIMO .....	Lake George Basin Integrated Management Organization
MDG .....	Millennium Development Goals
NEPAD .....	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO .....	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD .....	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OWAS .....	Operations Water and Sanitation (department within AFDB)
RBO.....	River Basin Organization
TA.....	Technical Assistance
TBG .....	Tooro Botanical Gardens
WASH.....	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WWF .....	World Wildlife Fund

# A. Introduction

## A.1. Purpose of the mission

This is a country report as part of an evaluation of the IWRM policy and the Climate Change policy of PROTOS. The mission to Uganda took place from 7-14 November 2010.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess:

- The implementation of the IWRM strategy in programs in both the South and the North in order to enrich the strategic choices for the future; and
- The implicit integration of elements of the Climate Change Strategy in programs in both the South and the North and recommendations to clarify the relationship between the IWRM strategy and the Climate Change Strategy.

Specifically through this evaluation, PROTOS wants to:

- Analyse the implementation of the IWRM strategy in some PROTOS projects;
- Analyse the relationship between the IWRM strategy and the climate change strategy of PROTOS;
- Analyse the relationship between advocacy of PROTOS in Uganda and the Climate Change Strategy; and
- Analyse the explicit relationship with the (inter) national policy and with other programs.

## A.2. Method used

The method for finding answers to these questions consisted of: using a basic questionnaire for an interview with PROTOS staff, field visits to various project sites, interviews with partners, group focus discussions, key stakeholder consultations, participant observation, and interviews with other actors involved in IWRM and/or climate change adaptation, and study of literature sources.

## B. Actors involved

Some observations on the actors involved in the IWRM and climate change activities of PROTOS in Uganda.

### B.1. PROTOS office

The activities through the PROTOS office in Fort Portal have a huge spread. The head of the office is working at sub-county level (with occasional inspections at local level), catchment level, basin level, national level and on top of that also has activities in neighbouring DRC. The sectors and topics covered are many as well: drinking water technologies, sanitation technologies, health education, fisheries, agroforestry and the management and governance processes at the various levels, each with their own characteristics. Finally the individual reporting to a variety of financial supporters completes the workload. This quite extreme agenda is likely to make the organization vulnerable: if the coordinator fails, much of the program is at risk. With hardly any experienced local staff to back him up, there is also a serious lack of institutional memory: a shift in staff is likely to have a very big impact on the program.

### B.2. DWRM

The key partner for the IWRM activities at catchment level is the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) in the Uganda's Ministry of Water and Environment.

The Directorate and its commissioner have been very important in the development of the activities of PROTOS in the Lake George Basin / Mpanga Catchment. They were interested in working at the basin-level, to gain experience in the basin approach. It was DWRM that asked PROTOS to start up a program of Catchment Based IWRM, as they were preparing for a national roll out. In the mean time DWRM did a similar process themselves in the Rwizi basin and they have worked through WWF in another basin linked to Lake George.

The DWRM has in fact co-funded the activities in the Lake George Basin and Mpanga Catchment, and has followed all steps of the process. They were, according to the PROTOS representative, always well-represented in all meetings and capacity building events.

The DWRM currently considers extending to more local level through deconcentrated local offices (see below).

### B.3. LAGBIMO

The organization at basin level is LAGBIMO, the Lake George Basin Integrated Management Organization. It was created to enhance the management and governance of natural resources of Lake George. In practice this mainly means managing the fishing activities on the lake. The organisation was created in January 2003 by the three districts (Bushenyi, Kamwenge and Kasese). Its constitution was formally accepted by the 3 districts at the end of 2002.

The organization has gone through several changes in personnel and as a result there are serious questions about its potential to lead processes at this moment.

## B.4. Mpanga CMO

The IWRM process at catchment level has been created through the start of a Catchment Management Organization (CMO). However, there is not yet a firm position of the CMO. The secretariat is still with PROTOS. The intention is shifting the secretariat to LAGBIMO, but this was not yet possible due to the discontinuity in their capacity. The choice of LAGBIMO is based on their constitution: they were created by the 3 districts sharing Lake George, and they have also the preservation of all natural resources of Lake George in their constitution. This would put them in a position to take charge of the IWRM processes in those catchments linking to the lake that are part of the 3 districts.

The CMO is a central structure in planning and management process involving the main actors in the catchment. The central document is the River Management Plan (RMP). This plan is supposed to be revised every 3 years.

The technical committee that was created in the beginning of 2009 should make the CMO more operational, linking the more technical staff of the various partners. They should meet every three months.

In the beginning of 2010 it was decided to start implementing some pilot projects. The members of the technical committee wanted to turn the talking into action and therefore walking the talk. This resulted in formulating several pilot projects:

- A project for protecting the riverbanks through the planting of trees;
- A project focusing on schools

## B.5. NGOs

There is a number of NGOs involved in the implementation of activities related to IWRM. These organisations seem to have various levels of comprehension when it comes to understanding of key IWRM concepts.

The key partner in water supply, sanitation and hygiene activities, as well as in a number of other activities is JESE (Joint Effort for Saving the Environment). At the moment their role is a bit limited, and there could be some criticism on the way they understand IWRM: as something related to drinking water and surface water. This may have been an artefact as a result of pressure from PROTOS early on to focus on 'drinking water, not allowing them to go for 'reforestation'.

**Tooro Botanical Gardens** (TBG) propagate tree-planting. They have a demo-garden where they show farmers how to practice agroforestry (combine trees with other crops). They have a herb-drying installation for producing medicinal products. They have been working with external support for some years, thus developing the various aspects of their work. They are a strong resource for further developing agroforestry sector in the region.

**SNV** has been working with PROTOS on the basis of an MOU. Both parties have concluded that this MOU needs revision, as there was no clear description of outputs. The understanding of IWRM with SNV in Fort Portal seems to be limited to water supply and sanitation. No broader vision linking this to the resource and the various threats to the resource in the Mpanga catchment was expressed. The organization seems to stay at a (too large?) distance from concrete action.

**Triple S**, a learning initiative on water services, financed by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and implemented by IRC.

**WWF** has several programs in Uganda. One of them is a sister project in the Lake Albert basin. The Country Director was not very forth coming in sharing materials or processes during the visit to the WWF offices in Kampala.



## C. Observations on IWRM

### C.1. About PROTOS projects

PROTOS has worked in the Lake George Basin since 2006. The activities are a result of the contact with the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) in Entebbe, who wanted to start a pilot on basin level IWRM. The project of PROTOS is one of several pilot projects working at basin level. The directorate had done a pilot itself in the Rwizi basin where it learned a lot and wanted to replicate the experiences to other parts of the Country. There is also a project being implemented by WWF linked to the Lake Albert basin. An activity by IUCN is to start in the north of the country.

To increase the operational character of the CMO, a technical committee was created, where the more operational persons from the various organizations present in the CMO would come together. In 2010 a number of pilot activities were selected to increase the operational character of the CMO and in particular the technical committee.

At the 'micro' level a number of activities have been developed in Kamwenge district, focusing on water supply and sanitation: building shallow wells and protected springs, in-house sand filters, sustainable sanitation solutions (ecosan) and biogas systems, but also organizing the users of water points in water user associations.

In the processes, pilot projects and studies there is a focus on the so-called blue water: surface water. The water that is crucial for much of the drinking water (groundwater) and the water that is crucial for most of the agriculture (soil-moisture or 'green water') are not included. If these would be included, it is very likely that the scope of the project would change.

Another observation is that the smallest hydrological unit for activities, a micro-catchment is currently not approached by the project. The valley of Ruterana in Rwanda is an example of such a unit. The advantage of intervening at this level is that it is less sensitive to political involvement and policy processes and the process has the potential of having a direct impact on the livelihoods of the community.

### C.2. National level

The policy for Uganda has been to create water resources management at a more local level, working through structures linked to the basin. The DWRM has recently published a study<sup>1</sup> on local level IWRM, done by COWI (financed through Danish support). PROTOS was consulted for this study (at the explicit request of DWRM). The roll-out strategy at catchment level shows key elements that were piloted by PROTOS, such as the process of the stakeholder forum and the organizational set-up with a Catchment Management Organization and a technical team. Starting a CMO based on the most pressing issues (picking the low hanging fruits) as proposed by PROTOS is now part of the way ahead for new CMOs. The challenge there will be to have sufficient information of the system as a whole with all

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Water and Environment, Directorate of Water Resources Management, Consultancy Services for Short Term Advisors: Catchment Based Water Resources Management Institutional Assessment, Draft Final Report, COWI, September 2009.

those participating in the process to ensure that the sometimes hidden fundamentals are clear to all. In the Mpanga two major elements of the water system were missing in the decision process (groundwater and soil moisture).

Out of four options the study concludes that there need to be de-concentrated offices of the national directorate. One such office should cover the Lake Albert region, including the Lake George Basin. Already today there is a lack of capacity at the national level, and there is an observed difference in quality between the staff at DWRM. How will this play out when the organization fragments itself over the country, most likely without a proper budget (although the claimed budget in the COWI study is quite considerable)? And what will be the consequences for any financing at catchment level, if there is a major financial need for this extended national organization?

### C.3. Basin level: Lake George Basin

In the beginning of the project a basin-wide project steering committee was created to make a start with the involvement of all actors. It was concluded that there was a need for a more detailed level of intervention. This resulted in the focus on the Mpanga catchment and the choice for supporting the creation of a catchment management organization (CMO) for the Mpanga River.

The existing structure at basin level, LAGBIMO, seems to be quite very weak. It has hardly any resources, and is limited in staff.

### C.4. Catchment level: Mpanga Catchment Management Organization

For the Mpanga basin a water resource assessment was done and presented to stakeholders. Unfortunately the study misses to clarify the overall hydrological system (rain, unsaturated groundwater, saturated groundwater, surface water). It fails to show the importance of the two types of groundwater ('saturated' for rural drinking water and soil-moisture for agriculture). Furthermore it fails to show the relation between deforestation on the hills and the hydrological system in the valley.

The study was however the basis for making a selection of topics by the stakeholders. They chose 4 topics to focus on in the next 3 years: Pollution, Hydrological monitoring, River bank protection and Wetland protection.

This should be the focus of the IWRM process activities in the project, but in reality this is more and more becoming a dysfunctional process. The Mpanga CMO is still having its secretariat at the PROTOS office and the River Management Planning process seems to be stalled. There is a draft plan, but only because the PROTOS coordinator prepared a draft.

The pilot-activities that were started through the technical team of the CMO proved popular. They lead to requests from other parts of the Lake George basin for similar activities.

The legal position of the stakeholder-based catchment management organizations is very limited. So far there is no formal link between a CMO and the decisions taken by the ministry. As a result there is no legal link to licenses and permits, nor is there a legal link between the fees paid by water users and the budget for action in the catchment. At best there would be a consultation in the framework of the Environmental Impact Assessments linked to major decisions / licenses. In the discussion with the commissioner of DWRM it was suggested that adding the obligation to ask for the advice of a CMO, linked to a fixed period of time, would

be likely to create the necessary motivation for many actors to be part of a CMO.

The secretariat of the CMO was supposed to be with the LAGBIMO, but due to the current weakness of that organization after several changes in personnel, the secretariat is still with PROTOS.

To be viable the CMO should have two points secured: finance and legal position

Finance: there should be a financial bases, for instance based on levies made from the use of water in the catchment (tea-plantations, hydropower) and from the discharge of wastewater (e.g. urban and industrial discharge). A problem here is likely to be that the development of de-concentrated offices is also supposed to be financed from these same sources.

Legal position: the CMO should have a formal position towards governmental decisions. The simplest way to do this is the obligation to be consulted directly by government when decisions touching the Mpanga are made. The CMO needs to respond within a fixed period (e.g. 4 weeks), and government has to come with proper arguments if it is to not follow the advice of the CMO. If it is not coming with sufficient arguments, the CMO can appeal in court. An alternative is to push for direct management at local level, but the decision for de-concentrated offices has probably closed that route.

Both issues have been brought up by PROTOS Uganda in its advocacy-role at the national level. In its comments on the recent national roll-out strategy for Catchment Based Water Resources Management, PROTOS has argued for the legal autonomy and the financial autonomy of the CMO's.

With these 2 elements in mind, there is a decision to be made about the further support of the Mpanga CMO. It is recommended that PROTOS formulates an exit strategy for its current (very active) role in the Mpanga CMO. The potential of the structure has been more or less established. The question is how to continue with the support to this structure, how much effort should be put in?

If the autonomy and finance issues are not resolved, a different (temporary) basis could be sought, for instance by using the presence of an interested university department in Fort Portal, giving them a role in monitoring and maybe even in organizing stakeholders. But this would obviously be a very temporary and institutionally unclear situation.

There are some alternative options for PROTOS to consider for deciding on its position:

1. A full support to the CMO structure, with a push for a bigger role, developing more pilot activities, and making it the centre of the PROTOS intervention in the area
2. PROTOS continues to support the CMO for a fixed amount of time (e.g. 3 years), with the aim to maintain the structure as a platform. An exit strategy is part of the plan.
3. The support for the CMO is ended, because no sustainable result has been created, the focus shifts to other activities in the catchment that have a more direct link with action for the poor.

## C.5. Local (sub county) level

At the local (rural) level the project activities focus on water supply and sanitation. Here IWRM is brought in through focus on taking protective measures around drinking water points, making separate water points for animals, working at school level. A specific activity linked to IWRM is planting trees to protect the riverbanks of the Mpanga from further erosion.

The material used for explaining IWRM at local level (produced by JESE) confirms the earlier observations: the focus is on surface-water. Erosion is positioned as a problem for the quality

of the surface-water, not as a destruction of the infiltrating capacity, resulting in a decrease of ground water recharge. There is no awareness of the importance of soil-moisture.

## C.6. Studies

A number of studies were prepared or drafted to support the process at the level of the Lake George basin and to support the process for the Mpanga catchment.

The initial activity in the Lake George basin focused on collecting information on the resource and its use, resulting in a GIS mapping of the basin.

One inventory study was made of the lake George basin, but this document was apparently never finished.

Subsequently a geographical information system was prepared. But because of the complexity this system has not been used very much in recent years. A simpler web-based system is now to be prepared by a Belgian student, probably in cooperation with the university in Fort Portal. Originally this system was supposed to be managed by Lagbimo, but because of the managerial problems in this organization, this was not deemed realistic. The unit for environmental monitoring of the university in Fort Portal seems a better option.

There has also been a water resources assessment of the Mpanga catchment (see earlier). This study was in fact based on the same materials as the Lake George basin study.

## D. Observations Climate Change

### D.1. National Level

Climate change and variability have already been observed in Uganda and are projected to increase considerably over the course of this century. Impacts of these changes are manifesting in various forms, most notably intensifying floods and droughts and observably-changing growing seasons. All sectors of Uganda's economy are being affected and will continue to be affected, including the water and other natural resources. Due to the importance of the water resources to other sectors such as agriculture, energy, forestry, fisheries among others the Directorate of Water Resources Management initiated a study in March 2009 titled "Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan for the Water Resources Sector in Uganda" to respond to the challenge that climate change poses to the sector. The main areas of vulnerability identified were:

- Institutional arrangements and capacity;
- Fluctuations of water levels;
- Water quality and human health, particularly on lake shorelines;
- Generating electricity from hydropower;
- Potential over-exploitation of groundwater by agriculture;
- Limited data, information and technology to provide critical information for optimal decision-making and policy-making;
- Transboundary water resources management issues that could lead to conflict in the region.

The resulting recommended focus areas for the Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan were initially the following:

- *Establish an institutional network in line with Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) principles that enables active community participation in water resources management and climate adaptation, and raises awareness of water and climate issues;*
- Improve fisheries catch quality;
- Improve human health through better management of water quality, both surface water and groundwater; and
- *Work with the Water for Production programme in order to secure groundwater as a natural asset through appropriate management actions.*

The links between those in charge of water resources management, and those linked to climate change adaptation are still weak. To take serious action on adaptation it is vital that actors linked to water resources management and use are involved in formulating policies, and in researching possible options for action. It was observed that both with the national working group on adaptation and with the directorate of water resources management there was a lack of actual contacts 'across the lines'. This risks the speed with which the current efforts can lead to results.

There was a very positive response to the idea of micro-catchment projects from the chair of the national working group on adaptation to climate change.

The NAPA activities show a lot of connection with integrated activities at community level. A proposed activity focusing on micro-catchments would have direct links to the proposed activities N°1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

If tree planting is taken up in a future program, probably in the form of agroforestry in the frame of catchment protection, there is the option of seeking finance from sources linked to climate change mitigation. Possible global sources would be REDD (coordinated through the National Forest Authority, NFA), or through projects that have been recognised in the framework of the clean development mechanism (CDM). An organisation that is working as a middleman in developing activities linked to carbon reduction is the Uganda Carbon Bureau ([www.ugandacarbon.org](http://www.ugandacarbon.org)). The IUCN representative also considered such activities having a high potential of being accepted for financing through REDD financing.

The risk of following this type of financing is of course that the typical way of action of PROTOS (start from action to create a position in the process) will not be there: the proposal needs to be defended rather than 'the result is being discussed'.

There is an increasing capacity available in developing local scale forestry. One such organization (and potential partner NGO) focusing on developing commercial forestry is SPGS ([www.sawlog.ug](http://www.sawlog.ug)).

## D.2. Catchment Level

No specific activities linking to climate change adaptation or mitigation at this level.

## D.3. Local Level

Currently the only activities that could be recognised as 'climate activity' are the tree-planting pilot, which was linked to the protection of riverbanks, and the rainwater collection (storage for household purposes and for schools). The tree-planting pilot did result in a very interesting cooperation with the Tooro Botanical Gardens (TBG), which could prove to be a key partner in any activity involving trees, such as catchment protection through agroforestry. The TBG proved to be quite able in both the technical and the social aspects of reforestation.

## E. Conclusions and suggestions

### E.1. National context

The position of PROTOS in IWRM in Uganda is a strong one. It has been invited by the directorate of water resources management (DWRM) to start an experiment in the Lake George Basin, and has been acknowledged ever since as a partner in developing IWRM as an approach for managing catchments and basins. In national fora, PROTOS is part of the team, such as currently in the thematic team for operationalizing the 'Catchment Based Water Resources Management'.

### E.2. Capacity

There is a serious quantitative lack of capacity in the Uganda office, making any activity at this moment very vulnerable. The partner NGOs linked to IWRM are not able to compensate this lack of capacity.

### E.3. Structure / Governance

After starting at the level of the Lake George Basin, the governance activities of PROTOS have been focussing on the catchment of the Mpanga River.

There is currently no serious functioning structure at basin level due to underfunding and therefore understaffing of LAGBIMO. As a result of this there is no capacity either for managing catchment level activities.

The IWRM process at catchment level has been created by the creation of a Catchment Management Organization, and the organization of a planning process. The experimental creation of the catchment management organization for the Mpanga is an important process for Uganda to understand the potential of such a structure.

However, the Mpanga CMO is not at all a firm structure. The secretariat is still with PROTOS. The intention is shifting the secretariat to LAGBIMO, but this was not yet possible due to the discontinuity in their capacity. The planning process for the catchment is not functioning as intended. The process is functioning because of PROTOS being active. The coordinator created the current draft.

There is interest from partner NGOs to work together at catchment level for implementing activities.

The Mpanga CMO may be viable if two conditions are met:

- Financing, for instance based on income from levies and taxes on water use and pollution in the basin;
- Legal position towards governmental decisions, for instance through the obligatory consultation in case of decisions affecting the Mpanga catchment.

A decision is needed on the future of the CMO / RMP process. To what extent should support to the CMO by PROTOS be continued, and for how long?

## E.4. Content of IWRM

There is a need to focus on ground water as well as soil moisture (green water) in the IWRM program. This is likely to lead to different actions and the involvement of different actors. The current activities are focusing on surface water. This is incomplete, considering that much of the drinking water for rural use is coming from ground water, and much of the agriculture is rain-fed and therefore depending on soil-moisture. Also it is clear from observing the catchment that one of the major causes for the water problems is the absence of tree-coverage of the hills. This will seriously affect the recharge of the aquifer.

Different material should be used/developed for explaining IWRM, both for schools and for other purposes. The material that is currently used for creating awareness is purely focussing on surface-water. This will not increase the awareness of water as an integrated part of life. It will reinforce an incomplete caricature.

## E.5. Climate change

At national level the links between the people linked to 'water resources management' and 'climate change adaptation' are still weak, despite the obvious alignment in interest. This risks the speed with which the current efforts can lead to results.

Some of the current activities could be considered as linked to climate change, particularly rainwater harvesting (adaptation) and tree planting and biogas (mitigation and adaptation).

PROTOS should consider developing micro-catchment management as part of IWRM and Climate Change -adaptation. Developing/piloting such activities is inevitable, particularly in those places where you have smaller valleys, allowing you to have such activities on a realistic scale. To develop this there is an obvious link with the experience in Rwanda (Ruterana). There is also a clear link with the work done by WOTR in India. There is major potential in integrated micro-catchment development in the Lake George basin due to a combination of reasons: the geo-physical conditions (small valleys with deforested hills), the existence of an IWRM governance structure, expertise on trees (TBG), community-oriented NGO partners. What is still missing: agricultural/economic entry point partners, e.g. linked to rice and / or coffee, for creating the economic (more immediate) 'carrot'.

Integrated micro catchment development would fit fully in the NAPA of Uganda. It would be inline with proposed activities nr 1,2,4,5 and 6 from the NAPA.

There is also need to identify and assess the vulnerable ecosystems and catchments to the impacts of climate change in order to be a basis for action. Efforts should be made to identify credible evidence of climate change on the livelihoods and water resources sectors in the region.

Climate Action Network Uganda (CAN-U) could be a partner on issues regarding climate change financing, technology transfer, adaptation and mitigation as well as policy formulation, analysis and advocacy in Uganda. It is also important for PROTOS and its partners in the region to link up and collaborate with the Climate Change Unit, which is mandated to coordinate all climate activities in the Country.

## E.6. Learning & knowledge management

Typically the PROTOS approach is based on exploring innovative ways to create development with water as a lever. The innovation is then proposed to others for further up-scaling.



This approach comes very close to, or is equivalent to, action research. But in the cases observed, there seems to be a lack on the 'research' side in 3 ways:

- Formulation: There are no clear questions formulated;
- Recording: There is not enough systematized documenting done of the activities taking place;
- Publishing: There is no publishing of the results/approach, for instance in the form of 'handbooks'.

There should be a further conceptual development of this 'action research' approach, including the formulation, recording and publishing part.

The presence of a local university with environmental monitoring as one of its topics would provide an excellent opportunity for combining an action research approach with capacity development.

The exchange with sister projects, like the one by WWF was not matched from their side. In reality it became a bit of a one-way street, with WWF using PROTOS.

The potential for knowledge sharing inside PROTOS in the region is being used. A regional meeting on IWRM was to take place directly after the visit of the mission to Uganda. A wider exchange with other PROTOS activities as well as a knowledge support from Gent would probably result in a better understanding of the various concepts and in more alternatives for action.

## F. Annexes

### F.1. Persons met

Name	Institution	Contact
Mr. Lieven Peters	PROTOS Uganda	lieven.peeters@protos.be
Mr Harald van der Hoek	PROTOS Rwanda	
Ms. Sarah Kasade	PROTOS Uganda	<a href="mailto:Sarah.kasade@protos.be">Sarah.kasade@protos.be</a>
Mr. John Bahinda	JESE	
Mr Martin Busiku	JESE	
Ms. Rebecca Angumye	JESE	
Mr. Godfrey Rugumayo	JESE	<a href="mailto:godfreymulinda@yahoo.com">godfreymulinda@yahoo.com</a>
Mr.Dennis Mwabembezi	Farmer Nyabbani	
Mr. Acleo Mawejje	Mahyoro landing site; Chairperson Beach Management Unit, Kainja landing site Mahyoro sub county	
Mr. Bashir Kalikabwe	Mahyoro landing site; Vice chair- person Kainja Landing site Beach Management Unit.	
Mr. Karim Ssenyomo	Mahyoro landing site; Member Beach management unit and area Village Health Team (VHT)	
Mr. Kasaija John	Sub county Chief Nyabaani sub county	
Mr.Twezamakye Laurence	Head teacher Kyanyinhuli Primary school	
Mr. Byaruhanga Deo	Sanitation Teacher Kyanyinhuli Primary school	
Mr.Balitanda Mustafa	Chairman LCI- Zanzibar Cell	
Mrs.Karuna Mwesigwa	Chairperson Watsan committee Zanzibar shallow well	
Mrs. Katariho Edrida	Caretaker and chaiperson Kyany- inhuli shallow well	
Mrs. Jacinta Nekesa	SNV Fort Portal	
Mr. Martin Watsisi	TripleS	<a href="mailto:watsisi@triple-s-ug.org">watsisi@triple-s-ug.org</a>
Mrs. Monday Lwanga	Care Uganda	<a href="mailto:lwanga@careuganda.org">lwanga@careuganda.org</a>
Mrs. Rita Opira	Directorate of Water Resources Management, Ministry of Water and Environment	<a href="mailto:Rita.negesa@mwe.go.ug">Rita.negesa@mwe.go.ug</a>
Mr. Godfrey Ruyonga	Tooro Botanical Gardens (TBG)	<a href="mailto:Gruyonga1@yahoo.co.uk">Gruyonga1@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Mr. Simon Thuo	GWP Eastern Africa	<a href="mailto:sthuo@nilebasin.org">sthuo@nilebasin.org</a>

Name	Institution	Contact
Dr. Callist Tindimugaya	Directorate of Water Resources Management, Ministry of Water and Environment	<a href="mailto:callist_tindimugaya@yahoo.co.uk">callist_tindimugaya@yahoo.co.uk</a> <a href="mailto:callist.tindimugaya@mwe.go.ug">callist.tindimugaya@mwe.go.ug</a>
Prof John B Kaddu	Chair National Commission on Adaptation to Climate Change	<a href="mailto:johnkaddu2006@yahoo.co.uk">johnkaddu2006@yahoo.co.uk</a> <a href="mailto:kaddujb@zoology.mak.ac.ug">kaddujb@zoology.mak.ac.ug</a>
Mrs. Barbara Nakangu Bugembe	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	<a href="mailto:barbara.nakangu@iucn.org">barbara.nakangu@iucn.org</a>
Mr. David Duli	World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF)	<a href="mailto:dduli@wwfuganda.org">dduli@wwfuganda.org</a>

## F.2. Documents and other sources of information

LAGBIMO, 2003, constitution of LAGBIMO

Oneworld Sustainable Investments, 2009, Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, Adaptation Strategy

PROTOS, 2007, Driejaarplan 2008 - 2010, Water: hefboom tot ontwikkeling

PROTOS, 2008, Stratégie de la GIRE

PROTOS, 2010a, Note stratégique transversale climat

PROTOS, 2010b, Driejaarplan 2008 - 2010, Water: hefboom tot ontwikkeling Voortgangsverslag 2009

Republic of Uganda, 2007, UGANDA NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (NDP)

SPGS, 2010, [www.sawlog.ug](http://www.sawlog.ug)

UGANDA NATIONAL ADAPTATION PROGRAMMES OF ACTION (NAPA)

Uganda Carbon Bureau, 2010, <http://www.ugandacarbon.org>

Zziwa Nimanya, Cate, March 2009, Water Situational Analysis for River Mpanga

## F.3. Program of the mission

### Sunday 7 November:

Transfer to Uganda, first meeting to prepare the details of the visit

### Monday 8 November:

Field visit to the sub-counties

### Tuesday 9 November:

Meeting at the PROTOS office in Fort Portal

Meeting with JESE

### Wednesday 10 November:

Meeting with Mpanga CMO Technical Team on pilot projects

Fieldtrip to pilot project riverside protection

### Thursday 11 November:

Transfer to Kampala

Meeting with Prof Kudda, chair of the national commission on adaptation to climate change

Meeting with Dr Callist Tindimugaya, commissioner for water resources management

Meeting with Mr Simon Thuo, GWP Eastern Africa

**Friday 12 November:**

Meeting with IUCN Uganda

Meeting with WWF Uganda

**Saturday 13 November:**

Preparing draft report