



NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN (2015-2025)

(ADVANCE COPY)

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY



SEPTEMBER 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	12
FOREWORD.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
1.0 INTRODUCTION – NBSAP	14
1.1 Background information	14
1.2 Status of biodiversity in Uganda.....	15
1.2.1 <i>Biodiversity at the Species level</i>	15
1.2.2 <i>Biodiversity description based on taxa</i>	16
1.2.3 <i>Biodiversity distribution in Uganda</i>	19
1.2.4 <i>Biodiversity in protected areas</i>	19
1.2.5 <i>Biodiversity outside protected areas</i>	20
1.3 Biodiversity trends in Uganda	24
1.3.1 <i>Species trends</i>	24
1.3.2 <i>Habitat trends</i>	27
1.3.3 <i>Status and trends of biodiversity in agricultural landscapes</i>	30
1.3.4 <i>Status and trends of Pollinators</i>	33
2.0 THE IMPORTANCE OF BIODIVERSITY TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ERADICATION	35
2.1 The contribution of Agriculture.....	35
2.2 The contribution of forestry	36
2.3 The contribution of wildlife and tourism	37
2.4 The contribution of wetlands	38
2.5 The contribution of fisheries resources.....	39
2.6 Biodiversity and Health	40
3.0 NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES	43
3.1 Taxonomy	43
3.2 Climate Change.....	44
3.3 Biotechnology and Biosafety	46
3.4 Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)	47
3.5 Oil Discovery in the Albertine Graben	48
3.6 Development and use of biofuels in Uganda.....	49
3.7 Biodiversity Disasters and hazards	51
3.8 Pollution.....	51
3.9 Green Procurement	52
3.10 Invasive alien species (IAS).....	53
4.0 GENERAL THREATS TO BIODIVERSITY IN UGANDA	55
4.1 Causes of Biodiversity Loss.....	55
4.2 Current efforts to Reduce Biodiversity Loss in Uganda.....	59
4.2.1 <i>National Policies</i>	59
4.2.2 <i>Legal Frameworks</i>	63
4.2.3 <i>Institutional Frameworks</i>	67
5.0 BACKGROUND TO THE NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN 2015-2025	73
5.1 Introduction.....	73
5.2 Overview of the first NBSAP for Uganda	73
5.3 Lessons learnt from implementing NBSAP1 for Uganda.....	73

5.4	Progress in Reviewing and updating NBSAP1 to NBSAP2 2015-2025 for Uganda	74
5.5	Summary of where Uganda is in the NBSAP review and updating process	76
5.6	The updated context of NBSAP2.....	76
5.7	Overarching principles of NBSAP2.....	77
5.8	Linking NBSAP2 to Uganda’s Vision 2040, NDP and MDG.....	77
5.9	Creating Synergies between the CBD and other international Conventions	79
6.0	THE NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN: PRIORITIES AND TARGETS	80
6.1	Guiding Principles for the Development of NBSAP2	80
6.2	Vision, Goal and Strategic Objectives of NBSAP2	80
6.2.1	<i>The Vision</i>	80
6.2.2	<i>Goal</i>	80
6.2.3	<i>The Strategic Objectives</i>	81
6.3	The National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans in detail.....	82
6.3.1	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management</i>	82
6.3.2	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: To facilitate and build capacity for research, knowledge and information management and exchange on biodiversity</i>	88
6.3.3	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: To reduce and manage negative impacts while enhancing positive impacts on biodiversity</i>	95
6.3.4	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4: To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity</i>	116
6.3.5	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5: To enhance awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders</i>	122
6.3.6	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 6: To harness modern biotechnology for socio-economic development with adequate safety measures for human health and the environment</i>	127
6.3.7	<i>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 7: To promote innovative and sustainable funding mechanisms to support NBSAP implementation</i>	139
6.3.8	<i>Strategies and Action Plans for New and Emerging Issues</i>	145
7.0	IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.....	152
7.1	Adoption and approval of the NBSAP.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.2	National Coordination structure that will guide, coordinate and ensure implementation of the NBSAP	152
7.3	The role of Sectoral Agencies.....	152
7.4	The role of District Local Governments	153
7.5	The role of Local Communities	153
7.6	The role of NGOs.....	154
7.7	The role of the Private Sector	154
7.8	Financing and Resource Mobilization	154
7.8.1	<i>Traditional Financing Mechanisms</i>	154
7.8.2	<i>Innovative financing mechanisms</i>	156
8.0	MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF NBSAP 2015-2025	161
8.1	Rationale for Monitoring and Evaluation of NBSAP2	161
8.2	Key Strategic Aims for Monitoring and Evaluation of NBSAP2.....	162
8.3	Identification of indicators to track progress towards national targets	162
8.4	Proposed institutional arrangements for M&E	162
	REFERENCES.....	163
	ANNEXES	166

Annex 1: Members of the Thematic Working Groups, Coordinators and Consultants for the NBSAP of Uganda.....	166
Annex 2: The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets	177
Annex 3: Mainstreaming NBSAP in policies, strategies, plans and programmes	180
Annex 4: Current Global Environment Facility support for biodiversity conservation & other environment management projects in Uganda	184
Annex 5: Selected donor funded biodiversity conservation-related projects in Uganda, 2009 -2014	185

List of Tables

Table 1: Recorded flora and fauna spp in Uganda	16
Table 2: Status of Uganda’s biodiversity according to the IUCN Red List (2008).....	16
Table 3: Major species of soil micro flora in Uganda	24
Table 4: Status of Uganda's biodiversity according to IUCN Red List (2008)	24
Table 5: Trends in large mammal populations in Uganda.....	25
Table 6: Diversity of common agriculture crop plants in Uganda.....	30
Table 7: Diversity of animal breeds/varieties in Uganda.....	32
Table 8: Economic value of Nakivubo urban wetland in Kampala.....	39
Table 9: Sectoral Policies relevant to biodiversity management in Uganda	60
Table 10: Sectoral laws for biodiversity management in Uganda.....	64
Table 11: Agencies under MAAIF with mandate relevant to biodiversity management	69
Table 12: NBSAP key contribution areas towards Vision 2040, NDP and the MDGs.....	78
Table 13: Linking the Strategic Objectives of NBSAP2 to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi targets	81

List of Figures

Figure 1: Location of Uganda in Africa.....	14
Figure 2: Mountain Gorillas in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park	15
Figure 3: Ostriches in Kidepo National Park.....	17
Figure 4: Bagrus documak(Ssemutundu -a delicacy in Uganda) from Lake Bisina	18
Figure 5: A lion in Queen Elizabeth National Park.....	20
Figure 6: Uganda Kobs in the Savanna Ecosystem of Queen Elizabeth National Park..	21
Figure 7: Aquatic biodiversity habitat.....	22
Figure 8: Hippos in River Nile within Murchison Falls National Park.....	22
Figure 9: Elephant population is slowly increasing.....	24
Figure 10: A Rhino at Uganda Wildlife Education Centre.....	26
Figure 11: The Rare Shoe Bill at Uganda Wildlife Education Centre... Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Figure 12: Fishing in Uganda’s waters	30
Figure 13: Fresh fruits in Uganda	31
Figure 14: Bwindi National Park Headquarters.....	37
Figure 15: Acommunity lodge in Bwindi National Park.....	37
Figure 16: Kibale Primate Lodge	38
Figure 17: Aloe vera – A medicinal plant	40
Figure 18: The legendary mountains of the moon in Rwenzori National Park	45
Figure 19: Young Jatropha plantation (a biofuel crop) in Uganda	50
Figure 20: The process proposed for reviewing and updating NBSAP1	76

FOREWARD

Uganda ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 8th September 1993. Uganda is also a Party to the Protocols made under the CBD namely the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS), the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Uganda developed its first National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP1) in 2002 with a rolling life span of 10 years. The NBSAP was therefore due for a major review in 2012 to ensure that new and emerging issues are addressed to make it relevant to developments within the CBD agenda that had taken place over the years and also to capture prevailing conditions in Uganda on biodiversity that were not addressed by NBSAP1. The review and updating of the NBSAP was started in time (in June 2012) with support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Government of Uganda is grateful for this support.

The review and updating of NBSAP1 was done taking account the guidance from the Conference of the Parties to CBD which is contained in decision X/2 which among others urged Parties and other governments to review and as appropriate update NBSAPs, in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and to develop national plans using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Targets, as a flexible framework, in accordance with national priorities and capacities and taking into account both the global targets and the status and trends of biological diversity in the country.

Unlike NBSAP1 which did not have targets, NBSAP2 has national biodiversity and biosafety targets which were developed using the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets and also the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol 2011-2020. The NBSAP2 was developed through wide stakeholder consultations involving Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies, the academia and research institutions, Civil Society Organizations, the private sector and representatives for the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs).

NBSAP2 has incorporated Government priority development agenda in the National Vision 2040. As a result of this, the NBSAP2 has been mainstreamed in National Development Plan (NDP2) 2015/2016 - 2019/2020. The National Vision 2040 is implemented through NDPs. Therefore implementation of NBSAP2 contributes to implementation of NDP2 and the long term Vision 2040. Furthermore NBSAP2 has been aligned to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Biodiversity has a very big contribution towards the achievement of SDGs in Uganda.

Government of Uganda is committed to promoting the conservation and sustainable use of its biological resources for national sustainable development, wealth creation and protection of vital ecosystem services provided by biodiversity. This is supported by the goal of NBSAP2 which is to maintain a rich biodiversity benefiting the present and future generations for socio-economic development and its mission which is to enhance biodiversity conservation, management and sustainable utilisation and fair sharing of the benefits.

I call up all stakeholders and our development partners to support the implementation of NBSAP2

For God and my country.

Prof Ephraime Kamuntu
MINISTER FOR WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This second edition of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP2) is a result of the collaboration and support of many individuals and institutions. The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) would like to acknowledge with profound thanks the contribution of NEMA Board of Directors, all the experts, advisors, consultants, representatives from Government institutions, the private sector, IPLCs and Non Governmental Organizations. NEMA is especially grateful to the following institutions for their active participation in developing NBSAP2:

Office of the Prime Minister
Ministry of Water and Environment
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries Department of Fisheries
Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Wetlands Management Department
Department of Water Resources Management
National Planning Authority
Uganda National Council for Science and Technology
National Agricultural Research Organization and the affiliate Research Institutes
National Fisheries Resources Research Institute
Aquaculture Research & Development Centre - Kajjansi
National Forestry Authority
Uganda Wildlife Authority
Animal Genetic Resources Center
Plant Genetic Resource Center, Entebbe
Uganda Export Promotion Board
Uganda Bureau of Statistics
Climate Change Department, Ministry of Water and Environment
Natural Chemotherapeutic Research Institute, Ministry of Health
Department of Forestry, Biodiversity and Tourism, Makerere University
Oyam District Local Government
Kayunga District Local Government
Buikwe District Local Government
Mukono District Local Government
Moroto District Local Government
Wildlife Conservation Society
Makerere University Department of Biological Sciences
The Technical Committee on Biodiversity Conservation
Economic Policy Research Centre, Makerere University
Nature Uganda
International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
World Wide Fund for the Conservation of Nature (WWF)
Total E&P Uganda

NEMA further acknowledges the technical support from the CBD through the capacity building workshops which the CBD National Focal Point Mr. Ogwal Sabino Francis benefited from, the technical from UNEP and UNEP-WCMC. NEMA is grateful to the CBD National Focal Point for effectively coordinating and guiding the development of NBSAP2 on behalf of Government. NEMA extends appreciation Ms Monique Akullo, Dr. Evelyn Lutalo and Mr. Junior Musinguzi for supporting the CBD National Focal Point on the day-to-day management of activities during the development of NBSAP2.

Dr. Tom .O. Okurut

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) is the main instrument for implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) at country level. NBSAP provides Government with a framework for implementing its obligations under the CBD as well as the setting of conservation priorities, channeling of investments and building of the necessary capacity for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the country.

At its tenth meeting in Nagoya, Japan, the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP 10) adopted the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, with 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The Parties then committed themselves to revising their NBSAPs and to adopting them as policy instruments by 2015. They also committed themselves to developing national targets that would support the achievement of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Targets. The revision of the NBSAP has enabled Uganda to demonstrate its commitment to the achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, with its Aichi Biodiversity Targets while having its own national targets.

Uganda developed its first National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP1) in 2002. The process was coordinated by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) which is the institution coordinating the implementation of the CBD in Uganda through the CBD National Focal Point. The NBSAP had an initial implementation period of 10 years with a major review after 5 years. The key obstacles to NBSAP1 implementation included:

- a) Inadequate financial resources for implementation of planned activities and programmes in the NBSAP
- b) Inadequate awareness of NBSAP1 among key implementing partners and the general public
- c) Inadequate human and infrastructure capacity in certain fields of biodiversity conservation such as taxonomy and characterization of germplasm in the National Gene Bank, among others
- d) Lack of a central node/Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) to facilitate information sharing among institutions involved in biodiversity conservation
- e) Limited information on indigenous farm plant and animal genetic resources
- f) Inadequate managerial and technical capacity at the District and lower local Government levels for implementation of NBSAP

A number of these obstacles have since been overcome. The Clearing House Mechanism (CHM), for example, is now operational and can be visited at www.chm.nemaug.org. A lot of capacity, through NEMA, has also been built at the District and lower levels to handle critical issues of biodiversity conservation at those levels. NBSAP2 has put in place measures to significantly increase the resource envelope for biodiversity conservation by exploring various sources of innovative sustainable funding mechanisms as shown in Strategic Objective 7.

The revised NBSAP addresses the key concerns regarding biodiversity management in Uganda. These include, among others, declining species abundance largely due to over-harvesting and exploitation of biological resources including trees and woody biomass, for instance mahogany tree species; shrinking habitats for example, wetlands and forests. These

loses are largely attributed to unsustainable use of biodiversity resources or habitat loss due to conversion of habitats into other commercial land/water uses or habitat degradation. Additional concerns include local species extinctions, invasive species, human-wildlife-conflicts, encroachment on protected areas, agricultural expansion, climate change and variability, human wildlife conflicts, diseases in wildlife, illegal trade in plants, animals and derived parts, soil erosion and pollution. There are also socio-economic pressures in the country including human population increase, poverty as well as political pressures which cause conflicts and insecurity, conflicting development policies as well as politics and public management.

While government continues to make every effort to address these concerns through strengthening of policy, legal and institutional frameworks, there have also been emerging challenges such as the recent discovery of oil and gas in the Albertine Graben, the increasing use of biofuels and the more frequent incidences of disasters such as droughts, floods and mudslides associated with climate change impacts which can have a disastrous impact on biodiversity if not urgently attended to.

The formulation of this NBSAP2 has had very wide stakeholder consultations to ensure ownership and smooth implementation. It has also included strong aspects of other Multilateral Environmental Conventions to enhance synergies and leverage additional funding from these Agreements.

The Vision of Uganda's NBSAP2 is to maintain a rich biodiversity benefiting the present and future generations for socio-economic development. **The goal** is to enhance biodiversity conservation, management and sustainable utilisation and fair sharing of its benefits by 2025. NBSAP2 has 7 Strategic objectives, namely:

1. To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management
2. To facilitate and enhance capacity for research, monitoring, information management and exchange on biodiversity
3. To put in place measures to reduce and manage negative impacts on biodiversity
4. To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity
5. To enhance awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders
6. To harness modern biotechnology for socio-economic development with adequate safety measures for human health and the environment
7. To promote innovative sustainable funding mechanisms for implementation of NBSAP activities

Each of the Strategic objectives is tied to an action plan stretching from 2015 to 2025. A separate action plan has also been prepared for critical new and emerging issues of oil and gas discovery and production, biofuel production and natural disasters. The total cost for implementing the strategy and action plan over the 10 year period (2015-2025) has been estimated at **USD 80,000,000** which is very modest considering the importance of biodiversity to Uganda's economy and sustainable livelihoods. The estimated cost will be further reviewed during the BIOFIN process.

Funds allocated and/or proposed by government, donors and trusts will represent a core source of funding for the action plan. Therefore stakeholders in government, private sector and civil society will have to work together to lobby parliament and the Finance Ministry to

ensure that the current levels of funding for biodiversity are at least maintained or at best increased in the medium and long-term. Other innovative financing mechanisms will also be actively explored and exploited with guidance from NEMA including payments for ecosystem services, biodiversity offsets, environmental fiscal reforms, Green markets through natural resource trade and value chains, Climate finance and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other donor-funded programmes.

NBSAP2 will have a rolling life span of 10 years. The first review will be carried out after the first 5 years of implementation will the major review will be done during the 10th year of implementation. Overall coordination and monitoring progress of implementation will be by NEMA. Institutions assigned the national targets (herein referred to as **target champions**) will take lead in implementing and reporting on progress towards the achievement of national biodiversity targets.

GLOSSARY

Invasive alien species: species whose introduction and/or spread outside their natural habitats, past or present distribution threatens biological diversity.

Below-ground biodiversity: variety of ecosystems and living organisms living under soil.

Biological diversity: the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter-alia terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexities of which they, are part; this includes diversity within species between species and of ecosystems (National Environment Act, cap 153).

Biological resources: includes genetic resources, organisms or parts thereof, populations, or any other biotic component of ecosystem, with actual or potential use or value for humanity.

Collaborative Management: The involvement of local communities, private sector, public institutions and other stakeholders in the management of wildlife resources.

Disaster risk management is a systematic process used to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster

Ecosystem: means a dynamic complex of plant, animals and micro-organism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit.

Endangered species: An endangered species is a population of organisms or an organism which is at risk of becoming extinct because it is either few in numbers, or threatened by changing environmental or predation parameters.

Ex-situ conservation: any material of plant, animal, microbial or of other origin containing functional units of heredity.

Genetic resources: means genetic material of actual or potential value.

Habitat: the place or type of site where an organisms or population occurs.

In-situ conditions: conditions where genetic resources exist within ecosystem and natural habitats, and, in the case of domestic or cultivated species, in the surroundings where they have developed their distinctive properties.

Lead agency: any ministry, department, parastatal agency, local government system or public officer in which or in whom any law vests functions of control or management of any segment of the environment.

Local community: Persons and households living in a defined geographical area, in close proximity to a wildlife conservation area, and identified by common history, common culture or common residence in a parish which shares a boundary with a wildlife conservation area.

Protected Area: means a geographically defined area gazetted by law which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives

Rare species: species not frequent or seldom met with or seldom occurring

Sustainable Use: the use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long term decline of abundance and diversity, thereby maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations

Threatened species: Species of animals or plants which are vulnerable to endangerment in the near future

Vulnerable Species: Species likely to become endangered unless the circumstances threatening its survival and reproduction improve

Wildlife Conservation Area: Any area gazetted as a National Park, Wildlife Reserve, Wildlife sanctuary, Community wildlife area, or any other area declared as such by law

Wildlife Protected Area: Any area gazetted as National Parks, Wildlife Reserves and any other area gazetted as such by law

Wildlife: Means any wild plant or animal species or their derivative products indigenous and or introduced in Uganda, including those that migrate through Uganda.

ACRONYMS

ABS	Access and Benefit Sharing
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CDC	Curriculum Development Center
CEPA	Communication, education and public awareness
CNOOC	China National Offshore Oil Cooperation
IEC	Information, education and communication
CFM	Collaborative Forest Management
CFR	Central Forest Reserve
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DEAP	District Environment Action Plan
DEAT	Department of Environment Affairs & Tourism,
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
DRM	Disaster risk management
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSSD	Forest sector Support Department
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
GoU	Government of Uganda
GTI	Global Taxonomy Initiative
HFA	Hyogo Framework of Action
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IK	Indigenous Knowledge
IPLC	Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
LFR	Local Forest Reserve
LGDP	Local Government Development Plan
LMO	Living Modified Organism
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MP	Medicinal plants
MT	Metric tonnes
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MTIC	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives
MWE	Ministry of Water and Environment
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organization
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and action Plan
NCRL	National Chemotherapeutics Research Laboratory
NDP	National Development Plan
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
MOES	Ministry of education and Sports
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOJCA	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
MTWA	Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities
NFA	National Forestry Authority

PAs	Protected Areas
PMA	Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture
PSFU	Private Sector Foundation
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation including conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
SIP	Sector Investment Plan
SOER	State of Environment Report
TCBDC	Technical Committee on Biodiversity Conservation
TWG	Thematic Working Group
UEPB	Uganda Export Promotion Board
UJA	Uganda Journalists Association
UMA	Uganda Manufacturers Association
UNBS	Uganda National Bureau of Standards
UNCST	Uganda National Council for Science and Technology
UNFF	Uganda National Farmers Federation
URA	Uganda Revenue Authority
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
UWEC	Uganda Wildlife Education Center
WMD	Wetlands Management Department

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background information

Uganda is a landlocked country that lies astride the equator between 4°N and 1°S and stretches from 29.5°W – 35°W (Figure 1). It is one of the smaller states in Eastern Africa covering an area of 236,000 square km comprising 194,000 square km dry land, 33,926 square km open water and 7,674 square km of permanent swamp (Langdale-Brown *et al* 1964, Langlands, 1973).



Figure 1: Location of Uganda in Africa

Given Uganda's location in a zone between the ecological communities that are characteristic of the drier East African savannas and the more moist West African rain forests (Figure 1), combined with high altitude ranges, the country has a high level of biological diversity. Internationally and in Africa, for its size, Uganda is among those countries endowed with the greatest diversity of animal and plant species. Although Uganda occupies only 2% of the world's area, with a recorded 18,783 species of fauna and flora (NEMA, 2009), Uganda ranks among the top ten most bio-diverse countries in the world. Uganda is host to 53.9% of the World's population of mountain gorillas, 11% (1,063 species) of the world's recorded species of birds (50% of Africa's bird species), 7.8% (345 species) of the Global Mammal Diversity (39% of Africa's Mammal Richness), 19% (86 species) of Africa's amphibian species

richness and 14% (142 species) of Africa's reptile species richness, 1,249 recorded species of butterflies and 600 species of fish. There are 30 species of antelope, 24 species of primates including charismatic species of Mountain Gorillas and Chimpanzees, and more than 5,406 species of plants so far recorded of which 30 species of plants are endemic to Uganda (MPS, 2013/2014).



Figure 2: Mountain Gorillas in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park

The country's immense biological diversity is important both nationally and internationally, and offers good opportunities for cost-effective multiple species conservation. Uganda's endemic species are primarily associated with high mountains, forests, and the major pleistocene refugium of the Albertine Rift Valley. Among the larger mammalian species, Uganda is endowed with relatively stable populations of among others, Elephant, Buffalo, Hippopotamus, Eland, Zebra, Hartebeest, Waterbuck, Reedbuck, and Uganda Kob. The country is also home to the Lions, Cheetahs, Leopards, Hunting Dog and Hyenas among others. Uganda therefore has all the big five animals. Currently Uganda has 159 species listed in the IUCN Red List, 2008; which includes 38 plants, 21 mammals, 18 birds, 6 amphibians, 54 fishes, 10 molluscs and 12 being other invertebrates.

1.2 Status of biodiversity in Uganda

Biodiversity is a fundamental element of the earth's life support system and is the basis for all ecosystem services and thus plays a fundamental role in maintaining and enhancing the world's population as it supports many basic natural services for humans for example fresh water, fertile soils and clean air. Biodiversity includes diversity at the genetic level, for example between individuals in a population or between plant varieties, the diversity of species, and the diversity of ecosystems and habitats.

1.2.1 Biodiversity at the Species level

Uganda is exceptionally rich in biodiversity with surveys reporting occurrence of over 18,783 species of flora and fauna. Our knowledge of the species present is confined to the more known taxa such as birds, mammals, butterflies, higher plants, reptiles, amphibians and fish (Table 1). This is because of their relative conspicuousness and economic importance. Little

is known about the less conspicuous ones including important forms such as belowground biodiversity.

Table 1: Recorded flora and fauna spp in Uganda

Taxon	Total number of species	% of global species	No. of globally threatened spps
Amphibians	86	1.7	10
Birds	1,012	10.2	15
Butterflies	1,242	6.8	-
Dragon flies	249	4.6	-
Ferns	389	3.2	-
Fish	501	2.0	49
Flowering plants	4,500	1.1	40
Fungi (poly pore)	173	16	-
Liverworts	275	46	-
Mammals	345	7.5	25
Molluscs	257	0.6	10
Mosses	445	3.5	-
Reptiles	142	1.9	1
Termites	93	3.4	-
Other invertebrates	-	-	17

Source: NEMA 2009

Because of various threats, several Ugandan species have qualified to be included on the IUCN Red Data list as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Status of Uganda's biodiversity according to the IUCN Red List (2008)

Conservation status	No. of Species	No. of Species
	2004	2008
Extinct	34	34
Extinct in the wild	4	4
Critically endangered	27	28
Endangered	31	36
Vulnerable	72	67
Lower risk/conservation dependent	18	18
Threatened	54	51
Near threatened	64	66

1.2.2 Biodiversity description based on taxa

The key fauna and flora biodiversity resources in Uganda may be described under the following categories; mammals, birds, fishes, reptiles, amphibians, plants and insects.

Mammals: Uganda has approximately 380 mammal species and is ranked 13 in the world in terms of mammal species richness (IUCN RED Data List 2008). The number of mammal species has been changing due to local extinctions and introductions (UWA, 2010).

Birds: Uganda has approximately 1,016 species of birds (10% of world total). There are over 2,250 species recorded on the African continent and the total list of Uganda species represents nearly half (47%) of all species recorded on the continent. There are 143 palaeartic migrants, 56 afro-tropical migrants and 25 Albertine endemics. A total of 189 species are forest specialists while 160 species are water dependent (Byaruhanga et al, 2001; NBI, 2010).



Figure 3: Ostriches in Kidepo National Park

Fishes: The fish biodiversity in Uganda is dominated by the cichlid family consisting of 324 species of which 292 are endemic to Lake Victoria. Of the over 600 fish species found in Uganda, the only commercial fish species include Nile perch (*Lates niloticus*) found in all the major lakes except Edward/George. Other commercially exploited species include the Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) found in all major water bodies, Mukene (*Rastreneobola argentea*) from Lakes Victoria and Kyoga, Muziri/Mukene, (*Neobola bredoi*) of L. Albert, Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) and the Silver catfish (*Bagrus documak*) from all major water bodies. *Alestes Baremose*, *Brycinus nurse* and *N. bredoi* currently constitute about 80% of fish biomass in Lake Albert. The most common fish species to almost all the water bodies is the Lungfish (*Protopterus aethiopicus*).



Figure 4: Bagrus documak(Ssemutundu -a delicacy in Uganda) from Lake Bisina

Amphibians: There are 98 species of amphibians recorded in Uganda, representing 1.65% of global species. Most of the amphibian species in Uganda have an IUCN category of Least Concern because they either have a wide distribution, tolerant to broad range of habitats or presumed to have large populations. However, a few species are recorded as restricted, 5 species vulnerable, 1 species is near threatened, 1 species critically endangered and 1 species (Northern clawed frog) is extinct while 3 species are data deficient (NBI, 2010). Over-all, little is known or documented about this taxa.

Reptiles: There are an estimated 150 reptile species in Uganda which represent approximately 1.5 % of total global species. Very little is currently known or documented about these taxa (NBI, 2010).

Domestic Animals: This category includes cattle, goats, sheep, pigs, poultry, rabbits, donkeys, horses, domestic buffalo, dogs and cats.

Plants: There are approximately 5,000 species of higher plants in Uganda, of which 70 are endemic and mainly concentrated in tropical forests in the western region. 58 Ugandan taxa of higher plants are listed on the Global Red Data List by IUCN. There is concern that more of Uganda's plant taxa will appear under the Red List due to habitat changes or loss unless immediate remedial measures are taken (NBI, 2010). The lower plants are generally poorly documented in Uganda. They fall under three main types: Algae (115 species), Bryophytes and Pteridophytes (ferns) (386 species). Bryophytes (mosses (500 species), liverworts (250 species) and hornworts) represent the most ancient lineage of land plants (UNESCO, 2012).

Fungi: Fungi are generally poorly known or documented in Uganda. However, available records show that there are 420 species of fungi (NBSAP, 2002) in Uganda. Fungi exists in form of ecological (saprophytic, symbiotic and parasitic fungi, edible and medical mushrooms), industrial (for instance, brewing and baking yeast), medicines and pathogenic organisms in human health (candidiasis, ring worms, athlete foot) or agricultural forms (crop and animal pathogens of domestic and wild animals).

Lichens: There are 296 species of lichens in Uganda represented in 51 genera. These represent 1.6% of world species (NBI, 2010).

Insects: Uganda houses 8,999 species of insects (1.2% of the global species) in 3,170 genera (NBI, 2010).

1.2.3 Biodiversity distribution in Uganda

Uganda's rich biodiversity is distributed across both terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Most of the biodiversity can be found in natural forests, but a considerable number is also found in other natural ecosystems such as mountains, savannahs, wetlands, lakes and rivers. Agricultural biodiversity on altered man-made ecosystems is also abundant; however great interest is given to biodiversity confined to natural ecosystem because of harboring most of the uncommon or rare species in their more preferred original states. Box 1.1 below shows the biodiversity hot spots in Uganda.

Box 1.1 Biodiversity hot spots in Uganda

- Mgahinga Gorilla National Park and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park - the mountain gorilla (*Gorilla gorillaberengei*) and other regionally and globally endemic species
- Rwenzori Mountain National Park — bay duiker (*Cephalophu.cleucogaster*)
- Sango bay wetlands and forest ecosystem — biodiversity of global significance
- Kibale National Park — globally and regionally endemic species, primate species richness
- Dry mountains of Karamoja (Napa, Morungole, Kadam, Timu and Moroto) — regional and global endemics
- Lake Victoria — cichlid and Nile perch species (alien species invasion)
- Papyrus swamps of Lake Edward, George and Bunyonyi which have, among others, the endemic papyrus (*'hioropetagracilirosiris*)

Source: SOER 2000/2002

1.2.4 Biodiversity in protected areas

Protected Areas (PAs) in Uganda mainly fall under two resources, namely forestry and wildlife. Out of a total surface area of 241,551sq.km (both land and water), 25,981.57sq.km (10%) is gazetted as wildlife conservation areas, 24% is gazetted as forest reserves and 13% is wetlands.

Biodiversity in Wildlife Conservation Areas: Uganda has 10 National Parks, 12 Wildlife Reserves, 10 wildlife sanctuaries, 5 community wildlife areas, 506 central forest reserves and 191 local forest reserves. It is however estimated that over 50% of Uganda's wildlife resources still remain outside designated protected areas, mostly on privately owned land which is of most urgent concern for protection and development.

Uganda's wildlife conservation areas are very rich in biodiversity. According to UWA (2012), there are 405 species of mammals, 177 species of reptiles, 119 species of amphibians and approximately 1,000 bird species in Uganda's wildlife conservation areas.



Figure 5: A lion in Queen Elizabeth National Park

Some mammal species are restricted in their distribution. For example, Zebras are restricted to Lake Mburo and Kidepo National Parks, giraffes to Murchison Falls and Kidepo National Parks and, mountain gorillas to Bwindi Impenetrable and Mgahinga National Parks. There are three local extinctions among the large mammals namely; Oryx, black rhino and Derby's eland (UWA, 2012).

Biodiversity in forest reserves: Uganda's tropical forests are also very rich in biodiversity. Central Forest Reserves (CFM) are known to house some 1,259 species of trees and shrubs, 1,011 species of birds, 75 species of rodents, 12 species of diurnal primates and 71 butterfly species (NFA, 2011).

Among the key forest biodiversity species, 4 primates species, 2 other mammals species, 6 bird species, and 2 butterflies are listed in IUCN Red Data Book (2008) to be globally threatened with extinction (NFA, 2011). Four species of mammals (Chimpanzee, 1'Hoest monkey, elephant and leopard), one species of birds (Grauers rush warbler) and one species of butterfly (Cream-banded swallowtail butterfly) are also listed as "vulnerable". Four species of forest birds (Nahan's francolin, African green broadbill, Flycatcher and Forest ground thrush) are classified as "rare". The Uganda red collobus monkey and Kibale ground thrush are categorized as "intermediate" species since not enough information is available about them (NFA, 2011).

1.2.5 Biodiversity outside protected areas

Uganda's present policies and legislation for management of terrestrial biodiversity outside PAs is inadequate. The existing land tenure systems of land holdings, leasehold and customary holdings offer little incentive for protection and management of biodiversity outside PAs. Maintenance of habitats and species are at the mercy of individual land owners. While wildlife is under considerable pressure and requires more attention for conservation. A few areas outside the PA system with considerable populations of mammals have been identified in several rangelands in Uganda e.g. the former Ankole Ranching Scheme which has viable numbers of impala, zebra, waterbuck, bush pigs, buffaloes, warthogs, oribi, topi

and hippos. Other areas in districts such as Kiboga and Luwero also have reasonable animal populations outside PAs.

The bulk of the forests (64%) in Uganda are found on private land (NFA, 2011) which is outside protected areas. These forests harbour the same extent of biological diversity as those inside the forest reserves. This situation shows that private land owners and communities could play a significant positive role in managing forest biodiversity in Uganda given the right incentives to do so.

As with wildlife, the status of plants outside PAs is not known. However, there are some restricted range species that are critical for example *Rytgyinia sp.* is confined to Iganga District in eastern Uganda whereas *Aloe tororoana* is only known on Tororo rock, an area of only a few hectares. *Phoenix reclinata* is highly vulnerable outside PAs, as it is heavily harvested as poles for fencing especially in urban areas.

Biodiversity in wetlands: Uganda's wetlands are known to support some 43 species of dragon flies (of which 20% are known to occur in Uganda only), 9 species of molluscs, 52 species of fish (which represent 18% of all fish species in Uganda), 48 species of amphibians, 243 species of birds, 14 species of mammals, 19 species of reptiles and 271 species of macrophytes (NBSAP, 2002). Papyrus and other wetland plants have commercial value, and many other plants are used for medicinal purposes (MWE, 2003).

Biodiversity in savannah ecosystems: Grasslands/savannas cover more than 50% of the land area of Uganda and are dominated in different locations by species of grasses, palms or acacias. A diversity of other plant and animal species are also closely associated with various natural savanna types. Much of this habitat has been converted to human use for agriculture and grazing. The remaining pockets of natural savannas and grasslands are primarily found in various protected areas in Uganda.



Figure 6: Uganda Kob in the Savanna Ecosystem of Queen Elizabeth National Park

Biodiversity in aquatic ecosystems: About 20% of the surface area of Uganda is under water comprising lakes (46,900 sq. km), swamps (7,300 sq. km) and rivers (2,000 sq. km). Uganda's fisheries landscape therefore includes the diverse resources ranging from the five large lakes Victoria, Kyoga, Albert Edward, George and Kazinga Channel, over 160 small lakes, a network of rivers, swamps and flood plains all of which are critical habitats, breeding and nursery grounds for fish and potential sites for Aquaculture development. The 160 small

water bodies occur in Eastern and western Uganda but their potential for fish production is largely unknown.

Aquatic biodiversity is to a large extent, outside the PA system. It therefore suffers direct human impacts as communities exploit it for their sustenance. For example, fish biodiversity has been adversely affected due to unregulated exploitation without adequate provisions for sustained renewal of the fish. There has also been a considerable change in fish species composition in lakes such as Victoria and Kyoga following the introduction of the Nile perch in the 1950s. Shoreline vegetation, such as papyrus, Vossia and Typha which are under increasing threat form an important habitat for fish biodiversity. Uganda has about 600 fish species in terms of biodiversity and all edible but the commonly encountered in trade are dominated by the Nile perch, Nile tilapia and small fishes (mukene, ragoogi and nkejje).



Figure 7: Aquatic biodiversity habitat



Figure 8: Hippos in River Nile within Murchison Falls National Park

Belowground biodiversity: Little is known about the status of soil biodiversity because it has received less attention from researchers and planners (Rwakaikara, 2008). As far as biodiversity conservation is concerned, the most important of these is the soil bacteria (Okwakol, 2007). The major species of soil microflora are given in Table 3 below.

About 20% of the surface area of Uganda is under water comprising lakes (46,900 sq. km), swamps (7,300 sq. km) and rivers (2,000 sq. km). Uganda's fisheries landscape therefore includes the diverse resources ranging from the five large lakes Victoria, Kyoga, Albert Edward, George and Kazinga Channel, over 160 small lakes, a network of rivers, swamps and flood plains all of which are critical habitats, breeding and nursery grounds for fish and potential sites for Aquaculture development. The 160 small water bodies occur in Eastern and western Uganda but their potential for fish production is largely unknown.

Table 3: Major species of soil micro flora in Uganda

Form	Genera	Species
Bacteria	37	92
Fungi	184	420
Algae	149	115

Source: NBSAP (2002)

1.3 Biodiversity trends in Uganda

1.3.1 Species trends

The rate of biodiversity loss in Uganda is high and was calculated in 2004 to be between 10-11% per decade (MWLE, 2003). Over-all, there is concern over the downward trend of Uganda's biodiversity on global scale. The number of known species recorded on the IUCN Red List is high as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Status of Uganda's biodiversity according to IUCN Red List (2008)

Conservation status category	No. of Spp	No. of Spp
	2004	2008
Extinct	34	34
Extinct in the Wild	4	4
Critically endangered	27	28
Endangered	31	36
Vulnerable	72	67
Lower risk/conservation dependant	18	18
Threatened	54	51
Near threatened	64	66
Data deficient	41	36
Least concern	1,562	1,508

Source: IUCN Red lists of 2004 and 2008

For mammals, the population of some species seems to be on the decline while others have increased. For example, the populations of chimpanzees, mountain gorillas and elephants have continued to rise during the last several years. Table 5 shows the trends in some mammalian species.



Figure 9: Elephant population is slowly increasing

Table 5: Trends in large mammal populations in Uganda

Species	1960s	1982-1983	1995-1996	1999-2003	2004-2006	2007-2010	2011	Status in Uganda
Buffalo	60,000	25,000	18,000	17,800	30,306	21,565	21,639	Population increasing
Burchell's Zebra	10,000	5,500	3,200	2,800	6,062	11,814	n/a	Population stable
Elephant	30,000	2,000	1,900	2,400	4,322	4,393	n/a	Population stable
Rothschild's Giraffe	2,500	350	250	240	259	984	n/a	Population stable
Hartebeest	25,000	18,000	2,600	3,400	4,439	4,099	4,001	Population stable
Hippo	26,000	13,000	4,500	5,300	7,542	6,580	n/a	Population stable
Impala	12,000	19,000	6,000	3,000	4,705	33,565	n/a	Population stable
Topi	15,000	6,000	600	450	1,669	845	n/a	Population stable
Uganda kob	70,000	40,000	30,000	44,000	34,461	54,861	54,080	Population stable
Waterbuck	10,000	8,000	3,500	6,000	6,493	12,925	13,128	Population increasing
Common Eland	4,500	1,500	500	450	309	1,409	n/a	Population stable
Bight's gazelle	1,800	1,400	100	50	n/a	n/a	57	Population precarious but recovering
Roan	700	300	15	7	n/a	5	20	Population precarious but recovering
Oryx	2,000	200	0	0	0	0	0	Extinct in Uganda
Black Rhino	400	150	0	0	0	0	0	Extinct in Uganda
Derby's eland	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	Extinct in Uganda
Northern White Rhino	300	20	0	0	0	0	0	Extinct in Uganda
Eastern Black Rhino	400	150	0	0	0	0	0	Extinct in Uganda
Southern White Rhino					6	11	14	This is a breeding population at the Rhino Sanctuary which is increasing
Lions				600		416		Population declining fairly rapidly

Source: UWA (2011)

It should be noted that before the civil strife in the 1970's and 1980's, Uganda had both the northern white rhinos (*Ceratotherium simum cottoni*) and eastern black rhinos. All these rhinos got extinct in the 1980s and we currently have none of the original indigenous rhinos. What we now have is the Southern white rhino (*Ceratotherium simum simum*) which is just an out of range sub-species (new introduction) in Uganda. Six of them were got from Kenya and 2 from United States. Their population now stands at 14 individuals in the country.



Figure 10: A Rhino at Uganda Wildlife Education Centre

Trends in bird populations: As for birds, of the more than 1,000 recorded species, Uganda has 15 threatened species at global level (NEMA, 2007); 10 are designated as vulnerable e.g. Blue Swallow and Grauer's Rush Warbler; 16 are near-threatened e.g. Shoebill, Lesser Flamingo and Fox's Weaver. There are seven species that are designated as rare, the majority of which are forest species and are mainly threatened by forest loss. These include the African green broadbill (*Pseudocalyptomena graueri*) and chapin's flycatcher (*Muscicapa lendu*) which occur in Bwindi forest. The forest ground thrush (*Zoothera oberlaenderi*) which has been recorded only in Semliki forest is also threatened by disturbance. Rare non-forest species include the endemic papyrus yellow warbler (*Chloropeta gracilirostris*), which occurs in papyrus swamps around lakes Edward, George, Bunyonyi and Mutanda, and is threatened by habitat loss and disturbance. The migrant corncrake (*Crex crex*) is also threatened. In terms of trends, some species seem to be recovering from a downward trend. For example, the population of pied king fisher is increasing while fish eagles have remained fairly constant (Pomeroy et al 2004).

Trends in commercial fish production: Total fish production potential in Uganda stands at about 560,000 metric tonnes with about 82% (460,000 MT) contribution from the major water bodies and 18 % (100,000 MT) from aquaculture fisheries. The general production has averaged about 220,000 metric tonnes per year in the last decade after peaking at 276,000 metric tonnes in 1993. Increasing fishing effort is exerting high fishing pressure on capture fisheries thereby causing fish scarcity and prompting use of destructive fishing gears and technologies. This has continually led to increased investment costs in fishing operations in an effort to chase and catch the fish.

The fisheries resources in Uganda have been on the decline due to various pressures and threats. The Nile perch stocks on Lake Victoria for example have decreased from an estimated 1.9 million tons in 1999 to 0.35 million tons in 2009. Currently 40 percent of the catch of large species in the lake is immature fish. Available information indicates that use of illegal fishing gears and malpractices have increased over years. On Lake Victoria, the use of illegal monofilament nets increased by 1,220 percent between 2004 and 2008. A declining trend in export levels and reduction in fish species diversity should be expected in the long term if this trend continues.

The major threats to fish production in Uganda include the following:

- a) Use of destructive fishing gears and technologies especially when they are used in fish breeding and nursery grounds resulting in harvesting of young fish
- b) Open access fisheries management regime has led to many fishermen to compete for fish without consideration for long-term resource sustainability
- c) Environmental problems such as water pollution, degradation of Lake Shoreline and riverine wetlands leading to siltation, use of agro-chemicals industrial and urbanization in lake and river catchments all alter fish habitat conditions
- d) Lack of realistic fish stock data for capture fisheries creates a weak basis for policy formulations, poor management decisions, under valuation of fisheries

Several measures are currently being taken to address threats to fisheries including:

- a) Restocking Lakes Victoria and Kyoga with native fish species to replenish the stocks of fish fed on by Nile perch
- b) Establishing and maintaining proper base data/information on fish stocks, fish species reproductive biology and their resilience potential
- c) Strengthening fisheries co-management
- d) Promoting and supporting aquaculture
- e) Gazetting a limited number of landing sites to reduce and concentrate landing sites to facilitate monitoring, surveillance and control
- f) Establishing no fishing zones especially fish breeding areas and protecting them from destructive fishing
- g) Controlling the size of fishing gear and establishing regional fisheries management institutions (like Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization on Lake Victoria)
- h) Harmonizing regional policies and laws governing trans-boundary fisheries.

1.3.2 Habitat trends

Forests

Forest land in Uganda is presently estimated at 3.3 million hectares or 16% of the total country area declining from 4.9 million hectares or 20% in 2001. Of the total area of forests, 30% are in protected areas (forest reserves, national parks and wildlife reserves) while 70% is found on private and customary land. Uganda is estimated to be losing its forest cover at a rate of 80,000 hectares per year implying a loss in forestry biodiversity as well. The size of forest and woodlands has significantly declined from 45% to 20% of total land surface between 1890 and 1990 (NFA, 2011). The majority of the forest loss has occurred outside of protected areas largely due conversion of forest lands into agriculture and over-harvesting wood for energy supply in form of firewood and charcoal (NFA, 2011).

Threats to forests and its biodiversity include the following:

- a) **Deforestation:** Due to high population growth rate and the rapid development in Uganda, the forest sector faces a huge problem of over harvesting through deforestation to satisfy the high demand for forest land for agriculture and forest products like charcoal, fuel wood and timber. Deforestation of the widely abundant woodlands is very rampant for the production of charcoal and conversion to agriculture and grazing land. About 78% of Ugandans are said to use firewood for cooking, a highly contributing factor to deforestation.

- b) **Diseases and pests** have also attacked some of the tree species reducing their quality in ecological functions and production for timber products yet it's difficult to prevent spread; very costly and tasking to spray affected areas for their area coverage and irregularities in forests.
- c) **Urbanization and Industrialization** have exerted great pressures on mainly peri-urban forest reserves for expansion of urban and industrial centers. For instance Namanve forest near Kampala (1000 ha) and Wabisi-Wajala in Nakasongola District (8,744 ha) were degazetted for industrial expansion. *The drive to modernization has also witnessed a dramatic increase in construction of residential, commercial and institutional buildings. Hence the demand for burnt bricks has translated into increased use of firewood. Timber for construction is also in high demand (SOER 2004/5, page 80)*
- d) **Encroachment** especially in the savanna woodland for the purpose of agricultural expansion and pastures for livestock grazing. For example in the forests reserves of Kiboga, Mubende, Luwero, Nakasongola, Bundibugyo, Soroti and Iganga, the reserves' boundaries in question were re-opened and demarcated especially in search of grazing grounds and at times farm land
- e) **Alien species introduction:** Several tree and other plant species were introduced during the colonial period for example the eucalyptus, that have adapted quite well, colonizing and replacing indigenous species such as *Lantana camara*.
- f) **Poor policies** have also contributed to the loss of forest cover for example during the 1972 to 1985; Box 1.1 shows poor policies of 1970s. In addition other good policies are impartial for example they at times lack public participation while other substantive laws lack subsidiary implementation

Box 1.2: Effect of misguided policies on forest resources

After 1972 forest encroachment started on an unprecedented level. After the expulsion of the Asians the President declared an "economic war" followed by the "double production campaign" and in 1973 he declared that Ugandans were free to settle anywhere. The land reform decree of 1975 strengthened peoples' hands in acquiring land supposedly for "development". Under these concepts, forests were sometimes regarded as wastelands' which could be cleared. Government officials started allocating gazetted forest land to either individuals or millstones for 'development. Tree planting and other silvi-cultural activities came to a standstill

Source: FAO, 1988

Wildlife Protected areas

As mentioned above, Uganda's wildlife protected areas include 10 National Parks, 12 Wildlife Reserves, 7 Wildlife Sanctuaries and 5 Community Wildlife Areas. The biodiversity in the wildlife conservation areas has in some cases declined and in other cases increased over the years as can be seen from Table 5 above.

The major threats to PAs are related to the seemingly high population growth rate of Uganda (estimated at 3.2 percent per annum) which results in high demand for resources including land, fuel and income but also failure by local communities to recognize the value of PAs and associated biodiversity. Population growth has increased the demand for agricultural land and fuel wood for domestic use. Although, opportunities to ameliorate PA degradation exist

through sound exploitation, rural poverty restricts the ability of local communities to invest in sustainable land use practices. More specifically, the stakeholder consultation stage highlighted the following threats:

- a) **Encroachment:** Loss of habitat is perhaps the serious negative factor and is certainly the most difficult to halt and reverse. Encroachment is prevalent in all types of PAs. There was much clearance of forest cover to make settlements in the forest reserves during Uganda's civil strife of the 1970s and 1980s; residual encroachment in PAs still continues. Most of the boundaries of the encroached reserves have not been reopened and are not clearly demarcated, and this forms part of the reason for the current challenge of protecting these areas.
- b) **Human-wildlife conflicts:** The perennial clash between human beings and wild animals continues to present stiff challenges in the management of PAs. Given the high population growth, many communities have ended up establishing farms and settlements very close to the boundaries of the PAs resulting in destruction of crops by wild animals especially elephants, hippos and buffaloes. This has prompted the local communities to either poison the animals or become antagonistic towards conservation programmes.
- c) **Illegal grazing in National Parks:** Communities neighbouring PAs continue to graze their domestic animals inside the game parks and reserves, and in most cases intruders are not deterred by fines. A number of factors contribute to the intrusion into PAs. These include disregarding the existing laws, failure to recognize the importance of the areas and desperation due to lack of other pasture options, among others.
- d) **Poaching:** Poaching is a serious problem in the wildlife areas and is largely attributed to the demand for products from wild animals and plants for food, cash, medicine and game trophies. This activity has caused a significant decline in wild population and in some cases resulted to localized species extinction.

Wetlands

There is a fair level of complexity in categorizing Uganda's wetlands and inconsistency in the size. However, wetland cover is presently estimated at 10% of the country's area, or about 26,000 km² (WMD, 2009) of which one-third are permanently flooded. In Uganda most wetlands occur outside protected areas and their range and quality is rapidly being eroded for agricultural land, urban settlement and industrial development. In Eastern Uganda alone 20% of wetlands have been destroyed, Central region 2.8%, Northern 2.4% and western 3.6% of wetlands have been destroyed (NEMA 2008). This has implications on wetlands biodiversity, especially for wetland dependent species such as Sitatunga.

Current threats to wetlands and their biodiversity include the following:

- a) **Encroachment of wetlands** due to extended demand for land for grazing and agriculture especially rice in the Eastern region, dairy farming and vegetables in South West and postural land in the North and East) this wetland conversion is most common in rural and sub-urban areas.
- b) **Drainage of wetlands** in urban centers especially in the central region, driven by the force of urban expansion or development.

- c) **Pollution of wetlands** especially in urban places from discharging and dumping untreated industrial and municipal wastes while in rural areas from large agricultural farms and mining areas.
- d) **Overharvesting or over-exploitation of wetland resources** which includes over fishing, over harvesting of wetland plants for domestic and commercial use and harvesting of construction materials like clay, sand, firewood, timber, papyrus and ornaments among others.
- e) **Siltation of wetlands**; this is due to poor methods of farming surrounding the wetland area that may cause massive erosion into the wetland

Aquatic ecosystems

The Status of these ecosystems has remained fairly stable in size, save for the fringing wetlands that have been dwindling in size over time. However, information on the ecological condition e.g. water quality is inadequate. There are reported increases in sedimentation in some water bodies e.g. Lakes Victoria, Kyoga, George and Bisina (NEMA, 2008).



Figure 11: Fishing in Uganda’s waters

1.3.3 Status and trends of biodiversity in agricultural landscapes

There is no complete record of biodiversity status within agricultural landscape in Uganda. Table 4 shows the diversity of common plants as far as they are known at present.

Plant genetic resources (PGR) in Uganda range from little known indigenous wild fruits and vegetables, pastures and forages, medicinal plants, indigenous staples like millet and sorghum to introduced crops such as maize, tobacco, coffee, cotton and beans. This PGR is distributed across the diverse ecological zones of Uganda. Common documented categories of agricultural plants are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Diversity of common agriculture crop plants in Uganda

Plants	Status
Exotic plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58 families in 180 tree species • 55 species of other plants which are dominated by ornamental and fruit trees/plants and vegetables
Edible plants	>200 species of non-cultivated edible plants
Indigenous edible fruit trees	37 families represented by 75 species

Source: NBSAP (2002)

Of the estimated, 1,400 indigenous plant species in Uganda (many of whose potentials have not been exploited), 30 species are known to be endangered, 43 are rare and 10 are vulnerable (NBSAP, 2002). In addition, there are over 230 exotic plant species, some of which are very important to this country.

Modern agriculture enforces use of improved cultivars but some farmers have retained their varieties. This form of in-situ on-farm conservation needs to be strengthened. The local communities are custodians of a lot of indigenous knowledge on PGR but documentation of this knowledge as well as inventories of the under exploited plants and location maps for further exploration are poorly developed in the country. A lot of genetic erosion of indigenous species is going on at an alarming rate as Uganda modernizes its agriculture with emphasis on exotic species and improved varieties. Populations of the once popular indigenous fruits and vegetables such as indigenous tomatoes are rarely seen nowadays.



Figure 12: Fresh fruits in Uganda

Threats to Plant Genetic Resources (PGR) for food and agriculture include the following:

- a) Replacement of local crop varieties by introduced commercial varieties (e.g. nematode and disease resistant varieties of banana, cassava, maize, beans);
- b) Loss or neglect of traditional varieties, including crop wild relatives and landraces e.g. millet, cowpeas, pigeon peas, Lima and Bambara beans, and wild medicinal plants and local fruits and vegetables (e.g. *Solanum nigrum*, Ginger lily through wetland destruction, Cape gooseberry by fire and overgrazing and introduction of exotic species such as tomatoes and cabbages)
- c) *Loss of other indigenous species found in cultivated areas (e.g. *Crotalaria jaburniflora*, *Thumbergia alata* and *Eluophia streptopetala* (internationally protected), as well as increasing problems of invasive crop weeds (e.g. parasitic *Striga*, Couch grass and *Lantana camara**
- d) Introduction of new varieties in preference to indigenous species
- e) Genetic erosion of indigenous plant genetic resources due to changes in land use
- f) Climatic change, leading to drought, diseases, pests, famine.

Potential interventions to address threats to PGR:

Threats to PGR can be addressed through many interventions including capacity building for plant inventory techniques, for developing and maintaining plant databases, for developing models for plant conservation and sustainable use, for boosting law enforcement and for plant conservation at technical and apprenticeship levels. Other interventions include the provision of incentives to taxonomists to retain staff in this valuable field, supporting, supporting domestication of useful plants, designing strategies and plans to protect threatened species on private lands, continuous collection and inventory of useful plant species, designing and maintaining a comprehensive database inclusive of species diversity, spatial distribution and taxonomic information to target collection sites and improvement of infrastructure and other working facilities for plant conservation.

Animal Genetic Resources

The indigenous breeds of cattle are the main source of beef in Uganda constituting almost 95% of the total cattle population. Table 7 shows the diversity of common livestock species in Uganda.

Table 7: Diversity of animal breeds/varieties in Uganda

Animals	No. of breeds or varieties	Status
Cattle	>16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4 indigenous breeds, 12 exotic breeds• Indigenous distributed country-wide mainly under traditional systems; exotics mainly under commercial dairy or beef farming
Goats	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 indigenous, 4 exotic breeds• There is increasing commercial value being given to goats for dairy and meat favouring exotic breeds.
Sheep	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 indigenous, 4 exotic species• 3 Exotic breeds are not well adapted, they are concentrated in highland areas.
Pigs	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 mixed breed, several breed related to wild forms; 3 breeds introduced• Economic value increasing as "pork" continues to become popular especially in urban areas
Poultry	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 indigenous; 6 introduced breeds• Exotics concentrated in and around urban areas.
Horses	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little known in Uganda• Owned privately for leisure
Donkeys	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little known• Reared mainly for providing "labour" especially in Karamoja and kapchorwa
Rabbits	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little known• Economic value is increasing as they continue to be valued as a protein diet and source of household income

Source: Mbuza et al. (1999)

Trends in Domestic Animal Diversity: In recent years, livestock numbers have been increasing, in line with human population trends and the relative civil calm in Uganda. The increase in cattle population is attributed to general improved animal health as a result of nationwide disease control, improved breeding programmes and better management practices. The demand for milk directly and by milk processing plants has further stimulated animal production. Exotic and cross-breeds are however becoming increasingly popular. There is some concern that indigenous breeds are being undermined, as land becomes scarcer and the demand for high-yielding breeds increases. It is believed that Uganda has lost 12 breeds of cattle, 3 breeds of goats and one breed of sheep over the last century leaving the current indigenous breeds which for the moment do not appear to be endangered (Table 5), although systematic monitoring needs to be undertaken to discern future trends in species composition.

Threats to domestic animal diversity include the following:

- a) **Poverty** - Large proportions of Ugandans live below the poverty line and are ignorant of the importance of conserving biodiversity. It is usually the best animals that are sold off for slaughter or sacrificed during difficult times thus leaving inferior ones to form the economic base. The ability of the owners to cope with the socio-economic demands keeps on dwindling as they dispose of more animals without replenishment capacity.
- b) **Introduction of new breeds** - The long-term viability of animal agriculture in Uganda depends strongly on the genetic variability of the indigenous animals being reared. However, this genetic base is now being rapidly eroded as breeds developed for intensive management regimes are replacing local races of livestock. The small number of improved breeds does not offer sufficient genetic reservoir for future breed improvement. Even the national semen bank mainly holds stocks of imported exotic semen. There are only a few stocks of semen of indigenous animals. Uganda has no stocks of cryo-preserved embryos.
- c) **Systematic breed substitution and irrational genetic transformation** - Due to the high demand for livestock products to feed the rising human population growth, cross breeding and breed replacement are increasingly being encouraged and intensified in Uganda. This has given rise to increasing numbers of crosses and exotic animals at the expense of the indigenous animals. This systematic breed substitution, although the threat is still small, could wipe out the local population in future if no adequate precaution is taken. There is fear that the rate of adopting exotics coupled with cross-breeding the exotics with indigenous breeds might accelerate the rate of displacement of the indigenous species by the introduced breeds.

1.3.4 Status and trends of Pollinators

A pollinator is biological agent that moves pollen from the male of a flower to a female flower to accomplish fertilization. The most recognized pollinators are the various species of bees while others include butterflies, moths, wasps, and bats, birds particularly humming birds, honeyeaters and sunbirds. Pollinators are very important in agricultural production and their status is therefore of concern not only to the farmers but to the Government as it has a direct impact on people's livelihoods and the economy.

Status of pollinator bees in Uganda: In a study by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) in 2009 on the integrated assessment of the potential impacts of the EU

ACP Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) on Uganda's biodiversity, local communities raised concern that pollinator bees were disappearing from commercial flower growing areas due to heavy use of agrochemicals thus affecting other agricultural activities within the vicinity of the flower growing areas. Although the study was inconclusive, there were indicators pointing to the need to phase out the use of some agro-chemicals in flower farms that may have adverse impacts on pollinator bees thus reducing agricultural productivity.

2.0 THE IMPORTANCE OF BIODIVERSITY TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ERADICATION

Uganda has unique physical features and biogeographical location that make it one of the richest countries in Africa in terms of biological diversity. This biodiversity represents one of the vital economic resources that the country has. The services and products provided by biodiversity in form of ecosystems and species constitute billions of shillings per year to Uganda's economy. In addition to direct gains in government revenues, biodiversity resources also support some of the poorest and most vulnerable sectors of Uganda's population. The rural people, the landless and women are highly dependent both on biological resource utilization, and on the diversity of resources that provides them with choice and fall back in times of drought, unemployment or other times of stress.

Natural ecosystems provide many essential services such as the provision of clean water and air, prevention of soil erosion, pollination of crops, provision of medicinal plants, nutrient cycling, provision of food and shelter and the meeting of spiritual, cultural, aesthetic and recreational needs. Large portions of the country's economy are heavily dependent on biodiversity including the fishing industry, tourism (from wildlife biodiversity), livestock industry, commercial and subsistence use of medicinal plants and ecotourism, among others. The continued loss and degradation of Uganda's biodiversity therefore present a serious challenge to its society and the national economy.

The exact economic value of these biodiversity and ecosystem services is complex and controversial to calculate. It has been shown in South Africa that unconverted, intact and conserved ecosystems are between 14% and 70% economically more valuable than ecosystems that have been converted for agriculture, forestry plantations or urban development (DEAT 2006). Despite limited data on biodiversity valuation in Uganda, past estimates put the gross economic output attributable to biological resource use in the fisheries, forestry, tourism, agriculture and energy sectors at US\$ 546.6 million a year and indirect value associated with ecosystem services and functions at over US\$ 200 million annually (Emerton and Muramira, 1999).

2.1 The contribution of Agriculture

Uganda's enormous biodiversity is a major supporter of agriculture in Uganda, which sector is one of Uganda's biggest economic contributors, employing more than 70% of the population. The agricultural sector is composed of crop and animal production, forestry and fisheries and the associated trade and processing industries. The major crops produced include cotton, coffee, tea, sugarcane, tobacco, maize, bananas among others. The contribution of agriculture to GDP is currently around 23%.

One of the major challenges to sustainable agriculture in Uganda today is the unprecedented levels of biodiversity loss including loss of indigenous crop and animal species and varieties. The loss mainly emanates from habitat conversion, high population growth rate, climate change, poverty, and poor farming practices. This loss not only undermines the potential of the sector but also threatens the sustainability of the current roles of the sector. Uganda's population is projected to reach 61 million in the next 30 years (Uganda vision 2040) which calls for increased productivity to meet the anticipated demand increase. Agro-diversity provides various species whose productivity can be enhanced through biodiversity conservation to meet the projected demand increase of food.

Plant genetic resources (PGR) for food and agriculture are the biological basis of world food security and, directly or indirectly support the livelihoods of every person on earth. The PGR for food and agriculture in Uganda range from little known indigenous wild fruits and vegetables, pastures and forages, medicines, indigenous staples like millets and sorghum to introduced crops such as maize, tobacco, cotton, and beans. These form the basis for the livelihoods of most Ugandans in terms of both food security and sources of income.

In terms of domestic animal diversity: livestock production in Uganda contributes 3.2% of the total gross domestic product (GDP) (Behnke and Nakirya, 2012). For the past decade, agricultural GDP growth has averaged about one percent per annum while that of the livestock sub-sector has remained steady at 3% per annum. This implies that the livestock industry has been one of the major contributors to agricultural GDP growth. According to the Uganda Census of Agriculture 2008/9, up to 26 percent of households in the country own cattle, 39 percent own goats, 9 percent own sheep and 18 percent own pigs (MAAIF and UBOS 2009).

2.2 The contribution of forestry

At the sectoral level, the contribution of forestry to Uganda's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for example, is estimated at 6%. In terms of livelihoods, Glenn Bush (2004) established that 11 - 27% of household cash incomes of communities around forest reserves were derived from forestry. In terms of employment, forestry employs over 1 million people in the formal and informal sectors (Forest Policy 2001). In addition, the contribution of forests to soil and water management, carbon sequestration, and future uses for Uganda's biodiversity has been valued at over US\$ 130.7 million annually (Glenn Bush, 2004).

Biomass Energy: The contribution of forestry to national energy demands is mostly expressed through woody biomass use by households and institutions for heating purposes. In 1994, charcoal production utilized 6 million cubic meters of round wood. This increased to 11 million cubic meters in 2007. In addition, the national consumption of firewood was estimated at 32.8 million cubic meters of woody biomass energy annually. The National Biomass Study (2003) indicates that 73 per cent of the districts in Uganda are experiencing a shortage of accessible woody biomass for fuel.

In addition to its contribution to ecological and energy concerns, forestry also supports the economy through forestry-related commercial products and services. These include timber products, ecotourism, arts & crafts, bee products, herbal medicine and rattan-cane. There is very little information to indicate trends in these products and services.

2.3 The contribution of wildlife and tourism

Wildlife resources yield direct benefits such as local and national income from tourism activities and are important sources bush meat, food, medicine, wildlife hunting, cropping and ranching. Tourism currently represents the major legitimate value accruing from wildlife resources.

Wildlife is therefore very important in Uganda's economy in terms of its contribution to GDP, foreign exchange earnings, direct and indirect employment, direct income to local communities, and creation of market for other national trade products, traditional medicine and biomedical research advancement, energy production, shelter construction materials, and a number of social-cultural and aesthetic values.



Figure 13: Bwindi National Park Headquarters

In terms of employment, the wildlife sector provides employment to Ugandans directly and indirectly through conservation, wildlife based tourism, trade and civil societies. For instance, by 2009, over 80,000 people were directly employed in the wildlife sector countrywide (MPS 2012/2013). Uganda Wildlife Authority alone employs over 1300 permanent staff. The concessions given to private businesses to operate hotels within the protected areas have also boosted employment opportunities for local people. Hotels within and outside conservation areas employ a number of people from the surrounding areas and contribute to the National Treasury through taxes.



Figure 14: Acommunity lodge in Bwindi National Park

Tourism which is largely wildlife based plays a key role in Uganda's export earnings. The sector is now the leading foreign exchange earner for Uganda contributing more than US\$1,003,000,000 as of 2013 (MPS 2012/2013) in the form of foreign exchange earnings.

Tourist arrivals rose from 806,658 in 2009 to 1,233,000 in 2013 representing about 17% annual growth rate. Uganda's tourism relies significantly on wildlife and visitors to wildlife protected areas have been steadily growing. Annual visitor arrivals to wildlife protected areas grew at an average annual growth rate of 35% in the last ten years.



Figure 15: Kibale Primate Lodge

Direct revenue generated from wildlife protected areas into national revenues has also been steadily rising, having grown from only UGX 3,305,000,000 in 2000 to now about UGX 46,000,000,000 in 2013. Uganda Wildlife Authority is now able to finance over 80% of its annual budget without direct government subvention by 2013, up from 27% in 2006. This is an indication that the sector is increasingly becoming sustainable. The 20% of all gate entrance fees to all Wildlife Protected Areas goes directly to local communities neighboring the respective Protected Areas. With increasing tourist arrivals and spending, local communities are bound to significantly benefit from wildlife resources. While tourism continues to be the fastest growing sector globally, Uganda could be a leading tourist destination in Africa as the security stabilizes and infrastructure improves.

2.4 The contribution of wetlands

Uganda's wetlands cover about, 29,000 sq. km, or 13% of the total area of the country. They comprise swamp (8,832 sq. km), swamp forest (365 sq. km) and sites with impeded drainage 20,392 sq. km (Figure 5). They include areas of seasonally flooded grassland, swamp forest, permanently flooded papyrus, grass swamp and upland bog. As a result of the vast surface area and the narrow river-like shape of many of the wetlands, there is a very extensive wetland edge.

There are basically two broad distributions of wetland ecosystems in Uganda: (a) the natural lakes and lacustrine swamps and the riverine and flood plain wetlands which are associated with the major river systems in Uganda. Wetlands also have intrinsic attributes, perform

functions and services and produce goods of local, regional, national or international importance. Together, they represent considerable ecological, social and economic values.

Wetlands in Uganda are known to support some 43 species of dragon flies (of which 8 are known to occur in Uganda only); 9 species of molluscs; 52 species of fish, 48 species of amphibians, 243 species of birds, 14 species of mammals, 19 species of reptiles, and 271 species of macrophytes. 11 sites have been gazetted as Ramsar sites and as such are being given special protection. Apart from providing seasonal breeding and reproductive ground for various fish species including *Labeo sp.*, *Barbus sp.*, *Clarias sp.*, and *Mormyrus sp.*, Uganda’s wetlands also provide habitats for feeding endangered fish species.

Other notable values of wetlands in Uganda include their important water sources for human consumption, agriculture, livestock, and recreation, as well as their ecosystem functions and services such as water purification, water flow, storage and recharge, shoreline stabilization, micro-climate regulation and biodiversity habitat provision. Papyrus and other wetland plants have commercial value (e.g. Table 8), at least 22 species of plants growing in wetlands are edible, and many other plants are used for medicinal purposes.

Table 8: Economic value of Nakivubo urban wetland in Kampala

Wetland benefit	Economic value (US\$/year)
Crop cultivation	60,000
Papyrus harvesting	10,000
Brick making	17,000
Fish farming	3,000
Water treatment & purification	700,000 – 1,300,000

Source: NEMA 2007

2.5 The contribution of fisheries resources

The aquatic environment is a major source of food, employment, local income and of export earnings. The fishing industry employs up to one million Ugandans. Fish and fish products have been the second highest export revenue earner in Uganda after coffee between 2002 and 2005 and between 2002 and 2006. In terms of export revenue, fish and fish products earned Uganda US\$ 141 million in 2006, declining slightly to US\$ 124 million in 2007 (UBOS, 2008). Current observations from commercial catches indicate that the species composition of Lake Victoria stocks has been reduced to three main species, namely Nile Perch, *Rastrineobola argentea* (locally known as mukene) and *Oreochromis niloticus*.

Contribution of fish to GDP: The fisheries sector contributes approximately 2.5% of the national GDP and 12% of the agricultural GDP. The total fish production in Uganda stands at about 560,000 metric tonnes annually with about 82% (460,000 MT) contribution from the five water bodies/several small lakes and only 18 % (100,000 MT) from culture fisheries. The sub-sector has significantly contributed to food, health, economy, exports, employment and tourism of the country. In terms of aquaculture, the country has about 2,000 individual farmers or farmer groups with over 5,000 ponds, 750 cages and over 100 tanks.

Contribution of fish to livelihood: In Uganda an estimated 1,000,000 – 1,500,000 are directly engaged full time or part time in capture fisheries with about 5,000 working with industrial processing fisheries sector and an additional 2,000 in aquaculture. An estimated

300,000 people, including a majority of poor men and women, are directly involved in fishing, fish processing and fish trading and nearly 5.3 million people (which is 15% of the total population) are directly dependent on the fisheries sector as one of their main sources of livelihoods.

Contribution of fish to food security: The worldwide per capita fish consumption increased from an average of 9.9 kg in the 1960s to 12.6 kg in the 1980s to 14.4 Kg in the 1990s reaching 17.3 Kg in 2010 but in Africa it is only 8.3 kg (FAO, 2010) and 10 Kg in Uganda (UBOS, 2010), which is still below the recommended WHO/FAO level of 12.5 Kg per capita. Fish has a highly desirable nutrient profile and provide an excellent source of high-quality animal protein that is easily digestible and of high biological value.

2.6 Biodiversity and Health

The practice of using herbs dates back to the African traditional societies that entirely depended on biodiversity to satisfy their health needs. This knowledge of plants with herbal value was passed on from one generation to another and is referred to as traditional or Indigenous Knowledge (IK) in the present day. There are various plants associated with medicinal value in Uganda including Moringa, Aloe Vera, *Prunus africana*, African tulip and African Tonic among others (NEMA 2011). Recent ethno botanical research has identified more than 300 plants (trees, shrubs, flowers and weeds) growing wild across the country associated with medicinal value. Some of these crops have gained value in the pharmaceutical industry and are now grown on a commercial value while others are harvested by herbalists at a zero price.



Figure 15: Aloe vera – A medicinal plant

Medicinal plants are of special importance to Uganda because of their wide application in traditional medicine by both the rural and urban population. It is estimated that approximately 80% of Ugandans depend on indigenous medicine. This is because they are less costly and more widely available than western medicine and, in Uganda, traditional health practitioners are widely supported within local cultures. With the emergence of HIV/AIDS and other non communicable diseases like diabetes, cancer and hypertension, and the lack of curative western medicine, many patients have turned to traditional healing systems (that predominantly depend on local medicinal plants) to treat related opportunistic diseases and

infections. This is in addition to the treatment of zoonotic and other diseases like malaria, abdominal pain, skin diseases, headache, worms, ulcers and epilepsy, among others.

The wide application and use of medicinal plants may have negative and far-reaching implications for biodiversity and its conservation. The implications for the conservation of medicinal plants include the non-sustainable harvesting of widely used species. On the other hand, implications for the healthcare system include the deterioration of knowledge of the correct plant materials to use and lack of adequate quality control measures in the preparation and administration of medicines among the users.

Government of Uganda (GoU) recognizes the need to establish standards for safety and efficacy of such traditional remedies. In this regard the National Chemotherapeutics Research Institute (NCRI) in the Ministry of Health has over the years developed collaborative relationships with key stakeholders (including but not limited to traditional healers, medical practitioners, ecologists, gender specialists, researchers, religious leaders, policy makers/government officials and members of local communities), under the following objectives:

- a) To encourage an approach to evaluating and improving the safe, effective, and sustainable use of medicinal plants in Uganda that integrates the professional expertise and knowledge of traditional healers with that of health workers
- b) To develop a policy to regulate the production and use of herbal medicine
- c) To assess the collection, trade, and conservation status of the target medicinal plant species
- d) To strengthen the capacity of the Natural Chemotherapeutics Research Laboratory to develop and implement valid, ethical, and feasible protocols for evaluating the safety and efficacy of traditional remedies in Uganda
- e) To clarify and establish equitable arrangements for intellectual property ownership and benefits from information contributed to this research by traditional healers and communities
- f) To disseminate the research findings concerning safe, effective, and sustainable use of the targeted traditional remedies among current and potential users, including traditional healers, community health specialists and practitioners of western medicine within Uganda and internationally; and
- g) To propose to the National Drug Authority and the National Environment Management Authority in Uganda, recommendations and implementation guidelines for the sustainable harvesting of medicinal plants and improved preparation of traditional remedies.

The major threats to medicinal plants include the following:

- a) **Gaps in institutional framework:** While NCRI as a lead institution has endeavoured to conserve medicinal plants (MP), It currently lacks both infrastructure and human capacity. There is need for the institution to expand for impact in conservation of MP
- b) **Gaps in research and development:** Although various individual researchers are involved in research in MP, there are no research programmes to link (indigenous knowledge) IK and MP research to development in science and technology in the country. Besides, there are very few research institutions that are involved in research in MP. Moreover, the existing institutions of research and higher learning lack adequate human and infrastructure capacity for validating therapeutic properties of MP. Furthermore, the process of patenting innovation arising from MP research does not also motivate scientist, since it is very costly and lengthy.

- **Gaps in Sensitization and advocacy**
 - (i) There is limited awareness with respect to potential opportunities of IK and biodiversity that could be tapped for the health sector to improve the health status of Ugandans
 - (ii) There is also misinformation and lack of understanding on the nature and scope of IK and MP. This is because there is less documentation of IK and medicinal plants. Most of the formally educated population consider IK practices and traditional medicine as primitive which has stigmatized their utilization for improvement of the livelihood of the people
 - (iii) Lack of a specific government programme to promote IK and MP in particular has lead to their under utilization in the development programme in the country.

- **Gaps in production and commercialization of medicinal plants**
 - (i) The potential of IK to contribute to the national economy through industrialization and commercialization has not yet fully been exploited in Uganda. The country does not have adequate technologies to develop MP on a commercial scale
 - (ii) The existing pharmaceutical industries are not involved in the manufacture of herbal products from medicinal plants. Most of these pharmaceutical companies do not have production lines for processing medicinal plants into herbal medicine, since they are designed only for synthetic medicine
 - (iii) Most herbal processors have limited education and skill to produce good quality products. Even those who have interest in scaling up their production for herbal products have limited funding and lack the technology for production of quality herbal products from medicinal plants
 - (iv) Whereas, NDA has development guidelines for production of herbal medicine, this information has not been disseminated to key stakeholders. Most herbal processors have little knowledge of the registration of herbal medicine which is a requirement for commercialization of herbal products. Streamlining the commercialization process will cater for conservation of medicinal plants which is the backbone of the value chain.

- **Gaps in capacity building and training:** Although a few of the traditional health practioners have obtained the required training, most of them still need to be trained further. There are also many charlatans and disgruntled people who have joined the traditional medicine sector due to lack of employment. This partly explains the lack of expertise in sustainable utilization of the medicinal plants and hence the continued degradation of natural resources.

Medicinal plants are also addressed under various sections for example activities 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.2.2, 2.3.2.

3.0 NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES

There are a number of issues that were not adequately addressed at formulation of NBSAPI but which have now gained prominence and must be included in the revised version (NBSAP2). A few of these are briefly discussed below.

3.1 Taxonomy

During the 9th Conference of the Parties (COP9), the Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) of the CBD:

- i) recognized the importance of taxonomic capacities to achieve the goals of the CBD and the need to support taxonomic research
- ii) urged the contracting parties, the GEF, and other key players to provide adequate support to developing countries in implementation of the GTI and
- iii) encouraged contracting parties to give full support to the taxonomic work needed in support of the implementation of the CBD (UNEP/CBD/COP/9/20/Add.2 2008)

Taxonomy is the means to getting the correct identification of an organism. This accuracy in determination of organisms supports and is crucial for determining the geographical distribution (including endemism) and levels of diversity. Monitoring programmes on species are also supported by correct identification of organisms. Activities in taxonomy are covered under strategic objective 2.

Taxonomy is a key pillar in national development, conservation and everyday life. Development of pharmaceutical, nutritional products, medicinal, botanical insecticides such as pyrethrum and other products from nature begins with correct identification of the species with the required ingredient. The choice of mushrooms for food requires taxonomy for distinguishing safe from poisonous species for consumption. Taxonomy is also handy in telling a rare or threatened kind of animal, fungus or plant from the closely related but different kinds so that conservation measures may be put in place to save the former.

In order to be able to get the necessary service of correct identification of plants, animals, fungi, bacteria, viruses and other organisms; there must be a cadre of well trained and experienced taxonomists in the relevant group of organisms. There is therefore need to build capacity to have a critical mass of trained personnel in the field of taxonomy, who can render this critical supportive role to other sectors of socio-economic development. Furthermore, there should be necessary infrastructure and taxonomic tools to facilitate the work of taxonomists. In Uganda, the institutions that are key in providing the necessary training of personnel in taxonomy are higher institutions of learning, particularly universities. Makerere University Department of Biological Sciences is currently taking a lead in this formal training. The Department houses the largest collection of botanical specimens (Herbarium) in the country and a sizeable collection of zoological specimens. For generations, the Department has trained personnel in taxonomy of lower and higher plants, fungi, birds, mammals and other vertebrates. Despite the training mentioned above, there are still major challenges to taxonomy and its application in Uganda (Godfray 2002). The general perception in Uganda is that currently there is inadequate taxonomic capacity in terms of personnel, infrastructure and taxonomic tools. Often times, the personnel trained do not get the opportunity to practice taxonomy as they find it difficult to get employment in that field. There is an urgent need to make the role of taxonomy clearer to the would-be end-users and encourage taxonomists to employ them as necessary. Although there have been some

initiatives to assess this capacity (e.g. the Botanical and Zoological taxonomic network process (Isabirye-Basuta et al. 2006, Kakudidi & Kabuye 2006; and Hafashimana et al. 2009), the initial findings were not put to any specific use.

In order to maximize on the value of taxonomy for biodiversity conservation, the following guidelines should be useful:

- a) Taxonomic capacity development can effectively be achieved through building an education base that promotes taxonomy training in primary and middle schools. The National Curriculum Development Center should follow this up and build taxonomy education and practice strongly into the school syllabi. Moreover, the capacity of teachers to teach taxonomy should also be developed at that level.
- b) To support the development and maintenance of taxonomic capacity and tools, government agencies such as UWA, NEMA, NARO, Wetlands Management Department and Customs Department should deploy and retain taxonomists with job descriptions in their institutions
- c) There is need to develop a taxonomic knowledge base for biodiversity in formats that are accessible to end users (in form of identification kits/keys - such as popular bird books, fact sheets among others)
- d) Taxonomic institutions, such as research institutes, universities and museums which hold representative natural history collections, with valuable information such as presence data, distribution, use and related indigenous knowledge, should be enabled (through funding, increased personnel and better infrastructure) to make this information available to end users.
- e) Concerted efforts should be made to create awareness of the need for application of taxonomic information in many production sectors of the country such as agriculture, trade, health, development and regulatory agencies as well as local communities
- f) The Global Taxonomy fund was set under the GTI of CBD to enable member countries establish Centers of Taxonomic excellence. Lead Institutions in Taxonomy in Uganda (such as Makerere University Herbarium and Zoological Museum) should work towards setting this up for Uganda

3.2 Climate Change

The change in climatic conditions being experienced across the globe as a result of the increased concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere since the industrial revolution also affects biodiversity. Uganda's climate is predicted to change such that the distributions of many of its species and ecosystems will shift in tandem with drier or wetter parts of the country. Climate change also causes changes in the temperature and alkalinity of aquatic systems affecting the survival of biodiversity (DEAT 2006).

Uganda has had its share of effects of climate change characterized by severe droughts and floods and evidence of change in glacial extent (area) on Mount Rwenzori (UWA, 2010). The main impact of climate change in Uganda has been observed to be climatic variability, the results of which are droughts and floods; while droughts lead to the drying of rivers and streams, floods result in submerged ecosystems. Although Uganda was assumed to be a net-

sink for greenhouse gases, as part of this planet, the country also experienced adverse effects of global warming which contributed to the alteration of climates as was evidenced by the increasing frequency of droughts and floods which alter various ecological systems in Uganda.



Figure 16: The legendary mountains of the moon in Rwenzori National Park

Impacts of climate change on biodiversity have already been observed in some areas. As a result of global warming the ice caps on the Rwenzori ranges (the legendary mountains of the moon) have largely melted, leading to increased volumes of water in the Semliki River. This has led to erosion, siltation and shifting of the course of the river, which all lead to habitat disturbance, as reported in the Uganda National Adaptation Programmes of Action report (MWE, 2007). Species reported to be affected include the Mountain Gorilla, alpine and sub-alpine species on the Rwenzoris such as the Giant Lobelia, Tree Senecio, the Rwenzori Leopard and the Rwenzori Red Duiker. The Three-horned Chameleon and Senecio are reported to have already shifted their ranges upwards due to warmer temperatures.

Uganda's National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) cites an average temperature increase of 0.28°C per decade in Uganda between 1960 and 2010, with the months of January and February especially exhibiting this warming trend, averaging a 0.37°C increase per decade (GoU, 2007, MWE, 2010). The frequency of hot days in the country has increased significantly, while that of cold days has decreased (MWE, 2010). The malaria parasite is spreading into new areas in the country (Namanya, 2009). Analysis of records on Uganda's glaciers has shown that the ice cap on Rwenzori has shrunk significantly in the last 100 years (IGAD, 2010). The rate of ice loss is highest on Mount Baker (96%) followed by Mount Speke (91%). Mount Stanley has the lowest rate of ice loss (68%). The changing temperature patterns have been linked with drought and consequent increased cattle deaths in the cattle corridor (Oxfam, 2008).

Droughts undoubtedly have adverse effects on biodiversity. Droughts increase the changes of wild fires which destroy a lot of biodiversity. Droughts also result into migration of people into protected areas, migrations of animals, drops in water levels and disruption of the biological clock, especially in reproductive cycles. While there have always been droughts in Uganda, evidence suggests they are becoming more frequent and more severe (IGAD, 2010). The increased frequency and duration of droughts is the most significant climate-related change being experienced in Uganda (GoU, 2007; MWE, 2010). With respect to floods, the 1997/1998 El Nino flood, also attributed to climate change, caused a lot of habitat

disturbance in addition to other economic and health effects. Floods in general destroy fauna and flora, a direct impact on biodiversity.

During the 1997/1998 floods, there was a 60 per cent drop in coffee exports and suspension of tea estates operations in eastern parts of the country, while 300 hectares of wheat were lost in the Kapchorwa District due to these floods (GoU, 2002). According to the Ugandan Agricultural Census (UBOS, 2011), at national level, 7 per cent of the 3.95 million agricultural households reported that they were prone to flooding, with most incidences reported in the Eastern Region. Efforts to enhance biodiversity conservation and ecosystems resilience to climate change are covered under activities 3.2.1-3.2.6 in the text while REDD (Reducing emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) together with REDD+ (including conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks) are also covered under activities 3.2.1-3.2.8, 3.6.2, 3.6.6, 3.6.7 and climate induced disasters may also be dealt with under activities 8.3.1-8.3.6.

3.3 Biotechnology and Biosafety

Agricultural biotechnology developments in Uganda were initiated more than five decades ago with the introduction of clonal coffee as a means of providing sufficient planting materials for farmers. By the end of the last century, various molecular level techniques such as development of bio-fertilizers (Rhizobia), tissue culture, and disease diagnostics were widely in use in the country. In the 1990s, a number of studies involving Ugandan scientists were seconded to external laboratories to understand the molecular nature of the major biotic constraints to crop production, such as Cassava mosaic virus and Maize streak virus. Since mid-2000's genetic engineering work has been going on in Ugandan research laboratories especially at the National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO), and has been on the increasing trends to address various agricultural production constraints.

The establishment of the laboratory and associated infrastructure was catalyzed by the needs and challenges at the time. Initially, focus was on building capacity, which led to the establishment of the National Biotechnology Centre at Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute in 2008. Thereafter, focus was on the need to generate complementary solutions to broader problems in the agricultural sector. This led to the establishment of the Biosciences Facility at the National Crop Resources Research Institute, Namulonge, and similar facilities in other NARO institutes. Parallel laboratory capacity development has also been undertaken by academic institutions such as Makerere University, Gulu University, and Kyambogo University.

Uganda has made significant progress in biotechnology R&D. Since its establishment in 1996, the National Biosafety Committee (NBC) has approved over twenty applications. To date, improvement of five (5) crops for nine (9) plant novel traits (PNTs) using recombinant gene technologies are under various stages of Confined Field Trials (CFTs) in three geographical regions of Uganda suggesting that in the near future several technologies at field level testing will be due for commercialization. Locally developed improved varieties of bananas, cotton, maize and cassava with novel traits currently under CFT are anticipated to be ready for open release in the next 5-10 years.

Currently biotechnology research in Uganda is mainly being conducted in the public domain by NARO as the apex body for guidance and coordination of all agricultural research activities within the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS). In line with the

government's commitment to foster national development using modern biotechnology, NARO through its public research institutes is conducting a number of studies to improve priority crops for key desired traits. R&D efforts involving the use of genetic engineering are at different stages for crops such as bananas, maize, rice, cassava, sweet potatoes and cotton. However, in the absence of an explicit law, biotech research is presently restricted to contained and confined experimentation.

The Draft Biotechnology and Biosafety Bill is presently being debated in Parliament. Once passed into law, it will operationalize the National Biotechnology and Biosafety Policy of 2008 and will provide a more unified approach to the safe development and application of modern biotechnology in Uganda. The bill spells out a regulatory framework for biotech R&D in line with provisions of the Biosafety Protocol; it designates a Competent Authority and a National Focal Point, establishes a National Biosafety Committee, Institutional Biosafety Committees and provides an overall framework for the regulation for the research, development and general release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in Uganda.

The Strategic Plan for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011 – 2020: The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity is an international treaty governing the movements of living modified organisms (LMOs) resulting from modern biotechnology from one country to another. Uganda is a signatory to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and is therefore, mandated to promote preserve, conserve, protect and develop her biodiversity. The Cartagena Protocol has 13 key issues including capacity building, public awareness and participation and risk assessment.

The key challenges to the protocol in Uganda include the following: The country only recently (June 2014) ratified the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur protocol on liability and redress; Uganda does not yet have a Biosafety Clearing House mechanism for information sharing; the border points of entry officers lack capacity and are not empowered to withhold suspected GM materials; the post entry quarantine laboratory at Namalere does not have adequate capacity (infrastructural and human) for GM detection to regulate GM seed imports and the capacity for management of transboundary movements of GMOs has generally been limited. These are challenges that need to be addressed as a matter of urgency for the country to swiftly forward in biotechnology development.

3.4 Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are organisms that are modified in the laboratory to have characteristics derived from genes of other species. Under Uganda's Biosafety Framework, GMOs have to be thoroughly tested before they are released as agricultural crops into the open environment. There is concern that GMOs could have a detrimental effect on biodiversity by cross-pollinating with indigenous species or by being viable in areas that non-GMO crops are not, thus resulting in additional loss of natural habitat. A number of institutions such as the National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO) are presently undertaking biotechnology related research and development activities. These activities are being guided by the Uganda Biosafety Framework that prescribes mechanisms for the judicious application of biotechnology in Uganda. Although the Biotechnology Policy has now been approved, there is still no law or regulations for implementing the Cartagena Protocol to allow for importation and testing of GMOs on a large scale. This is a task that is being handled by the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST). A National Biotechnology and Biosafety Bill has been tabled in Uganda's Parliament and is

presently under debate before approval to become law. Since Uganda does not yet have adequate control mechanisms for GM materials, NARO has not yet authorized large scale importation of any GM crop seeds.

The challenges in the use of GMOs in Uganda include:

- a) Limited awareness on the potential use and applications of biotechnology
- b) Inadequate skilled human resource capacity for biotechnology and bio safety management
- c) Limited institutional capacity for training in biotechnology
- d) Limited institutional and infrastructural capacity to handle biotechnology research and development
- e) Inadequate public-private partnerships in biotechnology use and applications
- f) Lack of a coherent policy and regulatory framework for biotechnology and bio-safety that specifically addresses national bio-safety regulations.

Issues of biotechnology and Biosafety are covered under Strategic objective 6.

3.5 Oil Discovery in the Albertine Graben

Oil and gas discovery has been a recent phenomenon in Uganda's socio-economic development. Efforts to establish Uganda's oil and gas potential have been reported to be successful. After the injection of significant capital investments for acquisition of meaningful data, the first oil seepage discovery was reported in 2000. By 2008, four oil fields namely Mputa, Waraga, Nzizi and Kingfisher had been discovered and a minimum of three hundred million barrels of oil was estimated to be in the Kaiso Tonya area alone that covers only less than 5% of the entire prospective belt. As of to-date Uganda has observed the best oil exploration success rates: so far out of the 77 wells dug, 70 have been successful. In addition Uganda has registered a number of shallow wells with Jobi as the biggest and shallowest well globally known.

The oil and gas exploration and prospect regions include the following regions the Albertine graben that runs from Arua to Kisoro: L. Wamala basin; L. Victoria basin Lake and L. Kyoga basin. The companies that have so far participated in oil and gas exploration in Uganda include: China National Offshore Oil Cooperation (CNOOC), Neptune (U) Ltd, Alpha Oil Ltd and Dominion which later pulled out, Tullow (U) Ltd (formerly Energy Africa), Heritage Oil and Gas Limited and Total. It has been reported that to complement the discoveries, the government plans to develop an inland refinery at Kabaale (Hoima district) in the Albertine Graben of which the feasibility study has already been done.

The Albertine Graben, which is the main oil and gas exploration region, is an ecologically sensitive region, harbouring most of the nation's unique species of high conservation value, distinct ecosystems and several tourist destinations. Therefore oil and gas exploration in this region faces the major challenge of minimizing its various negative effects on biodiversity and the ecology of the area; coping with pollution problems such as soil contamination by drill wastes and oil spills which affect the nearby water and aquatic life like fish around lake Albert and coping with air emissions due to combustion as the primary source of gaseous pollution (CO₂, CO, HCO₃, SO₂). Oil exploration requires vegetation clearance, causing loss of plant species and leaving the soil bare to erosion. Oil exploration also causes displacement, disruption and disturbance of people's livelihood and cultural or social setting especially the

local population, for example change in activities from fishing or agriculture to employment in the exploration facilities.

Although a National Oil Policy is now in place, there is an urgent need to review and harmonize the regulatory frameworks for the petroleum and mining sectors in Uganda and other cross-sectoral laws such as the Land Act, National Environment Act, Uganda Wildlife Act, and Forest Act among others so as to minimize the negative impacts of oil and mineral exploration on biodiversity in the Albertine region.

Although issues linked to oil and gas exploration and production are not covered under a separate Strategic Objective, they are clustered under new and merging issues in activities 8.1.1-8.1.7.

3.6 Development and use of biofuels in Uganda

Biofuels are liquid or gaseous fuels produced from biomass that can be used to replace petrol, diesel and other fuels. Biofuel production is being sought in preference to fossil fuels so as to harness the perceived benefits of biofuels, which include a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, increased energy security, creation of employment opportunities, increased income for rural households and improved balance of trade through reduced importation of petroleum. As such, the biofuel industry is expanding globally.¹

However the production of biofuel could have negative impacts on biodiversity, water availability, food security and land ownership. Aware of these and other impacts of biofuel production, the global community has recommended measures that Governments should take to minimize the potential negative impacts of biofuel production. The Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has adopted decisions to guide biofuel production. In Decision X/37 on biofuels adopted in October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan, COP among others called upon Parties to the CBD to:

- a) Ensure that sustainable agricultural practices and food and energy security of indigenous and local communities are addressed and respected;
- b) Promote the positive and minimize or avoid the negative impacts of biofuel production on biodiversity
- c) Develop and implement policies that promote the positive and minimize or avoid the negative impacts of biofuel production on biological diversity;
- d) Develop and use environmentally-sound technologies, and support the development of research programmes and undertake impact assessments, which promote the positive and minimize or avoid the negative impacts of biofuel production and use on biodiversity;
- e) Identify areas of high biodiversity value, critical ecosystems, and areas important to indigenous and local communities which should not be used for biofuel production;
- f) Assess and identify areas and, where appropriate, ecosystems that could be used in, or exempted from, the production of biofuels so as to assist policy-makers in applying appropriate conservation measures and identifying areas deemed inappropriate for biofuel feedstock production;
- g) Include biofuel production in national plans such as national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national development plans;

¹ Biodiesel 2020: A Global Market Survey

- h) Address impacts of the production and use of biofuels on biodiversity and the services it provides.

The decisions adopted by the COP are meant to ensure that when Governments decide to promote the production of biofuel, it should be consistent with the objectives of the CBD namely, conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of the components of biodiversity and a fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources.

The rationale for promoting the use of biofuels in Uganda stems from the deficit in energy needs for the country. Out of an estimated 2,000 MW potential of hydropower along River Nile, only 380 MW (from Kiira and Nalubaale) and 250 MW from Bujagali hydropower plant and only 53 MW of the estimated 200 MW of mini- hydropower potential have been developed. In the case of geothermal energy, there is still no facility that has been put in place to develop it. Uganda also imports all her petroleum product requirements as no petroleum products are produced locally although this is expected to change with the recent oil discovery in the Albertine Graben.

In light of these developments, Government is promoting the production of biofuel mainly to supplement petroleum fuels in the transport sector among other uses and also to increase the country's energy security. Guidelines and legislation that shall regulate the production, blending and utilization of biofuels are underway.

Biofuel production and utilization is not new in Uganda. Currently, biofuel production and utilization in Uganda is ongoing albeit on a small scale. Studies carried out indicate that biofuel production by the private sector is gaining momentum. Government is encouraging investment in biofuel developments to harness the perceived benefits of biofuels, which include a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, increased energy security, creation of employment opportunities, increased income for rural households, improved balance of trade through reduced importation of petroleum and enhanced National Economic development.



Figure 17: Young Jatropha plantation (a biofuel crop) in Uganda

Uganda has the potential to produce substantial amounts of ethanol and biodiesel from a variety of feed stocks which are either already grown on-farm for oil extraction and food or are growing in the wild. Much as Uganda is moving into biofuel production with zeal, it is important to understand that the advent of biofuel production is likely to lead to biodiversity loss, food insecurity, water stress, land conflict as well as the introduction of invasive alien species. Biofuel actions are covered under new and emerging issues (activities 8.2.1-8.3.7).

3.7 Biodiversity Disasters and hazards

Disaster risk management is a systematic process used to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of a disaster. In 2005, at the World Disaster Reduction Conference held in Kobe, Japan, 168 member states of the United Nations adopted the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA). This framework details priorities for risk reduction to be adopted by participating countries.

NBSAP1 did not handle the Framework of Action but NBSAP 2 incorporates the HFA to handle the disasters that arise from natural phenomena's like floods, climate change and oil spillage. The key success for Disaster risk management (DRM) is to protect ecosystems through participatory valuation and management of ecosystem services and mainstreaming of ecosystem approaches in DRM. This will prevent, lessen or transfer risks by using various risk treatment measures, mitigation and preparedness; and addressing issues related to policies, institutions, systems and risk reduction programs at the strategic and operational levels.

During the last five years Uganda has faced serious environmental disasters such as mudslides in Bududa district in Eastern Uganda and floods in Kasese district (south western Uganda) which devastated human livelihoods and biodiversity of the two areas. In 2003, scores of hippos perished in Lake Edward due to some mysterious disease. The disaster risk reduction (DRR) strategy in this NBSAP2 (**activities 8.3.1-8.3.6**) is directly relevant to a number of Aichi Biodiversity Targets including: **Target 7** (where DRR is a core element of sustainability for forestry and agriculture), **Target 11** (regarding the role of protected areas in DRR), **Target 14** (where essential services include those underpinning DRR) and **Target 15** (where ecosystem resilience is a key requirement for DRR and ecosystem restoration a major opportunity to achieve DRR).

3.8 Pollution

There are various sources of pollution in Uganda including those due to agricultural, industrial, municipal waste discharges and dumping and e-waste. These wastes pollute and alter fragile ecological systems leading to death of indigenous organisms. Other effects include bio-accumulation and bio-concentration of harmful chemicals in organisms which pose a grave threat to human livelihood.

The discharge of industrial effluents into water systems including rivers and lakes as well as the runoff from agricultural lands and urban settlements, bringing with it the chemicals leached from these areas, pollute these water systems negatively affecting aquatic biodiversity. High nutrient contents caused by fertilizers or other nutrients reaching aquatic ecosystems result in eutrophication where the system becomes anaerobic depriving many organisms with oxygen necessary for their very survival. Many toxic substances also have detrimental effects on biodiversity. Pollution from the use of pesticides associated with cotton production and malaria prevention (residual indoor spraying); herbicides used on tea and tobacco; pollution associated with urban areas (solid waste, air pollution, etc.) all pose potential threats to biodiversity, if not regulated by guidelines. The use of polythene bags and plastics pose a big threat not only to soils but also to soil biodiversity particularly in the urban

areas. While the level of industrialization in Uganda is still very low, the industries that are in operation are significant sources of pollution. Many operate with obsolete equipment; others use environmentally-inappropriate technologies. Nutrient-rich industrial effluents find their way into Uganda's open waters contributing to eutrophication and destruction of aquatic biodiversity in those water bodies as has been experienced in Lakes Victoria and George. These threats to biological diversity need to be addressed (see activities 3.7.1-3.7.3).

3.9 Green Procurement

Green Procurement is the purchase of environmentally preferable products or services, taking into account the necessity, not only for quality and price, but also for an environmentally-conscious business.

Promotion of green purchasing will allow us to create a green market place and encourage businesses to develop environmentally-preferable products and services through the market and promote sustainable management of the environment including biodiversity. Therefore green procurement has a power to change society as well as business behaviour.

Green procurement of a selection of products and services can minimize environmental impacts and damage to biodiversity. It includes extraction of raw materials, manufacturing, transportation, storing, handling using and disposing of the product. It also includes the purchase of products and services that cause minimal adverse environmental impacts such as recycled content products, energy efficient products, water efficient products and non-ozone depleting substances.

Role of green procurement in Biodiversity Conservation normally encompasses a variety of practices including the following:

- a) Prevention of pollution which strives to eliminate or reduce risks to human health and environment. This basically looks at air quality, water quality, soil quality and land quality for biodiversity sustainability
- b) Selection of products and services that minimize environmental impacts e.g. those products that have high level of degradability
- c) High demand from consumers, investors, shareholders and regulatory agencies for purposes of maintaining and promoting future businesses that directly or indirectly depend on biodiversity
- d) Reduction or prevention of waste by use of products with recyclable materials, less packaging, reversal logistics etc
- e) Eco-efficiency i.e. creating more goods and services while using fewer resources and creating less waste and pollution.
- f) Green products are generally produced in a manner that consumes less natural resources or uses them more sustainably
- g) Organizations that practice green procurement are recognized as good corporate citizens and can easily influence those around them
- h) Green products generally offer cost savings. They are easily recycled or re-used and therefore money is saved on waste disposal

The concept of green procurement is embedded in Uganda Government's procurement process. This is exhibited at the time of bid evaluation to determine the most compliant

bidder. Biodiversity conservation is implied in the Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets (PPDA) Regulation 327 (3), (b) and (c), 314 (4), 297 (2) (g) and (i) which prioritizes:

- a) Minimal use of virgin material in the product (e.g. recycled paper rather than virgin paper)
- b) Replacement of disposables with reusable or recyclables (e.g. reusable cups rather than paper cups), minimal environmental impact from the entire product or service life cycle (e.g. use of degradable products), minimal packaging or elimination of packaging (e.g. avoid individual products packaging for bulk purchases), reduced energy/water consumption (e.g. use energy efficient equipment)
- c) Toxicity reduction or elimination (e.g. products without toxic substances)
- d) Durability and maintenance requirements (e.g. avoid single-use disposable items)
- e) Waste disposal requirements (e.g. products that can be easily recycled)

Strategies to address green procurement are covered under activity 4.1.3.

3.10 Invasive alien species (IAS)

Invasive alien species (IAS) pose a global threat to the conservation of biodiversity through their proliferation and spread, displacing or killing native flora and fauna and affecting ecosystem services, including water and nutrient cycles and food chains. In Uganda, the water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) had a profound impact on the socio-economic development of Uganda in terms of curtailment of water transport, reduction of hydropower output, interference with urban water supply and reduction in fish production from Lake Victoria in the 1990's. The cost of controlling and managing water hyacinth was estimated to be in millions of dollars.

A preliminary list of IAS for Uganda (NARO 2002) includes species such as *Lantana camara*, *Broussonetia papyrifera*, *Mimosa pigra* and *Senna spp.* whose threat on native species has increased considerably. For example, *Senna spectabilis* has invaded over 1,000 ha of the Budongo Forest Reserve and vast areas of the Matiri Forest Reserve (Kyenjojo District) while *Broussonetia papyrifera* has covered vast areas of the Mabira Forest Reserve. Control strategies for these species are still being investigated (NARO, 2009). Examples of IAS introductions include the following:

- a) The present tree planting activities of NFA are focused on introduced species (*Eucalyptus spp.*, *Pinus spp.* and *Grevillea robusta*). Although useful to meet short term needs for timber, they could threaten the survival of native species if there are no guidelines for private tree planting. Moreover, the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) encourages the use of 'improved varieties' in a bid to modernize agriculture in line with the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA). Native species are ignored by these efforts. However, the integration of natural resource management is becoming important in NAADS programs and offers opportunity for addressing this anomaly.
- b) Lakes and rivers might be the ecosystems most affected by the introduction of exotic species and the consequent ecological changes in species and community composition. For example, the introduction of the Nile perch and the Water hyacinth has been extremely damaging to biodiversity in Lake Victoria. Lake Victoria is the largest tropical lake in the world, with 68,000 km² of surface area shared among three countries: Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. This lake supports Africa's most important inland fishery and, until recently, harboured more than 600 species of endemic haplochromine cichlids.

- c) Over the last century, the ecology of Lake Victoria has changed significantly and the fish stocks were subjected to three major events, which included fishing intensification, introduction of exotic species into the lake, and environmental changes. The introduction of the Nile Perch is resulting into approximately 40% of the haplochromine species disappearing. It is estimated that approximately 150 species of the haplochromine cichlids are extinct, 100 of them being from Ugandan waters.
- d) The Water hyacinth (*Ecihornia crassipes*), an invasive IAS, also known as the waterweed and arguably the most noxious aquatic weed in the world, was first reported in Lake Victoria in December 1989, having entered the Lake from River Kagera. The plant is native to South America where it occurs harmlessly in streams and seasonally flooded environments. Given its high proliferation rate, the weed has spread rapidly over the years to the shores of Lake Kyoga, the banks of River Nile and most of the northern tip of Lake Albert impacting negatively on fish and other aquatic species.
- e) Invasive plant species have also been reported in several forest reserves e.g., in Mabira, Budongo and Matiri forest reserves whereby paper mulberry and Senna Cassia species have been recorded (NFA, 2011). Within Wildlife Conservation areas, changes in vegetation due to invasive species of Acacia and other pasture grasses have been reported in Lake Mburo and Queen Elizabeth National parks.
- f) *Parthenium hysterophorus*, a native of Central America, is believed to have entered Uganda less than 10 years ago. It was first identified at Bugembe, near Jinja in 2008. Since then it has been seen in most towns and trading centers along the Busia-Kampala-Masaka-Mbarara-Kasese highway. In 2010, it was observed in Queen Elizabeth National Park, in Ibanda town and in Pader district, northern Uganda. In 2013, UWA reported that it was spreading in Queen Elizabeth National Park, and was anxious to get it under control. *Parthenium* has the potential to dominate and eradicate most grass species and other short perennial shrubs in open land. It has also been reported to be poisonous to cattle, buffalos and antelopes and causes allergic reactions in humans after prolonged contact. Invasive alien species are covered under activities 3.8.1, and 3.8.2.

4.0 GENERAL THREATS TO BIODIVERSITY IN UGANDA

4.1 Causes of Biodiversity Loss

Quite a number of factors are responsible for the trends described in the preceding chapters. They include habitat loss, agricultural encroachment and expansion, climate change effects, over-harvesting of resources, diseases, pollution, introduction of alien species, demographic factors, poverty and national policies, among others. The rate of biodiversity loss in Uganda was calculated in 2004 to be around 10-11% per decade or 1% per annum (Pomeroy and Tushabe, 2004). The historical loss of species has been great in Uganda, and the negative trends are continuing. Many major mammal species, such as rhinos, cheetahs, and oryx were extirpated during Uganda's decades of internal turmoil between 1970 and 1980. Birds and fish species continue to decline in numbers and distribution throughout the country. Most of the remaining large animals are confined to protected areas, where their numbers are small but stable or decreasing still. However, in a few cases (e.g. the mountain gorillas, elephants and kob), the trends show some increase partly because of increased attention (Pomeroy and Tushabe 2004). The major threats to biodiversity in Uganda are the main thrust of the strategies and action plans in this NBSAP and they are elaborated in the following sections.

Over-harvesting and exploitation of biological resources: Biodiversity is mainly lost through uncontrolled harvesting or removal without replacement and use of poor harvesting methods which affect regeneration of the species. Over-exploitation depletes Uganda's stock of animal and plant resources, lowering their populations, affecting the genetic diversity and increasing the risk of local extirpation and subsequent extinction. Over-exploitation can occur from commercial operations, such as logging, or from local practices, such as medicinal plant harvesting. The over-exploitation of non-timber products, such as native bamboo, can lead to the loss of biodiversity. In some cases the species are targeted because of their food value. In other cases, it is due to their commercial value or because they are used in popular medicines. In still other cases, over-exploitation is due to the pet and skin trade, whether by private or public collections. In other cases, fish have been extensively exploited for food. Illegal fishing through the use of wrong fishing gear is reported to pose a serious threat the fish population. It has a devastating effect on the fish stocks by interfering with the breeding cycle when immature fish and mature fish are caught before spawning. Poaching and over-hunting have, in the past, contributed to the loss of the country's animal species richness. During the 1970s, elephant and buffalo populations declined drastically due to massive poaching (Aleper and Moe 2006). In the late 1980s, with improved management and the reactivation of anti-poaching patrols in Queen Elizabeth National Park (QENP), a number of species – primarily kob, buffalo and waterbuck – increased rapidly as a result of a ban in wildlife hunting.

Unsustainable utilization of trees and wood biomass: There is an increasing trend in conversion of trees in woodlands and forests on both public and private land into charcoal, fuel wood and timber thus depleting tree resources from these habitats. These actions continue to affect biodiversity associated with these habitats and yet forests contain the biggest pool of biodiversity in Uganda.

Encroachment on protected areas: According to National Forest Authority (NFA, 2011), encroachment into forested areas is caused by people who have come from other locations and have been "facilitated" by or are "protected" by local leaders or protected areas personnel. There have been reports that by 2008, there were over 300,000 illegal settlements in Central Forest Reserves country wide. Agricultural encroachment is also common in National Parks

and wetlands. With regard to evictions of encroachers, efforts have generally not been very effective, partly due protection given by authorities or political interests which compromise law enforcement. This has generally been compounded by weak institutional capacity when handling evictions.

Agricultural expansion: The key agents of agricultural expansion into hitherto undisturbed landscapes and protected areas are small-scale farmers (over 70 % of the population of Uganda), immigrants and private large scale monoculture farming (Palm Oil and Sugar Cane) (NFA, 2011). It is reported that between 1990 and 2005, agricultural land area expanded by 2% (from 8,400,789 ha to 8, 847,591 hectares mostly in form of small-scale agriculture (NFA, 2011). Subsistence agriculture expanded into wetlands, grasslands, and forests. Agricultural expansion remains a major deforestation driver in Uganda especially in high population areas or areas with high influx of immigrants. Large-scale agriculture is not so wide-spread but has increased from 68,446 to 106,630 hectares between 1990 and 2005 (NFA, 2011).

Climate change and variability: Uganda has had its share of effects of climate change characterized by severe droughts and floods and evidence of change in glacial extent (area) on mount Rwenzori (UWA, 2010). It is believed that change in micro and macro climate may result in changes in habitats in terms of species composition and also the extent of the forest coverage. It may also reduce the resilience of crops to grow in certain regions. There is need for further research to ascertain the extent of change expected and the possible implications on the conservation of biodiversity and associated habitats.

Poaching and other incidental causes of animal mortality: Poaching of wildlife resources is a serious problem in Uganda. Wild animals are hunted for their products such as hides, ivory, horns and teeth. In others cases animals are poached for game meat and for cultural and medicinal values. Methods of poaching include wire snaring, trap nets, spears and dogs, pitfalls, arrows and bows, guns and many kinds of traps. Mountain gorillas and chimpanzees are sometimes hunted for body parts and infants captured for sale as pets. It is believed however that international trade in live gorillas and chimpanzees or their parts, declined with the listing of the species on Appendix I of CITES. Besides poaching, there are reported incidences of wild animal mortality due to road accidents, fires set by poachers and deliberate poisoning.

Human Wildlife Conflict: Human - wildlife - conflict is a situation that arises when wildlife's requirements overlap with those of human populations, creating costs to affected people and wildlife. It also arises as a result of competition between humans and wildlife for space and resources. In most wildlife protected areas conflicts occur in areas with a high and increasing human population density with an ever-increasing demand for land and natural resources. The major forms of human wildlife conflicts in Uganda arise out of the following factors, among others:

- (i) Crop raiding by wildlife and loss of livestock mainly in communities adjacent to protected areas
- (ii) Problem animals such as elephants and mountain gorillas which destroy crops and result in displacement of people in nearby villages
- (iii) Disease transmission between wildlife e.g. by mountain gorillas, buffaloes, zebras, etc. to humans and livestock
- (iv) Lack of direct benefits such as sharing cash payments with private land owners from tourism revenues paid to view game found on privately owned land

Diseases in wildlife: Disease spread and outbreaks pose a great threat to wildlife health and production. Some of the diseases are transmitted through human-wildlife interactions because of tourism or interaction with livestock. Disease outbreaks due to natural causes such as Anthrax continue to take their toll on wildlife populations. The Anthrax outbreak in Queen Elizabeth National park in 2002 is reported to have killed over 300 hippos (UWA, 2003). There is no scientific documentation of significant outbreaks of plant diseases in natural forests although outbreaks have been recorded in soft wood plantations.

Soil Erosion: One of the indicators of land degradation is soil erosion. It has been estimated (Yaron et al. 2003) that the annual cost of soil nutrient loss due to soil erosion in Uganda is about \$625 million per year. Notwithstanding the accuracy of the data used in the study, the evidence is clear: the problem of soil erosion is increasing with the ever increasing human population and this calls for urgent action. Poor agricultural practices, such as over-stocking of rangelands and cultivation on steep slopes contribute to erosion and siltation of water bodies, thereby altering ecosystems and species composition. Inappropriate policies, such as the agriculture policy of modernization, implicitly encourage mono-cultural and agrochemical-intensive farming systems that contribute to loss of genetic diversity through over-specialization and pollution of sub-soil ecosystems. The introduction of high-yielding maize varieties and promotion of clonal coffee are current examples.

Pollution: Due to Government policy of modernization of agriculture, Uganda has witnessed progressively increased use of pesticides, acaricides, fertilizers and other agricultural chemicals country wide. Although there are no national levels records of toxicity or pollution resulting from these uses, it is acknowledged that continued use without proper guidance and handling will affect biodiversity. Increased urbanization and industrial development is creating waste capable of polluting the environment. Both actions are increasingly becoming a source of problem for biodiversity management.

Invasive Alien Species (IAS): The introduction of exotic species into natural systems can affect biodiversity in many ways. Exotic species can out-compete native species and replace them in the system, thus reducing the species diversity, lowering genetic diversity, and increasing the homogeneity of the landscape.

Human population increase: A principal cause of habitat conversion is human population pressure. Despite the high incidence of fatal diseases, including HIV/AIDS, Uganda's population is growing fast and is over 80% rural. Human population growth rates for Uganda exceed 3% per annum, while the average world population growth rate is somewhere around 1.3%. Consequently, more land must be brought under cultivation annually to feed the increasing population.

- (i) In places such as Kabale and Kisoro, which are located within the Albertine Rift region, the increased demand for agricultural land has led to serious land fragmentation, which is a generalized pattern observed across all of Uganda. Fragmentation eliminates connectivity between natural habitats negatively impacting on wildlife movements.
- (ii) The deforestation rate in Uganda is estimated to be around 55,000 ha per year, based on habitat change from 1990-1995. This causes severe loss of habitat and biodiversity annually.

(iii) In the eastern region, population density is also highest in the highlands. For example, Bududa district has a population density of 952 persons/km² compared to the national average of 124 people/km². Elsewhere, population increase has put pressure on biodiversity in form of food and tradable products.

(iv) At national level, increasing human population and declining economic conditions have resulted into increased urbanization. Approximately 17% of Uganda's population is now living in an urban setting with increased concentration along major trade routes. The effect of this urbanization on biodiversity, especially in relation to wetlands and vegetation in general is evident.

Poverty: The relationship between biodiversity management and poverty may be measured using indicators of wealth status such as land ownership, ability to hire labour, resources to ensure education, quality of housing, and income levels. Based on these indicators, it has been reported that communities who live around protected areas in Uganda are generally poor (Plumptre et al., 2003). Poor communities around protected areas depend largely on resources from within the protected areas because of their low poverty levels. Resources demanded include fuel wood, timber, non-timber forest products, game meat and water. Because of poverty, there is limited capacity to develop alternatives to resources found within the biodiversity protected areas. The community's priority areas may be focused on growing enough food to feed their families and possibly having a bit left for sale. Using their meagre resources to grow alternatives to resources which can easily be got from the biodiversity protected areas is not a priority. Thus the demand for natural resources is not likely to diminish in the near future, but rather to increase, unless the issue of poverty in such areas is urgently addressed.

Insecurity and conflicts: There has been insecurity in some parts of the country, notably around Mt. Rwenzori (1996-2000), Murchison Falls National Parks (1992-2005), Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (1996) and Mgahinga National Park (1989-1994). All these have had a profound effect on wildlife conservation. During times of insecurity different species of animals for instance the mountain gorillas and elephants have been indiscriminately killed and traded in animal parts while wildlife habitats have been encroached and heavily degraded.

Illegal trade in plants, animals and derived parts: The low levels of enforcement and the very high prices for some crop and animal species and their derived products increases the levels of poaching and contributed heavily to the loss of the country's rich biodiversity with the loss of priceless species to extinction for example the white and black rhinos. This has been most pronounced on the Uganda-DRC border affecting mostly the timber resources. There is a possibility of such trade also affecting the northern Uganda region targeting products such as Gum Arabic and wildlife through movements between Uganda and Southern Sudan.

Development policies: According to the National Development Plan (2010), Uganda's economic policy objectives emphasize maintenance of macro-economic stability and discipline, equitable and efficient collection and utilization of public resources and, removal of constraints on private sector competitiveness. This policy puts emphasis on generation of quick economic returns which also influences the manner in which environment and natural resources base is utilized to yield such quick returns. However, environment and natural resources sector is not prioritized among key sectors because returns from investments in

natural resources such as soil and water conservation, tree planting and land management, to mention a few, take a long period to be realized. This policy has led to attempts to convert landscapes meant for biodiversity conservation, especially forest and wetlands, to other forms of land use thus diminishing their biodiversity.

Politics and public management: Uganda's public managers (politicians) and their political competition have driven them to disregard some important aspects of biodiversity management in Uganda in favour of quick political gains such as votes. Recent political events have witnessed some political actors working against maintenance of biodiversity protected areas, including supporting initiatives to degazette protected areas. There is a growing trend of change of land use of PAs to agriculture or to industrial expansion which is being encouraged by Government. The PAs are perceived by politicians and investors as a land bank for future appropriation for investment. This trend is worrying and has already claimed Bugala Islands in Lake Victoria for palm oil plantation, Namanve CFR in Kampala for an industrial park, part of Pian Upe Wildlife Reserve in Karamoja for large scale agriculture and is likely to affect the South Busoga forests which are some of the few remaining forests at the shores of Lake Victoria. These changes are likely to impact very negatively on biodiversity in those areas.

4.2 Current efforts to Reduce Biodiversity Loss in Uganda

Despite the above threats to biodiversity conservation, the Government of Uganda still recognizes the importance of biodiversity in national development and has therefore made significant progress in putting in place policies, laws and institutional frameworks on the conservation and management of biodiversity.

4.2.1 National Policies

A number of policies have been put in place to protect the Ugandan environment, including the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The key National Policy framework for management of biodiversity in Uganda is the National Environment Policy (1994). The Policy provides for the institutional structure as well as policy measures for biodiversity management in Uganda. The specific objectives of the policy are to:

- (i) Enhance health and quality of life of all Ugandans and promote long-term sustainable economic development through sound environmental and natural resources management and use.
- (ii)** Integrate environmental concerns in all development-oriented policies, planning and activities at national, district and local levels, with participation of the people.
- (iii) Conserve, preserve and restore ecosystems and maintain ecological processes and life support systems, including conservation of national biodiversity.
- (iv) Optimize resource use and achieve sustainable level of resource consumption.
- (v) Raise public awareness to understand and appreciate linkages between environment and development.
- (vi) Ensure individual and community participation in environmental improvement activities.

Sectoral Policies: Sectoral policies regulating the management of Uganda's natural resources provide measures for Biodiversity management in the various sectors of Government (Table 9).

Table 9: Sectoral Policies relevant to biodiversity management in Uganda

Policy	Relevance	Provision for Biodiversity Management
Uganda Wildlife Policy, 1999	Promotes the long term conservation of the country's wildlife and biodiversity in a cost effective manner which maximizes the benefits for the people of Uganda.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance health and quality of life of all Ugandans and promote long-term sustainable economic development through sound environmental and natural resources management and use. • Integrate environmental concerns in all development-oriented policies, planning and activities at national, district and local levels, with participation of the people, • Conserve, preserve and restore ecosystems and maintain ecological processes and life support systems, including conservation of national biodiversity. • Optimize resource use and achieve sustainable level of resource consumption. • Raise public awareness to understand and appreciate linkages between environment and development. • Ensure individual and community participation in environmental improvement activities.
Forestry Policy (2001)	Promotes management of forestry resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and manage sustainably the Permanent Forest Estate. • Promote the development and sustainable management of natural forests on private and customary land. • Promoting profitable and productive forests plantation business. • Promote collaborative partnerships with rural communities for the sustainable management of forests. • Promote tree growing on farms in all farming systems and innovative methods for delivering forestry extension and advisory services through decentralized and farmer - driven mechanisms. • Conservation and management of biodiversity in support of local, national social and economic development and international obligations. • Establish, rehabilitate and conserve watersheds. • Promote urban forestry • Support sustainable forest sector development through education, training and research • Promote innovative mechanisms for the supply of high quality tree seed and improved planting stock
Land Policy (2000)	Promotes the land use and physical planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants ownership of land-to-land owners and <i>bona fide</i> occupants of land in Uganda • Grants the use of land and all resources in accordance with other laws
National Wetlands Policy (1995)	Promote the conservation of Uganda's wetlands in order to sustain their ecological and socio-economic functions for the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish the principles by which wetland resources can be optimally used, and their productivity can be maintained into the future. • End existing unsustainable exploitative practices in wetlands to avert the decline in their productivity. • Maintain a biological diversity in wetlands either in the natural community of plants and animals or in the multiplicity of agricultural activity.

Policy	Relevance	Provision for Biodiversity Management
	present and future well being of the people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the functions and values derived from wetlands resources throughout Uganda. • Promote the recognition and integration of wetland functions in resource management and economic development decisions making about sector policies and programmes such as forestry, agriculture, fisheries, and wildlife and sound environmental management
Tourism Policy (2003)	Ensure that tourism becomes a vehicle for poverty reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop tourism in a sustainable manner, focusing on Agenda 21 issues in respect of the development of tourism facilities and encouraging nature friendly product development • Ensure that conservation programmes between Government Agencies (UWA, NFA and Wetlands Department) are well coordinated. • Develop facilities and products in the national parks in accordance with the park management plans. • Provide for channeling of tourism revenues towards the protection of the natural resource base
Fisheries Policy (2003)	Conserve and manage sustainably fisheries and other aquatic resources for sustainable production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of inventories of aquatic biodiversity resources, species distribution and role in aquatic systems for all waters. • Strengthen the role of enforcement and extension and involve NGOs, among others, in implementation and extension. • Give local communities better control over the management of fisheries resources and strengthen local management capacity. • Increase knowledge on the role of non-fish aquatic life in aquatic ecosystem dynamics and develop safeguards to ensure their protection and sustainable use. • Contain over-exploitation, the destruction of habitat and control species introduction through strengthened research efforts and better planning and monitoring. • Identify and map critical and sensitive habitats and take appropriate steps (gazetting) to minimize damage and disturbance to breeding, nesting, aestivation and feeding areas of all Aquatic species. • Put in place mechanisms, including research, planning and monitoring, to encourage the revival of endangered fish species in the waters and ensure sustainable utilization. • Regulate the disposal of water and wastes from fish processing areas, plants and other industries. • Increase training opportunities, develop more appropriate curricula and develop better local capacity in the fisheries manpower sector. • Collaborate and participate with the neighboring countries to harmonize the management and development of shared aquatic resources.
National Agriculture Policy	Promote farming systems and land-use practices that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance and strengthen the environmental concerns in the agricultural extension system, including research and training for extension workers, NGOs and land-users

Policy	Relevance	Provision for Biodiversity Management
(2009)	conserve and enhance land productivity in an environmentally sustainable manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place greater emphasis on environmentally friendly means of increasing agricultural production • Undertake a national soil survey and mapping programme and formulate a national soil policy • Where appropriate and practicable, offer land users tax incentives for soil and water conservation and good husbandry practices. • Support researches to develop farming systems that combine optimum production with land resources conservation and which are compatible with the socio-economic conditions of the target population.
De-centralization Policy (1993)	Districts are empowered to plan for development in the district and to manage the environment and Sectoral natural resources such forestry, wetlands, wildlife, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer political, administrative, financial and planning authority from the center to local governments. • Promote popular participation, empower local people to make own decisions and enhance accountability and responsibility. • Introduce efficiency and effectiveness in the generation and management of resources, and in the delivery of services.
National Gender Policy (1997)	Integrate gender concerns in environmental policy planning, decision making and implementation at all levels to ensure sustainable social and economic development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate gender concerns in existing and proposed policies and programmes. • Collect gender dis-aggregated information related to the environment including the human factors. • Include gender roles and analysis in environmental management training programmes at all levels. • Facilitate participation of both men and women in formal and informal education, training, public awareness campaigns and decision making in environmental and natural resources management. • Establish an institutional mechanism to review existing and proposed programmes to integrate gender issues. • Carry out research on the local knowledge and use of natural resources.
National Culture Policy (2006)	Conserve, protect and promote Uganda's tangible and intangible cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage Uganda's cultural heritage (Cultural sites, Monuments and Antiquities) and associated biodiversity values • Promote cultural practices and norms including those dependent on a variety of biological resources.
National Population Policy (1995)	Involve a society that is both informed and conscious of population and development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing awareness on the impact of population change on the environment through environmental awareness campaigns. • Promoting proper waste management in urban and rural areas. • Developing an early warning system on the effect of population pressure on the ecosystem. • Discouraging traditional inheritance systems whereby land is

Policy	Relevance	Provision for Biodiversity Management
	issues at all levels	fragmented at every successive generation, in light of increasing population. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting research in and adapting use of alternatives sources of energy and energy saving devices.
Education Policy (1992)	Promotes human resources development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote education that is relevant to Uganda's development priorities • Promote science based training and skills development

Over-all, these policies are deemed sufficient to guide and influence biodiversity management in Uganda although some policy gaps still need to be addressed including the following:

- a) There is need to review the current scattered sectoral policies and develop an integrated biodiversity management policy with key sectoral action plans/ strategies so that all the respective sectors contribute to the implementation of the main policy as compared to the current isolated, segmented and disintegrated sector-based policies (and the corresponding legislation) that are characterized by duplications, role conflicts and resource constraints
- b) There is need for a specific policy or policy guideline to specifically address biodiversity conservation and management in Uganda
- c) Such policy formulation processes should consider and incorporate indigenous knowledge systems in order to promote effective biodiversity conservation;
- d) There is a great need for the recognition, legislation and incorporation of the indigenous knowledge and practices in biodiversity related policy instruments. The recognition of the roles of royal or cultural authorities would enhance the effective implementation of such policies. Such recognition should be manifested through the empowerment and reinforcement of the cultural institutions in natural resource use and management while taking into account that in an African indigenous knowledge system, customs, practices and values, biodiversity takes fundamental roles in livelihoods security (food, shelter and health)
- e) The current policy initiation and planning processes tend to focus more on the political and technical expertise in the country while the policy environment includes many other players such as the civil society and the private sector; in most cases, the nongovernmental players are involved at the level of reviewing draft policy documents. Policy initiation and planning process should be an all-inclusive approach especially with biodiversity conservation concerns that affect all sectors of the population in terms socio-economic and ecological values of biodiversity. Some policy issues are addressed under **activities 1.1.2, 1.2.1.**

4.2.2 Legal Frameworks

Besides the above Policy frameworks, there are also elaborate legal regimes for the management of biodiversity in Uganda. These are grounded in the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995. Objective XIII of the Constitution requires the State to protect important natural resources, including land, water, wetlands, minerals, oils, fauna, and flora on behalf of the people of Uganda. Article 245 provides for Parliament to enact laws intended

to protect the environment from abuse, pollution and degradation as well as for managing the environment for sustainable development. Parliament has, in conformity with Article 245 of the Constitution, enacted both national and sectoral laws on the management of the environment, some of which are discussed below.

The National Environment Act (Cap 153): This Act provides for the over-all management, coordination and monitoring of environment management and conservation in Uganda. It provides for the protection and conservation of natural resources in Uganda as well as promotion of international cooperation in the field of the environment.

Sectoral Legislation: Requirements for biodiversity management by the different sectors are provided in several legislations (Table 10).

Table 10: Sectoral laws for biodiversity management in Uganda

Framework	Provisions for biodiversity management
Forestry and Tree Planting Act (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declaration of forest reserves for purposes of protection and production of forests and forest produce • Sustainable use of forest resources and the enhancement of the productive capacity of forests • Promotion of tree planting • Consolidation of laws relating to forest sector and trade in forest produce • Establishment of a National Forest Authority • Establishment of District Forest Services • Recognition of privately owned forests through, registration and requirement for such forests to be managed according to approved management plans • Repealing of the Forest Act (Cap 147) and Timber (Export) Act Cap 151
Wildlife Act Cap 200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation of wildlife throughout Uganda, so that the abundance and diversity of their species are maintained at optimum levels commensurate with other forms of land use. In order to support sustainable utilization of wildlife for the benefit of the people of Uganda • Sustainable management of wildlife conservation areas • Conservation of selected wildlife communities in Uganda • Protection of rare, endangered and endemic species of wild plants and animals • Ecologically acceptable control of problem animals • Enhancement of economic and social benefits from wildlife management by establishing wildlife use rights and the promoting of tourism • Control of import, export and re-export of wildlife species and specimens • Implementation of relevant international treaties, conventions, agreements or other arrangements to which Uganda is a party • Public participation in wildlife management
Local Government Act, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and management of environment and wetlands • Management of Local Forest Reserves and for over-all development of forestry resource within the district
The Land Act, Cap 227	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition of land by government for purposes of common good, which would include biodiversity management • Management and use of privately owned land in accordance with laws governing forestry, mining, environment, water, wildlife and other such laws

Framework	Provisions for biodiversity management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holding in trust for the people of Uganda and protecting environment sensitive areas such as natural lakes, rivers, wetlands, forest reserves, national parks and any other land reserved for ecological and touristic purposes.
The Water Act, Cap 152	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use, protection and management of water resources and supply • Promoting the rational management and use of water resources, including management of water resources for preservation of flora and fauna • Recreation in ways that minimize harmful effects to environment • Control pollution of water resources
Plant Protection Act, Cap 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of the introduction and spread of diseases destructive to plants. • Regulating introduction of exotic plant materials and managing the spread of plant disease or those plants capable of out competing dangerous plants (invasive species)
Animal Breeding Act, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting, regulating and controlling, marketing and quality assurance of animal and fish genetic materials and generally for implementing the breeding policy • Establishment of National Genetic Resources Centre and Databank
Fisheries Act, Cap 197	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controlling fishing, conservation of fish, purchase and marketing fish • Regulating the introduction or transfer of fish species or their eggs or progeny not indigenous to Uganda
Tourism Act (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulating and implementing the marketing strategy(s) for tourism in which ought to be done in consultations and cooperation of the private sector and other relevant entities • Promoting domestic tourism • Encouraging investments in the tourism sector, targeting, among others, less developed tourism areas • Developing tourism revenues management strategies • Provision of financial support and incentives to promote private entities in tourism sector
The Animal Diseases Act (1964) Amended (2006) Cap 218	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of introduction and spread of diseases that may endanger the lives of Animals and Humans • Rules and regulations for disease control and compensation for purposes of disease control and procedures for importation or exportation of animals and their products
The Animals (Prevention of Cruelty) Act of 1964.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides measures for modes of transportation of animals to prevent cruelty and exposure to diseases
Agricultural Chemicals Act Cap 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control and regulation of the manufacture, storage, distribution and trade in, use, importation and exportation of, agricultural chemicals and for other purposes connected therewith

Regulations and Guidelines for biodiversity management: Legal frameworks for biodiversity management in Uganda are also supplemented by various regulations and guidelines such as the Water (Water Resources) Regulations, The National Environment (Wetlands, River Banks and Lake Shores management) Regulations and the National Environment (Access to Genetic Resources and benefit Sharing) Regulations, among others.

Over-all, Uganda's legislation is adequate to ensure sound management of Uganda's biodiversity although the following legal gaps still need to be addressed:

- a) Management of trans-boundary biodiversity resources within ecosystems and administrative units (districts) as well as trans-boundary resources across international boundaries is still inadequate
- b) Presently there are no specific guidelines or regulations on biodiversity conservation and management. Whilst the NBSAP and sectoral policies provide strategic directions, these strategies could be more enforceable by having dedicated guidelines on biodiversity conservation
- c) The current direct regulation (legislation) in environmental compliance enforcement should be complemented by other approaches such as use of economic instruments (incentives and disincentives) like environmental levies, payment for ecosystem services; indigenous knowledge system and non legislative methods that promote biodiversity conservation. Some of these approaches are more efficient and effective than direct punitive measures such as arrests as they are self-regulating and easily administered through market and social/habit factors. The current direct regulation and policing enforcement approach has faced a lot of resistance amidst people's apathy, impunity and resource constraints (inadequate human, financial and logistical resources for administering the legislation)
- d) In areas deficient of legislation, it is imperative to conclude the pending bills, amend existing legislation, and repeal inoperative laws. For example, it is strongly recommended that while enacting a law on plant variety protection, the rights of farmers and communities to save, use and share seed and to benefit from their traditional knowledge must be recognized and protected to ensure a law that is balanced, fair and sustainable.

Multi-Lateral Environmental Agreements: Uganda is a signatory to a number of international Conventions, Protocols and Agreements relating to biodiversity management. These include the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992); the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2000); the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (1973); Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Water Fowl Habitat (the RAMSAR Convention); the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) (1994); the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (1992); Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), Paris; the Convention Relating to the Preservation of Flora and Fauna in their Natural State (1933), London; African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (1968), Algiers; Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora (1994); the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (2001) and the World Trade Organization (Sanitary and Phytosanitary Rules). Each Convention is implemented through a national Focal Point in a designated Ministry or Lead Agency in Uganda. One of the biggest challenges in the implementation of the Conventions and Agreements is the lack of coordination among the Focal Points which results in frequent duplication of effort. This is being proposed under **activity 1.1.3.**

Regional Frameworks: Uganda is also a signatory to a number of regional protocols and agreements including the East African Community Treaty, East African Community Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management, Protocol for Sustainable Development of Lake Victoria Basin, Convention for the Establishment of the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO), East African Community Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement, Tripartite Management Agreement for Trans-boundary Wildlife Protected Area and Cooperative Framework Agreement on the River Nile. Each regional framework is implemented through a National Focal point in a Government Ministry or Lead Agency. These Focal Points also lack a coordinating mechanism which results in a lot of duplication of effort especially in regional reporting.

4.2.3 Institutional Frameworks

The set-up for biodiversity conservation in Uganda involves many stakeholders including government agencies (central and local), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society and community level institutions.

National Arrangements: These fall under three broad categories:

- (i) Policy level arrangements which encompass the National Policy Committee on Environment (PCE), Lead Ministry, the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) and Lead Agency, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)
- (ii) Sectoral arrangements which encompass sectoral ministries, Lead agencies and research and training institutions
- (iii) International and Regional cooperation frameworks

The Policy Committee on Environment (PCE)

The over-all Environmental policy coordination and harmonization is the responsibility of the National Policy Committee on Environment under the Office of the Prime Minister established in 1995 under the Environment Act (Cap 153). The National Policy Committee provides a forum for coordinating and harmonizing policy issues pertaining to biodiversity due to its legality as well as its composition and mandate. Its membership consists of Prime Minister (Chair) and relevant ministers.

The functions of the PCE are elaborate and adequate to ensure that biodiversity management concerns are coordinated among sectors. It also provides a platform for resolving conflicts e.g., conflicts between biodiversity conservation and economic development.

The Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE)

This is the lead Ministry for biodiversity management. Its mandate is to carry out inspections, monitor and coordinate and provide technical back up to the water and environment sectors. With specific reference to biodiversity management, the following functions of the Ministry apply:

- (i) Provide mechanisms for integrated and sustainable water resources management
- (ii) Promote sound and sustainable management of environment for optimal social and economic benefits for the present and future generations

- (iii) Improve the ability of forests, trees and wetlands to yield increases in economic, social and environmental benefits for all, especially the poor and vulnerable, for current and future generations.

The mandate of the Ministry is executed through the Directorates responsible for Water Development, Water Resources Management and Directorate of Environment Affairs. In addition, the Ministry oversees and coordinates two semi-autonomous institutions namely: the National Environment Management Authority and National Forest Authority.

National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)

- a) It was established by an Act of Parliament in May 1995 as a principal agency for the management of environment and to coordinate, monitor and supervise all activities in the field of environment, advise the government on environmental matters and participate in developing environmental regulations, standards and guidelines
- b) NEMA is also responsible for initiating and developing legislation, policies and standards for management of environment resources
- c) NEMA also serves as the Focal Point for the Convention on Biological Diversity which is the principal convention on biodiversity management
- d) The mandate of NEMA over biodiversity management focuses on coordination, supervision and monitoring. Thus NEMA's functions build on and depend on functions of the Lead agencies and districts.

Sectoral Ministries

These refer to those government ministries whose mandates directly or indirectly influence biodiversity management in Uganda. They comprise of ministries responsible for biodiversity habitats (wetlands, forests, national parks, wildlife reserves, fresh water, land) or ministries whose mandate exploits or promotes biodiversity management e.g. tourism, agriculture, culture, etc.

Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities

The mandate of the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities (MTWA) is "To sustainably maximize the economic values of the tourism, wildlife, historical and tangible cultural heritage sector of the economy, through promotion of foreign and local investments to ensure that tourism becomes a key means of poverty eradication in Uganda." The Ministry manages wildlife through the Department of Wildlife Management, whose main responsibilities are to undertake macro management of the wildlife sector, focusing particularly on planning and development aspects, in consultation with the local governments and the private sector. The Ministry also oversees and coordinates three semi-autonomous institutions, namely: Uganda Wildlife Authority, Uganda Wildlife Education Centre and Uganda Tourism Board whose mandates are described below.

Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)

Its mandate includes the promotion of farming systems and land-use practices that conserve and enhance land productivity in an environmentally sustainable manner. This mandate is executed through three directorates namely Directorate of Crop Resources, Directorate of Animal Resources and Directorate of Fisheries Resources. In addition to these Directorates,

MAAIF coordinates and supervises the following agencies whose functions relate directly to biodiversity management (Table 11).

Table 11: Agencies under MAAIF with mandate relevant to biodiversity management

Agency	Biodiversity management functions
National Agricultural Research	Generation and dissemination of research technologies,
National Agricultural Advisory	Delivery of agricultural advisory services, including in-
National Animal Genetic Resource Centre and Data Bank	Animal genetic resources development

With specific reference to biodiversity management, the following MAAIF functions apply:

- a) Formulate, review and implement national policies, plans, strategies, regulations and standards and enforce laws, regulations and standards along the value chain of crops, livestock and fisheries
- b) Control and manage epidemics and disasters, and support the control of sporadic and endemic plants, animal and fish diseases, pests and vectors
- c) Regulate the use of agricultural chemicals, veterinary drugs, and biological planting and stocking materials as well as other inputs.
- d) Support provision of planting and stocking materials and other inputs to increase production and commercialization of agriculture for food security and household income
- e) Develop and promote collaborative mechanisms nationally, regionally and internationally on issues pertaining to the sector.

Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPEDE)

This Ministry is responsible for allocation of financial resources for management of the environment including biodiversity. It is the Operational Focal Point for Global Environment Facility (GEF) for Uganda. It endorses GEF projects on biodiversity on behalf of Government of Uganda after the project is approved by the GEF Steering Committee.

Lead Agencies in biodiversity management

The Institutions described under this section include autonomous and semi-autonomous institutions with mandate to manage sectoral resources in Uganda.

The National Forest Authority (NFA)

The National Forest Authority (NFA) was established in 2004 by the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act (2003). The mandate of NFA is to manage Uganda's Central Forest Reserves on a sustainable basis and to supply high quality forestry-related products and services to Government, Local Governments, local communities and the private sector.

The Wetlands Management Department (WMD)

The Department for Wetlands Management is responsible for ensuring that Uganda's Wetlands provide sustainable benefit to the population of Uganda as a whole, mankind in general and the environment.

The Forestry Sector Support Department (FSSD)

The mandate of FSSD is to effectively co-ordinate, guide and supervise Uganda's forest sector, and contribute to the rational and sustainable utilization, development, effective management, safeguard of forestry resource, for social welfare. This mandate is executed through the following functions:

- a) Formulate and oversee forestry policies, standards and legislation
- b) Monitor the National Forest Authority (NFA) using a performance contract
- c) Provide technical support and monitor District Forestry Services
- d) Support forestry advisory services under National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)
- e) Promote information, advice and advocacy to sector stakeholders
- f) Ensure effective National Forest Plan (NFP) coordination and cross-sectoral linkages
- g) Mobilize funds and other resources for the forest sector

Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)

This is the lead agency for management of wildlife resources in Uganda. It was established in 1996 by the Uganda Wildlife Act Cap 200. The mandate of UWA is to ensure sustainable management of wildlife resources and to supervise wildlife activities in Uganda both inside and outside protected areas. UWA manages 10 National Parks, 12 Wildlife Reserves and 12 Wildlife Conservation Areas.

Uganda Wildlife Education Centre (UWEC)

The mandate of UWEC is to educate the public on conservation of wildlife, with emphasis on the young generation. UWEC manages 400 indigenous wild animals, 500 plant/tree species and 250 bird species in three major ecosystems namely wetlands, savannah and forests. In terms of biodiversity management, the mandates of UWEC include:

- a) Promoting conservation education
- b) Rescuing and rehabilitating injured, confiscated or orphaned wildlife
- c) Carrying out captive breeding of endangered wildlife species
- d) Offering UWEC for leisure and entertainment

Uganda Tourism Board (UTB)

The mandate of UTB is to ensure success and growth of tourism in Uganda. Uganda's tourism sector is heavily reliant on Uganda's biodiversity attractions hence the functions of UTB directly contribute towards management in form of non-consumptive uses.

The Department of Museums and Monuments

The mandate of the Department of Museums and Monuments is to preserve Uganda's culture and antiquities. Through the displays at the Museums, the Department promotes tradition and culture measures for biodiversity management. The displays depict the traditional use of biodiversity resources and promote the preservation of those biodiversity values so as to sustain cultures and tradition.

The Directorate of Crop Resources

Through the Departments of Farm Development; Crop Protection and Crop Production and Marketing, the Directorate supports sustainable, market oriented crop production, pest and disease control, quality and safety of plants/plant products. This mandate relates directly to agro-biodiversity in form of domestic crops, soil biodiversity, exotic species, conservation of germplasm, access to genetic resources, among others.

The Directorate of Animal Resources

Through the Departments of Animal Production and Marketing; Livestock Health and Entomology; and Fisheries Resources; the Directorate supports sustainable animal disease and vector control, market oriented animal production and food quality and safety.

Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST)

This government agency is charged with coordination and monitoring of all research within the country. This includes bio-prospecting and access to genetic resources. Within UNCST is the National Biosafety Committee (NBC) whose main function is to provide technical advice on biosafety issues to government especially with regard to risk assessment and management and benefits associated with use of biotechnology and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs).

Local governments

Under the decentralized natural resource management (environment, land, wetlands, forests), local governments play a key role in biodiversity management. Their mandates are derived from the legal provisions under the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda and the relevant laws described above.

Academia

These include Makerere University, whose departments carry out training in natural resources management and Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST), with its Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation. Other Universities and institutions of higher learning in the country play varying roles in support of biodiversity conservation and management mainly through training.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

NGOs include international ones such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the German Technical Cooperation, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF). National NGOs active in environment include Uganda Wildlife Society, Wildlife Clubs of Uganda, Environmental Alert, NatureUganda, ECOTRUST, among others. These have been particularly involved in implementation of the various international Conventions and fulfilling the requirements of national legislation as well as in promoting community participation and empowerment in sustainable natural resource management and ensuring access to benefits there from.

Cultural institutions in Uganda

These have for a long time played an important role in the management of biodiversity resources. Such cultural institutions include Kingdoms (like Buganda, Toro and Busoga) and Chiefdoms (like Teso, Acholi and Lango).

The Private Sector

The key private sector organizations involved in biodiversity conservation include oil companies, tourism operators, fish and crocodile farmers, private farmers and tree planting operators, among others.

Institutional gaps that need to be addressed include:

- a) There is need to put in place efficient institutional mechanisms to regulate plant breeding activities, seed distribution network, proper input use policies and other regulatory frame works to ensure that plant genetic resources are used in a manner that gives incentives to farmers for conservation of the genetic resources and at the same time ensure food security for the burgeoning population
- b) There is need to involve non- governmental organizations and the private sector in engaging government to ensure that the rights of communities and small farmers are not lost at the expense of putting legislation in place
- c) There is need for closer collaboration among institutions to promote management of biodiversity. There still exist institutional role duplication and conflicts that characterize most government institutions that need to be harmonized for more efficiency and effectiveness (**activity 1.1.1**).
- d) There is need to strengthen the institutional collaborations and partnerships in research, industrialization and commercialization of products as a strategy to enhance conservation of biodiversity.
- e) Centers of excellence need to be created to coordinate research in order to have proper utilization and regularization of this information.
- f) A national coordination unit with a network of partner institutions for the MEAs (Conventions) that are related to ENR/biodiversity conservation should be established through Government efforts and support of development partners. The current implementation and domestication efforts for the MEAs are not effective partly due to lack of harmonized and coordinated strategies for the implementation of the MEAs (**activity 1.1.3**).

5.0 BACKGROUND TO THE NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN 2015-2025

5.1 Introduction

Uganda signed and ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 12th June 1992 and 8th September 1993, respectively. The CBD has three objectives namely: the conservation of biological diversity, its sustainable use and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources. Article 6 (a) of the CBD requires Parties to the Convention to develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) is the main instrument for implementation of the Convention at country level. NBSAP provides Government with a framework for implementing its obligations under CBD as well as the setting of conservation priorities, channelling of investments and building of the necessary capacity for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the country.

At its tenth meeting in Nagoya, Japan, the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP 10) adopted the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, with 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The Parties then committed themselves to revising their NBSAPs and to adopt them as policy instruments by 2015. They also committed themselves to developing national targets that would support the achievement of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets, and to report thereon at COP 11 or 12 in 2012 or 2014. The revision of the NBSAP at this time would enable Uganda to demonstrate its commitment to the achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, with its Aichi Biodiversity Targets while having its own national targets.

5.2 Overview of the first NBSAP for Uganda

Uganda developed its first National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP1) in 2002. The process was coordinated by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) which is the institution coordinating the implementation of the CBD in Uganda. The NBSAP had an initial implementation period of 10 years with a major review after 5 years. The first review should have taken place in 2007; but this was not done due to lack of financial resources. The second review has been done simultaneously with the formulation of the second generation NBSAP (NBSAP2).

5.3 Lessons learnt from implementing NBSAP1 for Uganda

A number of lessons were learnt from implementation of NBSAP1 (2002-2012). The NBSAP was effective in addressing various biodiversity concerns in the country such as:

- a) Improving coordination among various agencies through the formation of a Technical Committee on Biodiversity Conservation (TCBDC);
- b) Improving collaboration between the CBD and other international conventions at national level

- c) Addressing a number of Articles of the Convention such as the CBD programme of Work on Protected Areas (PAs), formulation of Regulations on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing, establishment of a Biodiversity information sharing mechanism, preparation of a National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan, promotion of public awareness on biodiversity as well as support to relevant areas of biotechnology and Biosafety;
- d) Implementation of the Convention's Thematic Programmes of Work and Cross-Cutting Issues such as inland waters biodiversity, agro-biodiversity, identification, monitoring and assessment, development of biodiversity indicators and the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity.

The key obstacles to NBSAP1 implementation included:

- a) Inadequate financial resources for implementation of planned activities and programmes in the NBSAP
- b) Inadequate awareness of NBSAP1 among implementing partners and the general public
- c) Inadequate human and infrastructure capacity in relevant field of biodiversity conservation such as taxonomy and capacity to carry out conservation and characterization of germplasm in the National Gene Bank
- d) Lack of a central node/Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) to facilitate information sharing among institutions involved in biodiversity conservation.
- e) Limited information on indigenous farm plant and animal genetic resources
- f) Inadequate managerial and technical capacity at the District and lower local Government levels for implementation of the NBSAP

A number of these obstacles have since been overcome. The CHM, for example, is now operational and very active in NEMA. A lot of capacity, through NEMA, has now been built at the District and lower levels to handle critical issues of biodiversity conservation at those levels. The current NBSAP will attempt to significantly increase the resource envelope for biodiversity conservation by exploring various sources of innovative sustainable funding mechanisms as shown in **Strategic Objective 7**.

5.4 Progress in Reviewing and updating NBSAP1 to NBSAP2 2015-2025 for Uganda

In line with the decisions of COP 10 on NBSAP review, Uganda has initiated the preparation of NBSAP2. As focal point to the CBD, NEMA is coordinating the development and updating of NBSAP1. The process started when Uganda participated in the capacity building workshop for the review and updating of NBSAP for eastern Africa which took place in Kigali Rwanda in June 2011. The workshop was organized by the CBD Secretariat and attended by representatives from Uganda.

Uganda also benefited from the regional workshop for Africa for updating the NBSAP which took place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in March 2012. Uganda was again well represented at the workshop.

Using the knowledge and skills gained from the above workshops, Uganda began the process of reviewing and updating its NBSAP with a capacity building workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to create a clear understanding of NBSAPs, the NBSAP review process, the

strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi targets, identify stakeholders to be involved/consulted during the review and updating of NBSAP1, develop a road map to guide the process as well as agree on the thematic areas for stocktaking/assessment of baseline information to feed into the NBSAP review and updating process.

The capacity building workshop achieved all the above objectives and in addition, initial national biodiversity targets and a provisional outline for the revised and updated NBSAP were developed. The provisional outline is available on the CHM website at www.chm.nemaug.org).

Four Thematic Working Groups were identified (details on the CHM website) and became operational in December 2012. The thematic working groups carried out stocktaking to provide baseline information to feed into the NBSAP review and updating process. The reports of the thematic working groups were also used to prepare the fifth National Report to the CBD for Uganda. Terms of Reference for the Thematic Working Groups were developed into account the guidance by the CBB for the preparation of the fifth national report. The four Thematic Working Groups were on:

1. Aquatic and Terrestrial Biodiversity
2. Policy, legislation and institutional framework for biodiversity management in Uganda
3. The status of biotechnology and biosafety in Uganda
4. Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and National Development

Overall over 62 high profile technical officers from central Government Ministries, parastatal organizations, District Local governments, NGOs, private sector and IPLC representatives participated in the Thematic Working Groups. Membership of the Thematic Working Groups is appended to **Annex 1**. The Groups began their work in December 2012, with each group producing a Thematic report. Overall coordination of the NBSAP review and updating process was by Mr. Sabino Francis Ogwal, assisted by Monique Akullo and Junior Musinguzi, all from NEMA.

All the four Thematic reports were shared with Dr. Bob Humphrey Ogwang, the consultant who was contracted by NEMA to consolidate the review findings and write the final NBSAP2 Report.

Another key output from the Working Groups was the development of provisional national biodiversity targets within the framework of the Aichi targets with corresponding indicators. Furthermore, the group also reviewed the vision and goal of the current NBSAP as well as its strategic objectives and made proposals for their modification. To complement the five strategic objectives in NBSAP1, the Working Group added two additional strategic objectives, namely: Biotechnology and Biosafety and Resource mobilization.

5.5 Summary of the processes for review and updating of NBSAP1

Figure 20 below shows that Uganda has so far made significant progress in the process of reviewing and updating the NBSAP. It also shows the importance of stakeholder consultations that Uganda attaches to the preparation of a national document of this status to ensure ownership of the final deliverable, the NBSAP itself. A strategy and action plan has now been prepared and so the next step is their implementation including coordination. After a few years, implementation will be followed by monitoring and evaluation in order to measure the effectiveness of the activities that were carried out during the period.

Reporting is usually through preparation of National Reports to the CBD using the format as guided by COP. So far the reports have been prepared within intervals of 4 years. After a period of 10 years (2025), it is anticipated that the NBSAP will again be ready for review and updating and the process will be repeated.




Figure 18: The process for reviewing and updating NBSAP1

5.6 The updated context of NBSAP2

The revised and updated NBSAP brings on board key developments and emerging issues which have taken place since the first NBSAP was prepared in 2002. Among these are:

- The National biodiversity targets developed within the framework of the Aichi targets
- The vision, goal and objectives of the second NBSAP have been aligned to the vision, mission and strategic goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 201-2020
- Two new strategic objectives have been added in the second NBSAP to cater for Resource mobilization and Biotechnology/Biosafety
- New and emerging issues have also been incorporated including oil exploration and production, the production of biofuels and natural disaster management.

The strategic objective on resources mobilization will assist Government to report on biodiversity financing. Guidelines and Action Plans for Financing Biodiversity conservation in Uganda have been developed to enhance resource mobilization. The strategic objective on biotechnology and biodiversity provides a framework for implementing the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020 and other issues on biotechnology and Biosafety at the national level.

5.7 Overarching principles of NBSAP2

The CBD Strategic plan (2011-2020) and the complementary Aichi Biodiversity Targets, Vision 2040 and the National Development Plan (NDP) have all closely guided the formulation of NBSAP2. NBSAP2 will be implemented in line with the following principles, which have been mainly derived from these instruments:

- a) Sustainable development and environmental sustainability
- b) Mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of biological resources and equitable sharing of benefits from biological resources into existing policy, legislative, institutional and development frameworks as appropriate (see mainstreaming strategy)
- c) Stakeholder participation in the development and implementation of biodiversity strategy and action plans
- d) Awareness creation, education, training and capacity building at local, national and institutional levels to enhance effective participation and implementation of biodiversity measures (see CEPA/IEC strategy)
- e) Recognition, promotion and upholding of traditional and indigenous knowledge of biological resources and sustainable resource management and where benefits arise from the use of this knowledge
- f) Engagement and collaboration with international partners to enhance conservation and sustainable use of Uganda's biological diversity.
- g) Integrated implementation of Multi-Lateral Environmental Agreements
- h) Equal consideration of the three objectives of the UNCBD – conservation; sustainable use; and benefit sharing arising from the use of biological resources.

5.8 Linking NBSAP2 to Uganda's Vision 2040, NDP and SDGs

In 2007, Government adopted a comprehensive National Development Planning Framework which provides for the development of a 30-year Vision (2010-2040) that will be implemented through: three 10-year plans; six 5-year National Development Plans (NDPs); Sector Investment Plans (SIPs); Local Government Development Plans (LGDPs); Annual work plans; and Budgets. The first five year National Development Plan operationalizing this Vision was launched in April 2010.

The NDP is designed to be the primary Government national strategic plan, the anchor for all Government and sector plans. It provides a guide for the allocation of resources through the Medium Term Expenditure Framework. Over the coming years, the NDP will guide decision making and implementation of government programmes including the annual budget process, and the prioritization and direction of Government actions. It will therefore, be a tool for prioritizing government interventions and mobilizing external resources.

This first National Development Plan (NDP) covered the period 2010 – 2015 while the second NDP covers the period 2015 -2020. NBSAP2 has been mainstreamed in NDPII

Uganda Vision 2040 provides development paths and strategies to operationalize Uganda’s Vision statement which is “A Transformed Ugandan Society from a Peasant to a Modern and Prosperous Country within 30 years” as approved by Cabinet in 2007. It aims at transforming Uganda from a predominantly peasant and low income country to a competitive upper middle income country. NBSAP2 will assist Uganda to reach its long-term goals as outlined in its Vision 2040, National Development Plans and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as shown in Table 12.

Table 12: NBSAP key contribution areas towards Vision 2040, NDP and the SDGs

NBSAP 2: Key contribution areas		
Vision 2040	NDPII	SDGs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Green Economy: poverty eradication, sustained economic growth, creating opportunities for employment, maintaining the healthy functioning of ecosystems •Protection and sustainable use of natural resources: promoting re-forestation, afforestation, tree planting and green agriculture practices; restoration of wetlands, hilltops and other fragile ecosystems •Sharing of environmental costs and benefits: conservation of ENR and cultural diversity; adoption of environmental patterns of production and consumption; promotion of the development, adoption and equitable transfer of environmentally sound technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Theme: Strengthening Uganda’s Competitiveness for Sustainable Wealth Creation, Employment and Inclusive Growth •Goal –to attain middle income status by 2020 •Development objectives – Increase sustainable production, productivity and value addition to key growth opportunities •Priority sectors: Agriculture, tourism, minerals, oil and gas •ENR Objectives • Objective 1: Restore and maintain the integrity and functionality of degraded fragile ecosystems •Objective 2: Increase the sustainable use of ENR •Objective 3: Increase wetland coverage and reduce degradation •Objective 5: Increase Uganda’s resilience to the impacts of climate change •Objective 6: Increase afforestation, reforestation, adaptation and mitigate deforestation for sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal 1. End poverty in all its form everywhere Goal 2. End hunger .improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture Goal 5. Attain gender equality, empower women and girls everywhere Goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable use of water and sanitation for all Goal 12. Promote sustainable consumption and production patterns Goal 13. Tackle climate change and its impacts Goal 14. Conserve and promote sustainable use of oceans, seas and marine resources Goal 15. Protect and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, halt, desertification, land degradation and biodiversity loss

5.9 Creating Synergies between the CBD and other international Conventions

Implementation of NBSAP2 needs to be harmonized as far as possible with that of the two sister Rio Conventions and other relevant international multilateral agreements. Common thematic areas for synergies between these Conventions and agreements have been identified in NBSAP2 and include:

- a) The CEPA/IEC Strategy which is relevant to all multi-lateral environmental agreements **(Strategic objective 5)**
- b) Support to sustainable land management (SLM) practices that conserve agro-biodiversity (CCD) **(activity 3.5.4, 3.6.3, 3.6.5, 3.7.4)**
- c) Pioneer a holistic and inclusive approach to law enforcement (focusing on intelligence, interception and prosecution) with regard to poaching and illegal trade in wildlife (CITES) **(activities 3.3.2-3.3.6)**
- d) Create synergies between the different multilateral Environmental Conventions **(activity 7.2.4)**
- e) Implement climate change mitigation and adaptation programmes for biodiversity conservation (UNFCCC) **(activities 3.2.1-3.2.8, 3.6.2, 3.6.4, 3.6.6, 3.6.7)**
- f) Wetland ecosystems providing essential services are being sustainably managed, and where necessary restored, taking into account environmental, economic and social needs (Ramsar Convention) **(activities 3.5.1-3.5.9)**
- g) Knowledge, science and research which is relevant to all multi-lateral environmental agreements **(Strategic objective 2)**

6.0 THE NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN: PRIORITIES AND TARGETS

6.1 Guiding Principles for the Development of NBSAP2

While addressing any gaps in the implementation of the just ended first edition of the NBSAP, the revised NBSAP2 will be based on the following guiding principles:

1. NBSAPs are key implementation tools for the Convention on Biological Diversity and NBSAP2 will therefore address all three objectives of the Convention
2. The NBSAP will highlight and seek to maintain the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to human well being, poverty eradication, and national development as well as the economic, social, cultural and other values of biodiversity
3. As a strategic instrument for achieving concrete outcomes, the role of the revised NBSAP will be to identify and prioritize the actions required in order to meet the objectives of the CBD at national level, and to devise a plan of how to implement those actions
4. In order to be effective, NBSAP2 will be jointly developed, adopted, and owned by a full range of stakeholders involved. For this to happen, every effort will be made to ensure that the NBSAP process is open, participative and transparent. It will also be necessary for high-level government support to be secured in the process of developing, updating and implementing the NBSAP
5. The revised NBSAP will also include measures to mainstream biodiversity into sectoral and cross-sectoral policies and programs. Conservation involves much more than protected area management and implementation of conservation actions; it necessarily requires mainstreaming. To an even greater degree, achieving sustainable use objectives will require mainstreaming.
6. Biodiversity planning is a long-term, cyclical and adaptive process. The development of NBSAP2 will involve continuous monitoring, evaluation, and revision; as progress is made, conditions evolve and lessons are learned.

6.2 Vision, Goal and Strategic Objectives of NBSAP2

Through a transparent consultative process, the Vision, Mission and Strategic Objectives of this NBSAP as agreed by the stakeholders were as follows:

6.2.1 The Vision

The Vision of Uganda's NBSAP2 is to maintain a rich biodiversity benefiting the present and future generations for socio-economic development.

6.2.2 Goal

The goal of NBSAP2 is to enhance biodiversity conservation, management and sustainable utilisation and fair sharing of the benefits.

6.2.3 The Strategic Objectives

The strategic objectives of the NBSAP2 are:

1. To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management
2. To facilitate and enhance capacity for research, monitoring, information management and exchange on biodiversity
3. To put in place measures to reduce and manage negative impacts on biodiversity
4. To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity
5. To enhance awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders
6. To harness modern biotechnology for socio-economic development with adequate safety measures for human health and the environment
7. To promote innovative sustainable funding mechanisms to mobilize resource for implementing the Strategy

The CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi targets are presented in **Annex 2**. Table 13 below shows the linkage between the Strategic Objectives of NBSAP2 and the CBD Goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its associated Aichi targets.

Table 13: Linking the Strategic Objectives of NBSAP2 to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi targets

No	Strategic Objective of NBSAP2	Linkage to Goals of *SPB 2011-2020 and Focal Area for *CPB 2011-2020	Linkage to the Aichi targets
1	To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management	goal A and E	Aichi targets 2 and 17
2	To facilitate and build capacity for research, monitoring, information management and exchange on biodiversity	SPB goal E	Aichi targets 18 and 19
3	To reduce and manage negative impacts while enhancing positive impacts on biodiversity	SPB goal B, C and D	Aichi targets 10, 11,12,13,14 and 15
4	To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity	SPB goal A,C and D	Aichi Targets 3, 13 and 16
5	To enhance awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders	SPB goal A	Aichi Target 1
6	To harness modern biotechnology for socio-economic development with adequate safety measures for human health and the environment	SPB goal E; Focal area 1 – 4 of the Strategic Plan of the CPB 2011-2020	Aichi target 19
7	To promote innovative sustainable funding mechanisms	Linked to strategic goal E	Aichi targets 20

Table 13 shows that the Strategic Objectives of NBSAP2 have a direct linkage with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, its Aichi targets and also the Strategic Plan for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020. {*CPB – Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; *SPB – Strategic Plan for Biodiversity}

6.3 The National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans in detail

6.3.1 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management

In order to effect this objective and address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, the following steps should be implemented:

- a) Mainstream biodiversity issues in the NDP, Sectoral, District and Local Development Plans
- b) Mainstreaming should be an important component of the NBSAP implementation process
- c) Review, update and initiate the process of implementation of NBSAP
- d) Put in place a monitoring and evaluation framework for NBSAP

The strategies and action plan for this objective will be as follows:

Strategic Objective 1: To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management								
1.1	National target: By 2020, biodiversity values have been integrated into the National Development Plan, Budget Framework papers, Ministerial Policy Statements and District Development Plans				Corresponding Aichi targets 2			
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Trends in allocation of national resources to biodiversity conservation 2. Trends in policies considering biodiversity and ecosystems services in environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Mainstream biodiversity issues in the NDP, Sectoral and District Development Plans	Put in place measures to enhance stakeholder coordination	1.1.1 Strengthen the capacity of the biodiversity coordination mechanism	CBD Focal Point is currently overstretched	Collaboration and information flow among stakeholders improved	NEMA	UWA NFA Districts	800,000
			1.1.2 Develop an integrated biodiversity management policy framework	Biodiversity related policies are disjointed	A national Biodiversity policy framework in place	NEMA	MWE MDAs Districts	70,000
			1.1.3 Lobby government and other relevant stakeholders to put in place a coordination mechanism for implementation of Multilateral Environmental Conventions	Lack of coordination among biodiversity related conventions	A coordinated mechanism put in place	NEMA	MWE MDAs Districts	70,000
			1.1.4 Develop and utilize	Examples of	Integration of	NEMA	MDAs	80,000

			biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation tools to quantify and monitor the environmental, economic and social value of biodiversity	biodiversity valuation is limited in Uganda	biodiversity issues in the NDP, sectoral and District Development Plans			
			1.1.5 Develop and implement guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity into national, sectoral and district plans (see mainstreaming framework in Annex 4)	No guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity exist	Biodiversity issues planned and budgeted for at National and Local levels	NEMA	NPA UWA NFA	10,000
			1.1.6 Utilize biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations to mainstream biodiversity into decision making and to develop a business case for biodiversity	Limited integration of biodiversity in local, sector and national plans	Biodiversity issues planned and budgeted for at National and Local levels	NEMA	NPA UWA NFA MoFPED	50,000

1.2	National target: By 2015, NBSAP reviewed, updated and adopted and being effectively implemented				Corresponding Aichi 17			
Key Outcome Indicators: 1. Level of integration of biodiversity issues within NDP, sectoral and local government plans with respective budgetary allocations								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Review, update and initiate the process of implementation of NBSAP	Mainstream biodiversity in NDP, sectoral and district plans	1.2.1 Develop a policy instrument/guidelines for implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan	No policy guideline presently exists	Policy guideline in place	NEMA	MDAs UWA NFA Districts	40,000
			1.2.2 Produce and distribute sufficient copies of NBSAP2 to relevant sectors in Government, Civil Society and Private sector	NBSAP has not yet been distributed	-Number of stakeholders with NBSAP2 -Devise a monitoring and feedback mechanism on NBSAP information on consumption	NEMA	MDAs Districts NGOS IPLCs	80,000
			1.2.3 Facilitate the mainstreaming of NBSAP2 actions in national, sectoral and district plans and programmes	Not yet done	Key issues in NBSAP2 mainstreamed and budgeted for in national, sectoral and district plans	NEMA	NPA MDAs districts	80,000

					and programmes			
			1.2.4 Undertake regular cross-sectoral consultations on NBSAP implementation	Not yet done	Revise strategies for implementation of NBSAP as appropriate	NEMA	MDAs Districts	200,000

1.3	National target: By 2015 an effective Monitoring and Evaluation strategy for the implementation of NBSAP developed and is in operation				Aichi target 17			
Key Outcome Indicators: - A Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy in place								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Put in place a monitoring and evaluation framework for NBSAP	Carry out periodic monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2	1.3.1 Develop an NBSAP2 Monitoring and Evaluation strategy with SMART indicators	An M&E yet to be prepared	A Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy in place	NEMA	MDAs districts Academia IPLCs	40,000
			1.3.2 Undertake Monitoring and Evaluation of the implementation of NBSAP at agreed periods	Not yet done	Periodic monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2	NEMA	MDAs Dsitricks	120,000

6.3.2 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: To facilitate and build capacity for research, knowledge and information management and exchange on biodiversity

One of the highlights of this objective stresses the importance of taxonomy as well as indigenous knowledge in biodiversity conservation. The Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI) of the CBD requires country-based taxonomic needs assessments and identification of priorities and nation capacity-building to support access to and generation of taxonomic information for improved taxonomic knowledge. In Uganda, awareness on the role and importance of taxonomy in biodiversity conservation and economic development is generally low. This is compounded by the relatively few well trained and experienced taxonomists who normally do not even find taxonomic jobs in relevant institutions.

Traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of local communities also need to be carefully harnessed and regulated so that these communities can benefit to a greater extent from their biodiversity-related expertise. This will also promote equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of natural resources thus promoting biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. In order to effect this objective and address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, the following strategies should be implemented:

- a) Support research in strategic areas of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use
- b) Build capacity for information management and exchange in taxonomy
- c) Strengthen the role of local communities in biodiversity conservation and management

The strategies and action plan for this objective will be as follows:

Strategic Objective 2: To facilitate and build capacity for research, knowledge and information management and exchange on biodiversity								
2.1	National target: By 2020, knowledge, research and science base relating to biodiversity has been significantly improved, and relevant technologies have been improved, shared and applied				Corresponding Aichi targets: 19			
Key Outcome Indicator: Trends in investment and partnerships in biodiversity-related research, technology and infrastructure in place								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Support research in strategic areas of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use	Support research, knowledge and information	2.1.1 Support innovative research, science and technology in the management of biodiversity with particular focus on value addition, product development and innovation	Research on value addition of natural products including medicinal plants is presently limited	Industrial development and commercialization of innovations and new biodiversity-based products	UNCST	EPB NEMA Makerere University	300,000
			2.1.2 Support Product testing and quality assurance and standards development	Product testing and quality assurance e.g. for herbal medicine is still lacking	Standards developed for new biodiversity – based products	NBS	UEPB NEMA UNCST	150,000
			2.1.3 Undertake taxonomic research to improve knowledge of little known taxa (especially those which may have commercial value)	Our knowledge of little known taxa such as lower plants and fungi and their potential value still limited	Number of research initiatives on underutilized taxa undertaken	NEMA	UNCST Makerere University	200,000
			2.1.4 Develop sector research priorities in biodiversity	Presently there is no systematic prioritization of	National biodiversity research agenda (guideline) in place	NEMA	UNCST UWA NFA	90,000

			biodiversity research agenda in the relevant sectors	Number of functional biodiversity research Institutions with identified priority research areas in biodiversity			
		2.1.5 Promote research and bioprospecting on PGR, including medicinal plants	Research on bioprospecting on PGR is presently limited	Number of Discoveries of valuable natural products Number of innovations/patents made	UNCST	NEMA Makerere University	200,000
		2.1.6 Enhance national capacity in information management and research which supports biodiversity conservation	National capacity in specialized areas such as taxonomy, information management, biodiversity valuation etc is inadequate	-Infrastructure in biodiversity in place -Human resource in place	UNCST	NEMA Makerere University	120,000
		2.1.7 Ensure that Uganda benefits from international cooperation and opportunities for information exchange and support in the field of biodiversity at the regional and international levels	Level of international cooperation in biodiversity support and management is still low	-Number of research grants received -Number of programmes funded -Level of funding and information exchange on biodiversity achieved	NEMA	UWA NFA CCU MTWA MWE	100,000

2.2	National target: By 2020, basic taxonomic information is packaged in user-friendly formats and widely disseminated, including use of school systems				Corresponding Aichi target: 19			
Key Outcome Indicators: - Taxonomic information in appropriate formats deposited in Uganda's Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) - Taxonomic data and information used to guide decision making								
	Strategy	Action plan	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Build capacity for information management and exchange in taxonomy	Integrate taxonomic information in decision making	Conduct awareness raising on the role of taxonomy in biodiversity conservation in public and private institutions	Role of taxonomy not well articulated in many relevant institutions	Role of taxonomy in biodiversity conservation well understood in relevant institutions	NEMA	NEMA Makerere University UNCST NARO	100,000
			2.2.2 Create awareness of the need for application of taxonomic information in many production sectors of the country such as agriculture, trade, health, development and regulatory agencies as well as local communities	Very little taxonomic information is used by the production sectors	Number of production sectors beginning to use taxonomic information	NEMA	NEMA Makerere University UNCST NARO	80,000
			2.2.3 Support institutions with taxonomic data and information (through funding, increased personnel or better infrastructure) to make this information easily available to end -users	Presently institutions with taxonomic data are reluctant to share data and information with other institutions	Mechanisms for taxonomic data acquisition and sharing are in place and being used	NEMA	NEMA Makerere University UNCST NARO	150,000
			2.2.4 Develop taxonomic knowledge bases of	Simple taxonomic knowledge bases	Several identification kits prepared and	NEMA	NEMA Makerere	80,000

			biodiversity in formats that are accessible to end users (in form of identification kits/keys - such as popular bird books, fact sheets etc)	are not widely available	available for distribution		University UNCST NARO	
			2.2.5 Improve taxonomic infrastructure and tools to provide adequate taxonomic information	Taxonomic infrastructure and tools in relevant institutions are inadequate	Improved taxonomic infrastructure and tools in place in relevant institutions	NEMA	NEMA Makerere University UNCST NARO	200,000
			2.2.6 Encourage Lead Institutions in Taxonomy in Uganda (such as Makerere University Herbarium and Zoological Museum) to establish Centers of Taxonomic excellence using the Global Taxonomy fund	No designated center of excellence in taxonomy has been identified using the Global Taxonomy Fund	A center of excellence for taxonomy established using the Global Taxonomy Fund	NEMA	Makerere University UNCST NARO	200,000
			2.2.7 Undertake human resource capacity development in taxonomy at all levels and retain taxonomists with job descriptions in their institutions	There are few qualified human resource in taxonomy	Increased number of taxonomists in the country	NEMA	Makerere University UNCST NARO	300,000
			2.2.8 Provide incentives to graduates with taxonomic backgrounds to retain them e.g. prioritizing taxonomy in Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)	There are very few job opportunities for taxonomist in the country	Well documented incentives for taxonomists available	NEMA	Makerere University UNCST NARO	90,000

2.3	National target: By 2017, traditional knowledge and practices of local communities integrated into biodiversity conservation and sustainable use at all levels				Aichi target: 18			
Key Outcome Indicators: 1. System(s) in place to document traditional knowledge as a basis for research and development of commercial biodiversity products 2. Trends in which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through their full integration, safeguards and the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the implementation of the NBSAP								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Strengthen the role of local communities in biodiversity conservation and management	Integrate traditional knowledge and practices in biodiversity management	2.3.1 Promote the role of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices in the management and use of biodiversity	Indigenous knowledge and practices for biodiversity conservation and use is generally ignored	Indigenous knowledge and practices are being widely applied in biodiversity conservation	NEMA	UNCST UWA NFA	150,000
			2.3.2 Document traditional knowledge and practices that promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity e.g. in herbal medicine	There are limited numbers of traditional knowledge and practices that have been formally documented	Number of groups and communities whose IK and TK, respectively, have been integrated during NBSAP implementation	NEMA	UNCST NCRI Districts MDAs Academia	90,000
			2.3.3 Develop Community Action Plans for biodiversity conservation in strategic areas	Community based Action plans are generally lacking in many strategic	Number of sector-based Community Action Plans for biodiversity conservation	NEMA	Districts MDAs	300,000

				areas				
			2.3.4 Develop access and benefit sharing arrangements with indigenous and local communities	Not many viable access and benefit sharing arrangements involving indigenous and local communities are in place	. Number of access and benefit sharing arrangements with indigenous and local communities	NEMA	CHM	150,000

6.3.3 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: To reduce and manage negative impacts while enhancing positive impacts on biodiversity

The main causes of biodiversity loss in Uganda may be summarized as habitat destruction and conversion, introduction of invasive alien species (IAS), pollution, impacts of climate change, oil and gas exploration, unsustainable land management practices, human wildlife conflict, illegal trade in plants, animals or their derived parts. It is planned in NBSAP2 to address these threats through various strategies including the following:

- a) Improve management effectiveness of Protected Areas
- b) Improve and support management of fragile and degraded ecosystems outside PAs
- c) Put in place measures for protection of threatened and vulnerable species
- d) Improve management of agricultural practices, forests and aquaculture for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use
- e) Monitor and support management of pollution and waste in vulnerable ecosystems
- f) Put in place eradication and control measures for alien invasive species
- g) Introduce appropriate incentives for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity

The strategies and action plan for this objective will be as follows:

Strategic Objective 3: To reduce and manage negative impacts while enhancing positive impacts on biodiversity

3.1	National target: By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water ecosystems in Uganda are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas for socio-economic benefit of the population				Corresponding Aichi target: 11			
<p>Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Management Effectiveness of most protected areas in Uganda in place</p> <p>2. Trends in the delivery of ecosystem services and equitable benefits from protected areas</p> <p>3. Trends in coverage of protected areas</p> <p>4. Trends in the connectivity of protected areas</p>								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Improve management effectiveness of Protected Areas	Effectively manage protected areas in Uganda	3.1.1 Develop and implement management PA plans	Presently few PAs especially CFRs are effectively managed	Number of PA management developed and implemented	UWA & NFA	NEMA MDAs Academia Districts	300,000
			3.1.2 Promote protected areas as core drivers for nature-based tourism development for the local economy	Few PAs especially CFRs have adequate tourism development contributing to the local economy	-Number of visitors to protected areas -Tourism revenue generated from protected areas -Tourism related infrastructure in place	UWA NFA	NEMA Districts MTWA MWE	500,000
			3.1.3 Establish viable game corridors	Many PAs lack connectivity which is important for gene dispersal	number of game corridor established	UWA	Districts NFA MTWA NEMA	200,000
			3.1.4 Support alternative livelihood options for community adjacent to PAs	There is massive encroachment especially for agriculture in PAs	number of community livelihood improvement initiatives in place	UWA NFA	MoFPED Districts	800,000

					Revenue shared with communities			
			3.1.5 Identify and fill gaps in the PA networks to conserve ecologically sensitive vegetation types, habitats, species and genetic diversity	There quite a number of PAs with conservation concerns that need to be addressed	Number of PA networks with well-protected ecosystems, species and genetic resources	UWA NFA	NEMA MDAs Districts	500,000
			3.1.6 Mitigate human wildlife conflicts	There are PAs with alarming human wildlife conflicts	-Number of incidences of human wildlife conflicts in previously vulnerable areas -Number of human wildlife mitigation initiatives in place	UWA	MTWA Districts NFA	150,000
			3.1.7 Strengthen partnerships with communities neighbouring protected forest areas for mutual benefits (Supporting REDD+)	Such partnerships are weak or non-existent with communities adjacent to Central Forest Reserves (CFM)	Conservation of forest carbon stocks	NFA	CCU NEMA Districts UWA FSSD	150,000

3.2	National target: By 2020,ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15%of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification				Corresponding Aichi target: 15			
Key Outcome Indicators: 1. Status and trends in extent and condition of habitats that provide carbon storage 2. Trends in coverage and effectiveness of protected areas								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Implement climate change mitigation and adaptation for biodiversity conservation including disaster risk reduction from climate change impacts	Enhance ecosystem resilience to climate change	3.2.1 Increase timber stocks countrywide to reduce pressure on current stocks, especially in natural forests	Rampant forest destruction is being promoted due to inadequate timber resources	-Reduced emissions from deforestation -Reduced emissions from forest degradation -Conservation of forest carbon stocks -Sustainable management of forests -Enhancement of forest carbon stocks	NFA	FSSD Districts NEMA UWA CCC	500,000
			3.2.2 Develop procedures and capacities for ensuring equitable and transparent implementation of REDD+ in partnership with CSOs	Close collaboration between government institutions and CSOs is weak with respect to REDD+ implementation	-Conservation of forest carbon stocks -Enhancement of forest carbon stocks	FSSD	FSSD NEMA CCU	120,000
			3.2.3 Enhance carbon stocks and storage by mainstreaming climate	There is limited mainstreaming of REDD+ in sector plans	Number of sector policies and plans that have mainstreamed	FSSD	NFA CCU NEMA	100,000

			change into the REDD+ strategy as well as in sector policies, plans and projects	and policies with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem protection	climate change			
			3.2.4 Support afforestation, tree planting and re-forestation activities at all levels	-This is on-going on some parts of the country -About 90,000 ha of forest are lost annually, 3,769,235 ha have been lost by 2014 since 1990, and only 3% of this restored since 1990.	Acreage afforested	FSSD NFA	NEMA Districts CCU	400,000
			3.2.5 Promote and support rehabilitation of degraded wetlands	This is on-going on some parts of the country	Wetland areas restored	WMD	Districts NEMA	200,000
			3.2.6 Enhance biodiversity and ecosystems' resilience to climate change especially in biodiversity hotspots	Policy makers, technocrats and local communities find it difficult linking climate change impacts to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem resilience	Number of Policy makers, technocrats and local communities appreciate the linkage between biodiversity conservation and climate change	NEMA	CCU UWA NFA WMD	400,000
			3.2.7 Establish buffer zones for protection of critical conservation areas with high biodiversity within PAs	Some buffer zones impacted negatively by climate change might require adjustments	-Number of protected areas with buffers -Area under Buffers	UWA NFA	UWA NFA DLG	400,000
			3.2.8 Monitor and control bush burning in fire prone areas	Uncontrolled fires is common in many biodiversity rich areas	-Number of fire control mechanisms put in place -Trends in acreage	Districts	NEMA UWA NFA	300,000

					affected by fires			
			3.2.9 Collect and store diverse gene pools as a basis of genetic adaptation to climate change	Drought resistant plant varieties are not yet adequately collected and stored for distribution to farmers	Number of accessions of drought resistant crop varieties in adequate quantities in gene banks	NARO	UWA NFA NEMA Districts IPLCs	200,000

3.3 National target: By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of vulnerable species, has been improved and sustained		Corresponding Aichi target: 12						
Key Outcome Indicators: 1. Trends in abundance of selected species								
Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$	
Put in place measures for protection of threatened and vulnerable species	Prevent extinction of threaten species	3.3.1 Manage all threatened, endemic and vulnerable species so that they are protected to contribute to the socio-economic development of Uganda	There are a number of anthropogenic factors which are threatening species survival in various ecosystems	Reduction in the number nationally extinct, threatened and vulnerable species Number of Species Management Plans under implementation Number of previously extinct species re-introduced	UWA NEMA NFA	Districts Academia	400,000	
		3.3.2 Support ex-situ conservation of plant and animal resources with specific programmes	Inadequate conservation measures for plant and wildlife conservation ex-situ	Number of functional ex situ institutions	NARO	UWEC MAAIF	400,000	
		3.3.3 Put in place measures to curb illegal activities such as charcoal burning and over-exploitation of plant resources	Illegal trade in wildlife is increasing	Number of strategies developed and implemented	UWA NEMA	NFA FSSD MTWA Districts	300,000	
		3.3.4 Effectively combat poaching and illegal	Poaching and illegal trade in wildlife is still	-Deterrent laws in place	UWA	Districts NFA	300,000	

			wildlife trade and trafficking through strengthening law enforcement	rampant in Uganda	-Number of points of entry and exit controlled -Number of cases reported and successfully prosecuted -Number of well trained, motivated, equipped and coordinated law enforcement personnel			
			3.3.5 Strengthen the capacity of CITES Management Authority in the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Heritage and CITES Competent Authority in Uganda Wildlife Authority	Capacities of CITES Management Authority and CITES Competent Authority are presently inadequate	-Number of cases reported and successfully prosecuted -Number of trophies confiscated at border points	MTWA	UWA NFA FSSD NEMA	150,000
			3.3.6 Strengthen PA institutional capacity and coordination for effective monitoring of wildlife	UWA has inadequate capacity for effective monitoring of wildlife	Availability of up to date data on wildlife species trends	MTWA	UWA NFA NEMA	100,000

3.4	National target: By 2020, The genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed animals including their wild relatives and other socio-economically valuable species conserved and strategies developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity				Corresponding Aichi target 13			
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Collection of at least 20% of the genetic diversity of important crops and animals in Uganda together with their wild relatives undertaken and conserved after estimating their baseline 2. Trends in genetic diversity of selected species								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Put in place measures for protection of genetic diversity cultivated plants and domesticated animals	Minimize loss of genetic diversity of cultivated plants and domesticated animals	3.4.1 Collect information on availability of plant and animal germplasm	Information on availability of PGR germplasm presently inadequate	Information on germplasm documented	NARO	UWA NFA FSSD Makerere University NEMA	100,000
			3.4.2 Support national repositories for plant and animal genetic resources	The repositories are not well facilitated	Fully functional national repositories for plant and animal genetic resources	NEMA	Makerere University, MAAIF UWEC NARO	250,000
			3.4.3 Identify, Collect and conserve traditional species and varieties	Species and varieties ex-situ conservation presently inadequate	Important species and varieties are adequately conserved	NARO	MAAIF UWEC NFA UWA Makerere University NEMA Districts	200,000

			3.4.4 Reintroduce germplasm of species extinct in the country	A number of Ugandan germplasm are held outside the country	Number of germplasm reintroduced	NARO	MAAIF, UWEC NFA UWA NEMA	300,000
			3.4.5 Strengthen human and infrastructural capacity for genetic resources conservation and management	Presently there is inadequate capacity for PGR	Genetic resources conservation and management is effective	NEMA	NARO PGRC UWA NFA NEMA	350,000

3.5	National target: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced				Corresponding Aichi targets: 5, 14			
	Key Outcome Indicator:							
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restoration programmes for critical fragile and degraded/threatened ecosystems in place 2. Trends in benefits that humans derive from selected ecosystem services e.g. medicinal plants 3. Trends in proportion of degraded/threatened habitats 4. Trends in economic values of selected ecosystem services 5. Trends in proportion of land affected by desertification 							
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Put in measures to stop further loss of natural habitats	Restore degraded natural habitats	3.5.1 Identify, map and prioritize degraded habitats including forests and wetlands	Information on mapping is incomplete	Trends in extent of selected ecosystems and habitats	NEMA	UWA NFA WMD Makerere University	200,000
			3.5.2 Calculate the rate of conversion of the degraded/threatened habitats by human activities such as agricultural expansion and encroachment	Some information is available but incomplete	Trends in the proportion of natural habitats converted	NEMA	UWA NFA WMD Makerere University	150,000
			3.5.3 Estimate the productivity of the degraded/threatened habitats	Some information is available but incomplete	Trends in primary productivity	NEMA	UWA NFA WMD Makerere University	400,000
			3.5.4 Estimate the proportion of land affected by desertification	Some information is available but incomplete	Trends in the proportion of land affected by desertification	NEMA	UWA NFA WMD Makerere	150,000

						University	
		3.5.5 Promote awareness on regulations that protect fragile ecosystems	Lack of awareness of the general population about regulations which protect fragile ecosystems	Increased awareness of laws and regulations regarding the protection of fragile ecosystems	NEMA	NFA WMD NEMA districts	300,000
		3.5.6 Sensitize policy makers to support actions to reverse the rate of habitat loss	Policy makers are more interested in political gains than ecosystem protection	Trends in proportion of degraded/threatened habitats	NEMA	UWA NFA WMD NEMA Districts	200,000
		3.5.7 Put in place species recovery plans for the degraded/threatened habitats	Some information is available but incomplete	Extinction risk trends of habitat dependent species	NEMA	UWA NFA WMD Districts FSSD	250,000
		3.5.8 Restore and safeguard ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being	Inadequate protection of ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being	Vulnerable areas restored and protected	NEMA	NFA WMD FSSD UWA Districts	500,000
		3.5.9 Develop mechanisms for sharing costs and benefits of using wetlands	No mechanisms exist for sharing the costs and benefits of wetlands	Number of cost and benefit sharing mechanisms implemented	NEMA	NFA WMD FSSD UWA Districts	400,000

3.6	National target: By 2020, management plans are in place for areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry to ensure sustainable biodiversity conservation				Corresponding Aichi target: 7			
Key Outcome Indicator: Trends in area and productivity of agricultural land, forests under sustainable management								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Improve management of agricultural practices, and forests for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use	Sustainably manage areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry	3.6.1 Promote agricultural practices which minimize the negative impacts of agricultural production on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning	There are a number of agricultural practices which threaten biodiversity e.g. rice cultivation and large scale commercial farming	Measures put in place to ensure a win-win situation for agricultural production and biodiversity conservation	NARO	NAADS MAAIF NEMA DFS DLG	200,000
			3.6.2 Promote agro-forestry practices (supporting REDD)	Agro-forestry practices still confined to certain regions of Uganda	Significant increase in area and distribution of agro-forestry practices in the country	NARO	NAADS MAAIF NEMA Districts	400,000
			3.6.3 Support sustainable land management (SLM) practices that conserve agro-biodiversity	SLM practices still confined to certain regions of Uganda	Significant increase in area and distribution of SLM practices in the country	NARO	NAADS MAAIF Districts	200,000
			3.6.4 Promote sustainable management practices to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in forests	Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in forests still face a number of challenges	Mechanisms put in place to protect biodiversity in forests	NFA FSSD	NEMA Districts	300,000
			3.6.5 Support local communities to diversify	Over-harvesting of resources is rampant in	Livelihoods initiatives put in place	LG	UWA NFA	400,000

			their livelihoods through biodiversity friendly enterprises which ease pressure on the resource base	key ecosystems such as forests	More protection of biodiversity by local communities		FSSD NEMA LG	
			3.6.6 Implement forest management planning that zones and projects timber production to meet demand whilst restocking for future needs (supporting REDD+)	Over-harvesting of resources is rampant in key ecosystems such as forests	-Reduced emissions from deforestation - Reduced emissions from forest degradation -Conservation of forest carbon stocks	NFA FSSD	NFA FSSD	200,000
			3.6.7 Improve forest timber harvesting and utilization technologies (supporting REDD+)	Over-harvesting of resources is rampant in key ecosystems such as forests	-Reduced emissions from deforestation - Reduced emissions from forest degradation -Conservation of forest carbon stocks	NFA FSSD	NFA FSSD	200,000

3.7	National target: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity				Corresponding Aichi target: 8			
Key Outcome Indicators: 1. Pollution standards in place and enforced 2. Pollution levels due to various anthropogenic practices such agriculture, waste water, oil and gas development activities are compliant with national and international standards 3. Trends in water quality in aquatic ecosystems 4. Trends in sediment transfer rates 5. Trends in proportion of wastewater discharged after treatment								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	institutions	Costs in US\$
	Monitor and support management of pollution levels and waste in vulnerable ecosystems	Reduce pollution levels that are detrimental to biodiversity	3.7.1 Monitor and manage levels of pollution through a range of effective and appropriate measures	Management of pollution is still confined to very few vulnerable ecosystems e.g. Lake Victoria	Trend in pollution levels Management Enhanced capacity (infrastructure, human resources and financial) to detect and manage pollution in place	WQMD	NaFIRRI Fisheries Department Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization NEMA Districts	300,000
			3.7.2 Monitor the impact of agrochemicals on selected pollinators	Not much data is available in the country regarding the impact of agrochemicals on pollinators which are important for agricultural production	More data is available on the impact of agrochemicals on pollinators	NARO	NEMA MUK (Faculty of Agriculture & EPRC Research Institutions)	100,000
			3.7.3 Manage all forms of waste in an effective and efficient manner to	Emerging waste productions such as e-waste and from oil and	Effective and efficient options for managing all forms of waste are	NEMA	LG MoH	300,000

			reduce its negative impact on the environment	gas are not yet being adequately managed	under implementation			
--	--	--	---	--	----------------------	--	--	--

3.8	National target: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment				Corresponding Aichi target: 9			
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Management Plans in place to control most threatening invasive alien species 2. Trends in the economic impacts of selected invasive alien species 3. Trends in number of invasive alien species 4. Trends in incidence of wildlife diseases caused by invasive alien species								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Put in place eradication and control measures for alien invasive species	Control IAS that have adverse impacts on biodiversity and human health	3.8.1 Develop mechanisms and measures to prevent the establishment and introduction of alien invasive species	Alien invasive species are seriously affecting biodiversity in agricultural landscapes, aquatic ecosystems etc	-National guidelines on invasive species in place -Adequate measures to contain alien invasive species in vulnerable ecosystems are in place -An inventory of alien invasive species	NARO NEMA	NARO NFA MAAIF NEMA	600,000
			3.8.2 Implement/enhance eradication or control measures for existing alien invasive species	Bottlenecks such as adequate monitoring of seeds at Uganda's border control points still inadequate	-Capacity (personnel, equipment and human resource) built for monitoring alien invasive species -Trends in alien invasive species	NARO NEMA	NARO NFA MAAIF NEMA Customs Department	700,000

3.9 National target: By 2020, the impacts of fisheries activities on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits		Corresponding Aichi target: 6						
Key Outcome Indicators: 1. trends in catch per unit effort								
2. Trends in area, frequency, or intensity of destructive fishing practices								
Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Data sources Partner institutions	Costs in US\$	
Sustainable manage fisheries resources	Put in place measures to control illegal fishing and over exploitation	3.9.1 Put in place effective control measures to manage fishing and alien fish species such as the Nile Perch	No control measures are in place to protect other fish species	-Trends in fish catch -Measures put in place to control alien fish species	Fisheries Resources Department	NaFIRRI NEMA Districts	400,000	
		3.9.2 Put in place control measures for the Water Hyacinth	Water Hyacinth is still abundant in some open waters such as lakes	Surface area under Water Hyacinth	NARO	MAAIF NEMA Districts	800,000	
		3.9.3 Promote sustainable aquaculture for socio-economic development	Number of farmers engaged in aquaculture is low compared to its potential	Trends in farmers engaged in aquaculture Trends in catch	Fisheries Resources Department	NaFIRRI NEMA Districts	600,000	
		3.9.4 Undertake SEA/EIA on policies, programmes or projects that are likely to have significantly negative impacts on aquatic biodiversity	Some key projects and programmes have not been subjected to EIA	All key projects and programmes are subjected to SEA/EIA	NEMA	NARO NAFIRRI Districts	200,000	
		3.9.5 Develop and or implement appropriate mitigation measures	Habitat degradation of open water resources is rampant	Number of mitigation Measures put in place to restore degraded	Fisheries Resources Department	NAFIRRI Districts	300,000	

			against habitat degradation of open water resources		open water habitats			
			3.9.6 Promote private sector investment and participation in aquatic biodiversity conservation	Presently the interest of private sector is more towards commercial fishing operations	Trends in private sector investment in aquatic biodiversity conservation	Fisheries Resources Department	NaFIRRI Districts NEMA	400,000
			3.9.7 Support transboundary management of fisheries resources	Transboundary management of fisheries resources is still inadequate	-Harmonized fisheries legislations and management practices -Transboundary fisheries management initiatives in place	Fisheries Resources Department	MAAIF DLG Na FIRRI NEMA	400,000

3.10	National target: By 2020, all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species				Corresponding Aichi target: 6			
Key Outcome Indicators: - Trends in fish stocks - Trends in fish species abundance and diversity - Trends in fish catch rates (Catch per Unit Effort) - Trends in the use of destructive fishing methods and gears								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Promote sustainable harvesting of fish and invertebrate stocks	Put in measures to sustainable harvesting of fish and invertebrates	3.10.1 Strengthen community and resource use groups participation in fisheries management	There is still inadequate participation of local communities in fisheries management	Number of Communities in landing sites actively participating in fisheries management	Fisheries Resource Department	NEMA NARO NAFIRRI districts	500,000
			3.10.2 Regulate and Control importation and usage of fishing gears	There is still rampant use of illegal fishing gears in lakes and rivers	-Number of reported and successfully prosecuted cases -Trends in fish population structure	Fisheries Resource Department	NEMA NARO NAFIRRI districts	150,000
			3.10.3 Strengthen monitoring, control and surveillance fishing activities	There is inadequate monitoring of fishing activities in the major lakes	-Number of reported and successfully prosecuted cases -Trends in fish population structure	Fisheries Resource Department	NEMA NARO NAFIRRI districts	500,000
			3.10.4 Develop and implement community fisheries management plans	Community management plans are lacking in most landing sites	Number of community fisheries management plans	Fisheries Resource Department	NEMA NARO NAFIRRI districts	400,000
			3.10.5 Provide adequate support to Beach	Managers of Beach Management Units	Number of BMUs supported	Fisheries Resource	NAFIRRI districts	300,000

			Management Units (BMU)	lack resources to efficiently perform their duties		Department		
--	--	--	---------------------------	--	--	------------	--	--

6.3.4 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4: To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity

This objective advocates for benefits of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use to flow back to the people whose livelihoods are affected, and who are often the real stewards of a natural resource. Local people can benefit financially or from training, employment, provision of infrastructure and equipment arising from development activities or projects on biodiversity conservation. Both costs as well as benefits from biodiversity conservation must be shared otherwise many stakeholders may not see any reason to support new approaches to biodiversity management in their areas.

Access and benefit sharing (ABS) is considered a key instrument to ensure that communities benefit from the commercialization and use of their natural resources. Institutional structures; increased funding and mechanisms for research and development; and increased awareness are all necessary so that the potential of ABS can be harnessed. These are elaborated in the strategies and action plans outlined below:

Strategic Objective 4: To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity								
4.1	National target: By 2020, appropriate incentives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use are in place and applied					Aichi target: 3		
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Trends in economic instruments in use supporting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity 2. Trends in the number and value of incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity, removed, reformed or phased out								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Data sources Partner institutionsa	Costs in US\$
	Introduce appropriate incentives for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity	Phase out incentives harmful to biodiversity	4.1.1 Develop economic instruments to encourage activities that enhance biodiversity conservation but discourages activities that impact negatively on biodiversity	Economic instruments are still inadequately being used to manage biodiversity in Uganda	Effective instruments to manage biodiversity are under implementation	NEMA	MFPED NEMA EPRC	150,000
			4.1.2 Introduce environmental taxes and levies and market-based instruments	Environmental taxes and market based instruments are still inadequately being used to manage biodiversity in Uganda	Effective taxes and other instruments to manage biodiversity are under implementation	MFPED	NEMA EPRC	300,000
			4.1.3 Promote and support Green Procurement through purchasing of environmentally preferable products or services, taking into consideration the necessity, not only for	Green procurement is still a relatively new concept in Uganda for protecting biodiversity and	Green procurement is being widely used to protect biodiversity and its sustainable use	NEMA	PPDA MFPED	250,000

			quality and price, but also for biodiversity conservation-conscious business	its sustainable use				
			4.1.4 Undertake Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) of policies, programmes or projects which are likely to have significantly negative impacts on biodiversity	Some policies, programmes and projects have not been subjected to EIAs	Almost all policies, programmes and projects likely to have significant negative impacts on biodiversity should undergo EIAs	NEMA	MDAs Districts	150,000

4.2	National target: By 2020 at least 2 partnerships established to ensure that wild harvested plant-based products are sourced sustainably					Aichi target: 13		
Key Outcome Indicator: Partnerships with the private sector developed								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Data sources Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Promote Public Private Partnership (PPP) for sustainable use of biodiversity	Establish PPP	4.2.1 Promote public and private sector partnership (PPP) to collect, harvest and process plant based products for commercialization	Private companies currently collect and process some plant based products in isolation of important public institutions	Evidence of collaborative ventures between the private sector and public institutions	UNCST	UNCST	400,000
			4.2.2 Support value addition on plant based products for commercialization	Very limited processing of plant based products such as medicinal plants is undertaken particularly with local communities	Private sector and local communities engaged in processing for value addition on plant based products	UNCST	UNCST	600,000
4.3	National target: By 2016, a well established framework for implementing the Multilateral System of accessing and sharing of benefits arising from access to PGR and use in place					Aichi target 13		
Key Outcome Indicators: - A framework in place for sharing the benefits from access to PGR in the country - Documents prepared on indigenous knowledge on PGR for food, agriculture and medicine - Several community based PGR management initiatives in place								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$

						(target champion)		
	Promote synergies in the implementation of ITPGRFA, CBD and the Nagoya Protocol on ABS		4.3.1 Put in place mechanisms for sharing the benefits from access to PGR in the country	Presently there are no clear mechanism for sharing benefits from access to PGR	Effective and documented mechanisms for sharing benefits from access to PGR put in place and are being implemented	NARO	UNCST NEMA Districts	200,000
			4.3.2 Document indigenous knowledge, innovations and practices in PGR	There is limited documentation of indigenous knowledge, innovations and practices in PGR	-Detailed documentation of indigenous - Knowledge, innovations and practices in PGR available	NARO	UNCST NEMA NCRI Districts	150,000
			4.3.3 Distribute documents on the indigenous knowledge to be used for planning for food security and health care (medicinal plants)	Documents not distributed	Documents on indigenous knowledge distributed to relevant stakeholders	NARO	UNCST NEMA NCRI Districts	120,000
			4.3.4 Initiate and support community based PGR management initiatives in various parts of the country	PGR management initiatives are absent up-country	Some PGR management activities initiated in some parts of the country	NARO	UNCST NEMA NCRI Districts	350,000

4.4	National target: By 2016, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation						Aichi target 16	
Key Outcome Indicators: Improved regulatory framework for ABS in Uganda, with involvement of local and indigenous communities								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Domesticate the Nagoya Protocol on ABS	Enforce the Nagoya Protocol on ABS	Accede to the Nagoya Protocol on ABS	Accession to the Nagoya Protocol on ABS by 2015	Instrument of accession	NEMA	MWE Ministry of Justice UNCST	30,000
			4.4.1 Review the ABS Regulations and incorporate relevant elements of the Nagoya Protocol	ABS Regulations have not been reviewed since 2005	ABS Regulations reviewed incorporating elements of the Nagoya Protocol	NEMA	UNCST MDAs districts	60,000
			4.4.2 Submit the revised ABS Regulations to Cabinet for approval	ABS Regulations have not been revised	Revised ABS Regulations submitted to Cabinet for approval	NEMA	UNCST	10,000
			4.4.3 Promote and regulate bioprospecting and biotrade activities for the benefit of the population	Biotrade activities are presently not regulated	Both bioprospecting and biotrade are regulated for the benefit of the population	UNCST	UEPB NEMA MDAs districts	300,000
			4.4.4 Support the Establishment of a functional Intellectual Property (IP) regime on ABS	No functional IP regime specific to genetic resources	Joint ownership of patents and other IP rights reserved	UNCST	NEMA MDAs districts	150,000

6.3.5 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5: To enhance awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders

The review process of NBSAP1 revealed low levels of awareness of the NBSAP document itself as well as low levels of understanding of the term biodiversity. Very few implementing partners and the general public at large had ever seen or heard of NBSAP1. This was a serious impediment to the implementation of NBSAP1. For this reason a comprehensive and targeted communication, education and public awareness (CEPA)/Information, Education and Communication (IEC) strategy should be one of the key priorities of NBSAP2, both to raise awareness of NBSAP2 itself and for better understanding of the importance of biodiversity generally.

The ultimate goal of the CEPA/IEC Strategy will be to achieve a positive change in the behavior of stakeholders towards biodiversity, based on effectively demonstrating its value and importance to the Ugandan society. The CEPA/IEC strategy will also seek to ensure that economic, ecological and social benefits from the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are known, understood and emphasized.

The CEPA/IEC strategy will focus on three key strategic themes as shown in the action plan below, each with corresponding strategic aims:

Awareness/Information

- a) Develop and implement stakeholder awareness education programmes on biodiversity and its values
- b) Promote and facilitate development of stakeholder awareness and education materials on biodiversity
- c) Promote awareness and education of NBSAP2 to stakeholders

Education

- a) Develop and implement educational programs on biodiversity issues relevant to Uganda
- b) Mainstream biodiversity into school curricula at all levels

International Cooperation and networking

- a) Strengthen and enhance collaboration, linkages and networking among stakeholders involved in biodiversity and environment-related issues including other Conventions
- b) Participate in regional and international cooperation programs and activities on biological diversity
- c) Mobilise support and financial resources for biodiversity conservation programs at international level

Strategic Objective 5: To enhance public awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders								
5.1	National target: By 2018, at the latest, people are aware of the meaning and values of biodiversity conservation and the steps they can take to use it sustainably				Aichi targets: 1			
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Trends in behavioral change particularly among decision makers and the general public towards biodiversity conservation and sustainable use								
2. Trends in communication programmes and actions promoting social corporate responsibility								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Promote awareness of NBSAP2 among key stakeholders Policy makers, professionals, private sector, general public	Conduct public awareness on biodiversity	5.1.1 Undertake intensive awareness raising on the content of NBSAP2 at all levels	Not yet done	A reasonable percentage of stakeholders at all levels are aware of NBSAP and its value (after estimating the baseline of where we are now)	NEMA	MDAs Districts	100,000
	Develop stakeholder /public awareness programmes on biodiversity and its values		5.1.2 Sensitize local communities on what biodiversity conservation is and how they can benefit from biodiversity through radio, community gatherings and local government structures	Not yet done	A reasonable % of local communities in defined areas aware of what biodiversity conservation means and how they can benefit (after estimating the baseline of where we are now)	NEMA	MDAs Districts	240,000
			5.1.3 Develop	Not yet	Regular surveys	NEMA	MDAs	300,000

			and produce biodiversity public awareness/IEC materials such as posters, flyers, brochures; and carry out campaigns across all media i.e on radio, TV, print and produce materials by 2016	done	Attitude and behavioural change among communities Increased participation in biodiversity conservation		Districts	
5.2	National target: By 2020 at the latest, students and teaching staff are aware of the value of biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use				Aichi targets: 1			
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Positive attitude and behavioral change among students and teachers in educational institutions 2. Biodiversity integrated into the National School Curriculum								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Develop and implement educational programs on biodiversity issues relevant to Uganda	Integrate biodiversity in national curriculum	5.2.1 Develop and implement educational programs on biodiversity issues relevant to Uganda	Has been done to a limited extent	Biodiversity incorporated in school curricula at various levels	NEMA	MOE MDAs Districts	200,000
		5.2.2	Strengthen and establish environmental clubs or	Has been done to a limited extent	Biodiversity incorporated in environmental activities in	NEMA	MDAs Districts	200,000

			societies that include biodiversity activities, or mainstream biodiversity in relevant existing educational institutions clubs; regional and national competitions		educational institutions at all levels			
			5.2.3 Develop and produce educational materials on biodiversity such as posters, charts fact sheets, pictures, social media, TV and Radio programmes, Newspaper pull-outs such as Straight Talk, Tree Talk, magazines	Has been done to some extent	A variety of educational materials developed, produced, accessed, used, and appreciated	NEMA	MOE MDAs Districts	200,000
5.3	National target: By 2020, international cooperation and networking is effective enough to enhance communication of the value of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use			Corresponding Aichi target: 1				

Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Adequate and active participation in regional and global fora by Ugandans								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Support participation in regional and international cooperation programs on biological diversity	Represent Uganda at regional and global for a on biodiversity	5.3.1 Seek support to enable personnel attend regional and international fora on biodiversity	On-going	-Number of participants at international conferences and workshops on biodiversity and related areas -Number of biodiversity regional and international workshops organized and held in Uganda -Number of Reports	NEMA	MDAs	180,000
	Mobilize support and financial resources at international level for biodiversity programs		5.3.2 Develop proposals for supporting biodiversity conservation programs at national level		Biodiversity programs at national level developed and implemented	NEMA	MoFPED MDAs Districts	400,000

6.3.6 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 6: To harness modern biotechnology for socio-economic development with adequate safety measures for human health and the environment

Uganda has made significant progress in biotechnology R&D compared to many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. There has been steady increase in the number of applications for research on genetically modified (GM) crops received by UNCST and reviewed and approved by the National Biosafety Committee (NBC) over the years. This trend shows a positive prospect for development and application of modern biotechnologies in the country for the years to come. Uganda is also a signatory to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and, is therefore, mandated to promote, preserve, conserve, protect and develop her biodiversity. The Cartagena Protocol has 13 key issues including capacity building, public awareness, risk assessment and risk management, socio economic aspects of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and progress of implementation at the national level. Despite the remarkable progress Uganda has made in biotechnology and Biosafety, a number of bottlenecks still prevail including the following:

- a) There is lack of capacity for implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur protocol
- b) There is presently no Biotechnology Clearing House Mechanism
- c) Limited application of biotech tools for biodiversity conservation
- d) Low public awareness and low level of participation in Biosafety and Biotechnology matters
- e) There is limited infrastructural and human capacity for biotechnology in the country
- f) There is inadequate legal environment for Biotech development and application
- g) Capacity for management of transboundary movements of GMOs is also generally limited
- h) At present, GMOs have not been officially approved beyond confined field trials, so social economic considerations have therefore not been high on the national agenda

Strategies for biotechnology and Biosafety in Uganda will include:

- a) Assess national capacities in biotechnology and Biosafety
- b) Enhance the availability and exchange of information on Biotechnology and Biosafety
- c) Establish a mechanism(s) for continuous Human and Infrastructural Resource Capacity Development, deployment and retention
- d) Develop a fully functional National Biosafety System
- e) Enhance regulatory performance of the National Biosafety Committee and the Institutional Biosafety Committees
- f) Establish a national repository for plant and animal genetic resources
- g) Promote research in medical, agricultural, environmental and other areas of biotechnology and Biosafety
- h) Update information on biotechnology and Biosafety
- i) Establish a strong and effective monitoring system for biotechnology use and application
- j) Undertake EIA or risk assessments on biotechnology policies, programmes or projects that are likely to have significantly negative impacts on human health and the environment including biodiversity
- k) Promote trade in biotechnology products
- l) Develop mechanisms for sharing costs and benefits of biotechnology
- m) Promote integration of biotechnology values into macroeconomic frameworks

- n) Support awareness and education on the benefits and risks of biotechnology and Biosafety
- o) Develop and disseminate biotechnology awareness materials

These strategies will be implemented according to the following action plan:

Strategic Objective 6: To harness modern biotechnology for socio-economic development with adequate safety measures for human health and the environment

6.1	National target: By 2018, public Awareness, Education and Participation in Biotechnology and Biosafety are enhanced				Corresponding Aichi target: 19			
Key Outcome Indicators: - Increased participation and support of biotechnology by stakeholders - Increased adoption of biotechnology for national development - Biotechnology harnessed for biodiversity conservation								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target Champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	CEPA strategy implemented for biotechnology and Biosafety	Create awareness on the benefits of modern biotechnology	6.1.1 Conduct a baseline study on level of public awareness and education on the benefits and risks of biotechnology and Biosafety	Low level of public awareness and participation in Biosafety and Biotechnology matters	Increased stakeholder involvement in biotechnology and Biosafety practices	UNCST	NARO NEMA NACRI	100,000
			6.1.2 Develop a platform for information exchange among the different Biotechnology and Biosafety stakeholders (e.g. a National Biosafety Clearing House Mechanism)	Lack of Biosafety clearing house mechanism in place	A National Biosafety Clearing House Mechanism or similar entity in place	UNCST	NARO NEMA NACRI UNBS Academia	200,000
			6.1.3 Conduct specialized trainings in Biosafety for regulators and inspectors	Limited trained Technical Personnel on biotechnology and Biosafety	Increased number of trained Technical Personnel in	UNCST	NARO NEMA NACRI UNBS Academia	200,000

					biotechnology and Biosafety			
			6.1.4 Conduct specialized biotechnology communication for media specialists	Imbalanced and low reporting on Biotechnology and Biosafety by the Media	Balanced and informed reporting by the media on Biotechnology and Biosafety.	UNCST	NARO NEMA NACRI UNBS Academia UJA	100,000
			6.1.5 Conduct trainings in Biotechnology and Biosafety for the general public	Low level of awareness on Biotechnology and Biosafety in the general Public	Increased levels of appreciation on Biotechnology and Biosafety in communities	UNCT	NARO NEMA NACRI UNBS Academia	150,000

6.2	National target: By 2018, National Capacity for Biotechnology applications and use is adequate				Corresponding Aichi target: 19 Strategic Plan for the Cartagena protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020			
	Key Outcome Indicators: - Mechanisms for continuous Human and Infrastructural Resource Capacity Development, deployment retention put in place - Biotech tools developed and optimized for biodiversity conservation							
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Support capacity building for biotechnology and Biosafety	Build capacity on the application of biotechnology	6.2.1 Assess national capacities in biotechnology and Biosafety	Capacity has not been assessed	National capacity for biotechnology and Biosafety assessed	UNCST	NEMA MAAIF MOH MTC Academia	80,000
			6.2.2 Support the development of skilled human resources for biotechnology and Biosafety	National capacity is low	A critical mass of scientists trained in Biotechnology and Biosafety	UNCST	UNCST NARO NEMA Academia MOFPED	300,000
			6.2.3 Promote infrastructural Development and Research on biotechnology and Biosafety.	Inadequate infrastructure	Accredited Biotechnology and Biosafety infrastructure developed.	UNCST	NEMA MOFPED MAAIF MOE	400,000
			6.2.4 Develop and apply biotechnology tools for identification, characterization and	Inadequate tools in place	Adequate tools developed for identification, characterization and conservation	UNCST	NEMA NARO ACADEMIA UNBS	300,000

			conservation of biodiversity		of biodiversity			
--	--	--	---------------------------------	--	-----------------	--	--	--

6.3	National target: By 2015, the National Biotechnology and Biosafety Law in place				Corresponding Aichi target: 19			
Key Outcome Indicators: - National Biotechnology and Biosafety Law in place -National Biosafety Committee effectively supported to perform its functions								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Support the passing into law of the Biotechnology and Biosafety Bill 2012	Expedite approval of the Bill	6.3.1 Undertake widespread awareness on the benefits and risks associated with biotechnology	There is limited awareness and knowledge of biotechnology	Increased appreciation of biotechnological developments	UNCST	UNCST MFPED MAAIF MOES	100,000
			6.3.2 Popularize the Biotechnology and Biosafety Policy	Limited awareness and knowledge on the Biotechnology and Biosafety policy, 2008	Increased Awareness and knowledge on Biotechnology and Biosafety policy.	UNCST	NEMA MFPED MOLG MAAIF MOES MWE	100,000
			6.3.3 Advocate for the approval of the National Biotechnology and Biosafety Bill to enable regulation of Biotechnology and Biosafety developments in the country.	The Bill has not been passed by parliament.	A Biotechnology and Biosafety law in place.	UNCST	NEMA MOJCA Parliament MOWE MAAIF Academia MOH	10,000
			6.3.4 Popularize the Biosafety and Biotechnology Policy	Many stakeholders and the general	Stakeholders and the general population	UNCST	NEMA MWE	150,000

			and Bill/Act	population understand little of the benefits of the law	develop a positive attitude towards the law			
			6.3.5 develop guidelines compliance to biosafety	No guidance on Biosafety compliance at the moment	Guidance on Biosafety compliance in place	UNCST	NEMA MDAs MWE	80,000
			6.3.6 Enhance the regulatory performance of the National Biosafety Committee (NBC) and the Institutional Biosafety Committees (IBC)	The NBC and IBCs are inadequately remunerated.	The NBC and IBCs are adequately remunerated and perform their duties diligently.	UNCST	MWE NEMA MAAIF Academia MOH	150,000
			6.3.7 Promote public-private partnerships (PPP) in biotechnology development	There are limited public-private partnerships in Biotechnology development.	Vibrant public-private partnerships in biotechnology development.	UNCST	NEMA UMA PSFU MOTC, UNFF	200,000

6.4	National target: By 2015, the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is in operation and implemented				Corresponding Aichi target: 19			
	Key Outcome Indicators: Increased compliance with national and international requirements							
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Domestic the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on liability and redress	Popularize the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Protocol on ABS	Engage high level government including parliamentarians Accede to the Supplementary Protocol	Accession to the Supplementary Protocol planned for 2015	Accession Instruments	NEMA	UNCST Ministry of Justice	20,000
		Create awareness on biosafety	6.4.1 Hold National and Local Stakeholder awareness creation campaigns on biosafety	Limited knowledge on benefits to be shared, low capacity to review prepare and negotiate material transfer agreement MTA including mutually agreed terms and prior informed consent	Increased understanding of ABS issues by the Government and communities	NEMA	UNCST UWA MLG NEMA NGOs	70,000
			6.4.2 Support tertiary Institutions to run short courses on biosafety	No tertiary Institution training on ABS	Increased capacity to support scientific	UNCST	NEMA MOES URA MOLG	200,000

					research and development in genetic resources			
			6.4.4 Support the full implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Liability and Redress	Uganda acceded to the Nagoya Protocol in June 2014	The Protocol on Liability and Redress is fully operational	UNCST	NEMA MDAs NGOs Development partners	200,000

6.5	National target: By 2020, there is widespread application and use of biotechnology and its products for national development				Corresponding Aichi target:19 Strategic Plan for the Cartagena protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020			
Key Outcome Indicator: - Biotechnology applications and use widely accepted by the Ugandan public								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Support biotechnology applications and use for National development	Carry out research on biotechnology	6.5.1 Promote management oriented research and development in medical, agricultural land industrial biotechnology.	Limited modern biotechnology research is on-going in agricultural sector mainly	Vibrant biotechnology and Biosafety research in the fields of medicine, agriculture and Industry	UNCST	NEMA MLG MWE	400,000
			6.5.2 Undertake ESIA or risk assessments on biotechnology plans, programmes and projects	The third schedule of the National Environment Act doesn't specifically state biotechnology issues	Environment and social impact studies complied with by developers in biotechnology,	NEMA	UNCST Private sector MLG MWE NGOs ,	100,000
			6.5.3 Establish a strong and effective monitoring system for biotechnology use and applications	Inadequate human, physical and financial infrastructure to effectively and efficiently monitor	A strong monitoring system in place for biotechnology use and applications	NEMA	UNCST Private sector MLG	200,000

				biotechnology use and applications.				
			6.5.4 Promote trade in biotechnology products	Trade in biotechnology products is still low	Increased trade and diversity of biotechnology products on market.	UNCST	NEMA Private sector MoLG	200,000
			6.5.5 Develop mechanisms for sharing costs and benefits of biotechnology	Mechanisms for sharing costs and benefits of biotechnology are not yet in place	Effective mechanisms in place for sharing costs and benefits of biotechnology	UNCST	NEMA Districts MDAs NGOs	200,000
			6.5.6 Promote integration of biotechnology values into macroeconomic frameworks	No socioeconomic study so far conducted in Biotechnology,	Biotechnology applications mainstreamed in National macroeconomic programmes.	UNCST	NEMA MFPED MOLG NGOs	200,000

6.3.7 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 7: To promote innovative and sustainable funding mechanisms to support NBSAP implementation

While the costs for implementing NBSAP2 have only been roughly estimated in this document, Uganda recognizes that increased resource mobilization is needed to maximize Uganda's contribution to the achievement of the CBD Strategic Plan. It is equally important that a methodology to undertake and establish baseline assessments of total investment into biodiversity conservation is put in place to monitor trends in resource mobilization.

Uganda is committed through NBSAP2 to implementing decision XI/5 of CBD COP11 in Hyderabad, India which called on governments to implement the following measures among others:

- a) Identify and seek funding support from diverse sources including regional and international donor agencies, foundations and, as appropriate, through private-sector involvement
- b) Establish strategic partnerships with other Parties and other Governments and with various organizations, regional bodies or centers of excellence with a view to pooling resources and/or widening opportunities and possibilities for mobilizing resources from various sources
- c) Identify and maximize opportunities for technical cooperation with regional and international organizations, institutions and development assistance agencies
- d) Ensure efficient use of available resources and adopt cost-effective approaches to capacity-building.

The action plan for mobilizing the resources for NBSAP activities are described below:

Strategic Objective 7: Promote innovative and sustainable funding mechanisms to support NBSAP implementation								
7.1	National target: By 2015, a study is undertaken in respect of CBD Decision X/3 and guidelines for financing biodiversity in Uganda developed					Aichi target: 20		
Key Outcome Indicator: 1. Guidelines for financing biodiversity in Uganda in place								
2. Trends in mobilization of financial resources								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Put in place measures for sustainable biodiversity financing	Develop guidelines and action plans for financing biodiversity in Uganda	7.1.1 Undertake a study to collect information which will guide in the development of guidelines for financing biodiversity in Uganda	No guidelines at present	Study undertaken and information collected to use in the development of guidelines	NEMA	Development partners MDAs NGOs MWE	70,000
			7.1.2 Develop and implement guidelines for financing biodiversity in Uganda	No guidelines at present	Guidelines developed	NEMA	Development partners MDAs NGOs MWE	500,000
			7.1.3 Develop and implement Resource Mobilization Plan	No Resource mobilization plan	Resource mobilization plan developed	NEMA	MoFPED Development partners MWE	300,000
7.2	National target: By 2017, finance resources for effectively implementing NBSAP2 is increased by at least 10% from the current level					Target: 20		
Key Outcome Indicator: Trends in National financial resource allocation for biodiversity conservation								
	Strategy	Action	Proposed	Baseline 2014	Output	Lead	Partner	Costs in

			Activities		indicators	Agency (target champion)	institutions	US\$
	Mobilize financial resources for biodiversity conservation	Engage stakeholders on resource mobilization	7.2.1 Identify and seek funding support from diverse sources including regional and bilateral development partners, foundations and private sector	Presently there is limited financial support for biodiversity from various sources	Increased funding from diverse sources mobilized	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE	200,000
			7.2.2 Support capacity building for writing project proposals	There is low capacity for preparing project proposals targeting GEF and other agencies	Capacity built for writing project proposals	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE	80,000
			7.2.3 Develop project proposals to target designated donors under the convention of Biological Diversity e.g. GEF	Proposals need to be prepared regularly	Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use are being effectively supported by GEF and other development partners	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE	200,000
			7.2.4 Mobilize resources by creating synergies between the	There is limited synergy between the CBD	Mobilize additional resources through	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development	10,000,000

			different multilateral Environmental Conventions	implementation and other Conventions	partnership with the other Conventions		partners MWE	
			7.2.6 Budget for activities of biodiversity and incorporate in annual budget of Line ministries, NGOs, private sector	There is limited allocation of funds for biodiversity conservation in the various sectors	Proportion of funds annually budgeted for by line ministries, NGOs, private sector for biodiversity activities	NEMA	MFPED MDAs Districts MWE	40,000,000
			7.2.7 Promote accountability, transparency, gender mainstreaming in implementation of biodiversity projects	These elements are often lacking in biodiversity projects	Biodiversity projects which incorporate aspects of accountability, transparency, gender mainstreaming	NEMA	MFPED MDAs Districts MWE	80,000

7.3	National target: By 2018, new financing mechanisms are operational and new funding mobilized for biodiversity conservation				Target: 20			
Key Outcome Indicators: - Trends in funding for biodiversity conservation								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Promote innovative financing mechanism	Identify and implement new financial mechanisms for biodiversity conservation	7.3.1 Put in place an enabling policy or legislative framework for new biodiversity financing mechanisms	No enabling framework in place	A policy or regulations in place	NEMA	MFPED MDAs Development partners MWE districts	80,000
			7.3.2 Issue environment bonds	No bonds have been issued	Environment bonds issued and bought	NEMA	MFPED MWE districts	2,000,000
			7.3.3 Provide incentives that promote green production and purchase of green goods	No incentives have been articulated	Incentives to promote purchase of green goods identified and provided	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE districts	1,000,000
			7.3.4 Institute appropriate pricing mechanisms for biodiversity goods and services	Pricing mechanisms have not been put in place	Pricing mechanisms put in place for biodiversity goods and	NEMA	MFPED MWE	400,000

					services			
			7.3.5 Support green marathon	This has not been tried in Uganda	The concept of green marathon promoted and supported	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE	500,000
			7.3.6 Promote green products, technologies & clean MFPED / production	This has not been tried in Uganda	Clear mechanisms identified to promote green products and technologies	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE districts	300,000
			7.3.7 Support sensitization and capacity development to individuals and companies that benefit from ecosystem services	This has not been done	Sensitization and capacity building undertaken	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE districts	300,000
			7.3.8 Enhance payment for ecosystem services	PES payments are still limited	Increased level of payments for ecosystems services	NEMA	MFPED MDAs NGOs Development partners MWE districts	4,000,000

6.3.8 Strategies and Action Plans for New and Emerging Issues

As mentioned earlier, new and emerging issues are those issues that were not adequately addressed during the formulation of NBSAP1 but which have now gained prominence and must be included in the revised version (NBSAP2). Some of these have been integrated in different strategic objectives above while the remaining ones including oil exploration and discovery, biofuels and management of natural disasters are addressed below, conveniently numbered as 8 although not a strategic objective *per se*:

8.1	National target: By 2016, oil exploration and production are being guided by biodiversity friendly regulations				Aichi target: No specific target			
Key Outcome Indicator: Biodiversity conservation and ecosystem resilience are being maintained adjacent to oil exploration and production areas								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Support biodiversity conservation in oil rich regions of Uganda	Manage negative impacts on oil and gas development on biodiversity	8.1.1 Set up environmental standards to limit the production or discharge of harmful (hazardous) wastes or products in sensitive ecosystems	Some of the standards are not yet in place	Ensure that all the required standards have been formulated	NEMA	MoEMD UWA NFA MDAs districts	250,000
			8.1.2 Ensure that EIAs are conducted for all petroleum explorations	EIAs may not be undertaken for all oil activities	All oil and gas activities are being subjected to EIA	NEMA	MoEMD UWA NFA MDAs districts	200,000
			8.1.3 Support protection and restoration measures for degraded ecosystems, threatened species and migratory routes in oil exploration and production regions	Some of the ecosystems and species may be adversely affected by oil activities	Affected degraded ecosystem put under restoration activities and special species are protected	NEMA	MoEMD UWA NFA MDAs districts	300,000
			8.1.4 Routinely improve/update	The 2010 version has	The Atlas is	NEMA	MoEMD	200,000

			the Sensitivity Atlas for the Albertine Graben	not yet been updated	routinely updated		UWA NFA MDAs districts	
			8.1.5 Support comprehensive awareness programmes and information flow regarding petroleum processes and biodiversity	Awareness and information flow is often lacking especially to the communities adjacent to the oil exploration areas	Awareness and information flow is adequately managed	NEMA	MoEMD UWA NFA MDAs NGOs	200,000
			8.1.6 Set up a biodiversity offset trust fund to be managed by UWA to ensure no net biodiversity loss due to petroleum activities as well as to compensate for the residual impacts of petroleum exploration that cannot be mitigated against	No biodiversity offset trust fund is presently in place	Biodiversity offset trust fund is available for use when needed	NEMA	MoEMD UWA NFA MDAs NGOs districts	500,000
			8.1.7 Examine and implement opportunities for translocation of animals from sensitive areas where oil exploration is already taking place e.g. translocation of animals from the Delta area to upper Murchison Falls National Park	This has not yet been necessary	Translocation to other areas effected where necessary	UWA	MoEMD UWA NFA MDAs NGOs NEMA districts	400,000

8.2	National target: By 2018, the development and use of biofuels are widespread in Uganda to complement hydrocarbon fuel sources				Aichi target: No specific target			
Key Outcome Indicator: Proportion of hydrocarbon fuel sources substituted by biofuels								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	D Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Promote the use of biofuels in Uganda	Control production of biofuel	8.2.1 Undertake awareness at all levels on the positive and negative impacts of biofuels	Not many Ugandans know about biofuels	Increased area allocated to biofuel crops	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE district	100,000
			8.2.2 Develop a policy framework that promotes the positive and minimizes the negative impacts of biofuel production on biodiversity	No such a policy framework presently exist	A policy framework in place for production and use of biofuels	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE districts	80,000
			8.2.3 Put in place measures to protect food and energy security of local communities when introducing biofuel crops	No such measures exist at present	Measures in place	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE districts	100,000
			8.2.4 Assess and identify areas suitable for biofuel production and areas inappropriate for biofuel production	Such areas have not yet been systematically identified	Suitable and inappropriate areas for biofuel production identified and mapped	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE districts	250,000
			8.2.5 Ensure that EIAs are conducted for all biofuel projects and programmes	EIAs have not yet been conducted in the few biofuel production areas	Most biofuel production areas are subjected to	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE districts	100,000

					EIAs			
			8.2.6 Promote and support research programmes on biofuels	Very limited research has so far been initiated on biofuels in Uganda	More research on biofuels being undertaken	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE districts	300,000
			8.2.7 Promote and support the use of environmentally-sound technologies which promote the positive and minimize the negative impacts of biofuel production on biodiversity	Environmentally – sound technologies are not yet being applied without guidance	Environmentally-sound technologies have been identified and are being widely used	NEMA	MDAs MoEMD MWE districts	300,000

8.3	National target: By 2017, Uganda's biodiversity is reasonably protected from natural disasters				Corresponding Aichi targets: 7,11,14,15			
Key Outcome Indicator: Disaster Risk management strategy in place to address potential biodiversity risks and hazards								
	Strategies	Action	Proposed Activities	Baseline 2014	Output indicators	Lead Agency (target champion)	Partner institutions	Costs in US\$
	Minimize the impact of natural disasters on biodiversity	Integrate disaster risk management in biodiversity management	8.3.1 Identify and implement risk management, mitigation and preparedness measures for biodiversity	Such measures have not yet been put in place	Appropriate measures to protect biodiversity in place	NEMA	OPM MWE MFPED NGOs MDAs districts	400,000
			8.3.2 Develop a Disaster Preparedness, Risk Reduction and Management Plan for protecting biodiversity	There is presently no such a plan for protecting biodiversity	Biodiversity Risk Management Plan in place	NEMA	OPM MWE MFPED NGOs MDAs	200,000
			8.3.3 Mainstream Disaster Preparedness, Risk Reduction and Management Plan in key National, sectoral and Districts planning frameworks for protection of biodiversity	There is presently no such a plan to mainstream national, sectoral and district planning frameworks	Disaster Preparedness Plan to protect biodiversity mainstreamed in key national, sectoral and district planning frameworks (see mainstreaming guidelines in Annex 4)	NEMA	OPM MWE MFPED NGOs MDAs districts	200,000
			8.3.4 Improve disaster	There are problems	Reliable early	NEMA	OPM	200,000

			management systems like early warning systems	of accuracy in prediction of onset of disasters	warning systems put in place for dissemination to stakeholders		MWE MFPED NGOs MDAs districts	
			8.3.5 Support participatory valuation and management of ecosystem services	The concept of participatory valuation is not yet widely used for disaster management	Active participatory valuation and management of ecosystem services in place in disaster prone areas	NEMA	OPM MWE MFPED NGOs MDAs districts	300,000
			8.3.6 Strengthen the capacity of Disaster Reduction and Management Committees at all levels	The Committees are usually not effective because they are not well facilitated	Effective capacity built in the Disaster Reduction and Management Committees at all levels	NEMA	OPM MWE MFPED NGOs MDAs districts	250,000

TOTAL FUNDING NEEDED TO FUND NBSAP2 IN UGANDA FROM 2015-2025 = USD 79,920,000 or approximately 80 million USD

Whereas general mobilization of funds for biodiversity is often associated with other environment management activities, the financing strategy for the next 10 years would require mobilization of at least **US\$ 80 million as shown above** for biodiversity conservation activities alone and independent of other environment management activities.

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

7.1 National Coordination structure that will guide, coordinate and ensure implementation of the NBSAP

NEMA, which is the CBD Focal Point in Uganda, will be responsible for the over-all coordination of the implementation of NBSAP2. The specific role of NEMA will involve overseeing and co-ordinating the implementation of various strategies and actions spelt out in NBSAP2. Other functions of NEMA will include, among others, the following:

- a) Acting as an information clearing house on biodiversity through the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM)
- b) Providing policy and strategic advice on biodiversity matters
- c) Supporting awareness, communication and outreach on biodiversity
- d) Ensuring the integration of biodiversity issues into overall national planning through coordination with the relevant ministries, districts, departments and government agencies
- e) Providing secretarial services to the Technical Committee on Biodiversity Conservation
- f) Coordinating and monitoring the implementation of NBSAP2

7.2 The role of Sectoral Agencies

Sectoral agencies will be responsible for ensuring the implementation of the Sectoral strategies and action plans in the sectors. Specifically they will be responsible for:

- a) Providing guidance and support to their respective links at district and local levels to ensure biodiversity issues are addressed;
- b) Integrating biodiversity issues into their sectoral policies, plans and projects;
- c) Addressing specific issues that are mentioned in the NBSAP;
- d) Monitoring and disseminating information on their activities affecting biodiversity;
- e) Collaborating with NEMA on relevant issues in the NBSAP.

7.3 The role of District Local Governments

At the district level, the District Local Government shall be the lead agency in supporting NBSAP implementation. Environment management including biodiversity is a decentralised function, in accordance with the National Environment Act 1995 and the Local Governments Act 1997. Mechanisms are already in place for performing this function including the office of the District Environment Officer, the District and Local Environment Committees and the District Technical Planning Committee. Working through these bodies, the roles of the District Local Governments will include:

- a) Co-ordinating the implementation of the NBSAP in the District;
- b) Formulating and enforcing local policies and bye-laws related to biodiversity conservation and use
- c) Assisting in documenting indigenous knowledge, technologies and practices in biodiversity conservation
- d) Monitoring biodiversity conservation including maintaining and disseminating accurate information
- e) Integrating biodiversity issues in District Environment Action Plans and subsequently incorporating them in District Development Plans
- f) Mobilizing resources, including community contributions, and allocation of resources for the implementation of NBSAP
- g) Mobilizing local communities, resource use groups, NGOs and CBOs in biodiversity conservation;
- h) Identifying vital critical ecosystems, biodiversity hotspots and critical species that need protection and where required ensuring fulfilment of Uganda's obligations to the Convention on Biological Diversity and other related international agreements.

7.4 The role of Local Communities

At the local level, the partners in implementing the NBSAP will be the local communities based on the assumption that they will be ready, willing and able to shoulder the responsibility for conserving and sustainably utilizing biodiversity resources in the areas. It is imperative that extensive awareness as well as identification of incentives to enhance their participation is clearly understood and undertaken beforehand. The specific roles of the local communities will include:

- a) Participation in planning processes such as DEAPs to identify and prioritise issues and actions related to the NBSAP;
- b) Implementing measures and activities geared towards ensuring land improvement and biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilization;
- c) Participating in training and capacity - building activities;
- d) Sharing information on traditional knowledge, technology and practices with communities and other stakeholders.

Local communities will need a lot of capacity building in the form of technical and logistic support if they are to meet the challenges involved in implementing the NBSAP. Some of this support will be provided by NEMA, local NGOs and CBOs. But much of the support will have to come from the district local governments themselves.

7.5 The role of NGOs

NGOs will be crucial in NBSAP2 implementation. Their functions, among others, will include:

- a) Carrying out awareness-raising activities on the NBSAP;
- b) Assisting to strengthen the capacity of community-based organisations to implement NBSAP;
- c) Facilitating technology transfer at community level;
- d) Promoting networking opportunities, especially among NGOs and other civil society organizations;
- e) Documenting indigenous knowledge, technologies and practices in biodiversity conservation
- f) Assisting CBOs and communities to formulate and implement projects related to biodiversity conservation.

7.6 The role of the Private Sector

Key roles of the private sector, among others, will be to:

- a) Invest in sustainable and environmentally-sound technologies
- b) Invest in alternative income-generating activities
- c) Contribute resources to support programmes on land management and biodiversity conservation
- d) Provide support to the new financing mechanisms proposed in NBSAP2

7.7 Financing and Resource Mobilization

Provisional estimates of the costs for implementing the various action plans outlined within this document was carried out to cover the period 2015-2025 which amounted to **USD 80,000,000 (actual was 79,920,000)**. In general terms, this funding will come from various public and private sources. The main sources and financial instruments that can be tackled are detailed in the NEMA Guidelines (2014) and include the following:

7.7.1 Traditional Financing Mechanisms

Traditional financing mechanisms in Uganda include financial disbursements from the central government, budget support allocations from donors, and trust funds. Biodiversity conservation stakeholders should aim at working with the government, donors and environment conservation trusts to ensure that the funds currently allocated and/or proposed in medium term and long-term expenditure frameworks are maintained.

Funds allocated and/or proposed by government, donors and trusts represent a core source of funding for biodiversity. Therefore stakeholders in government, private sector and civil society will work together to lobby parliament, and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development to ensure that the current proposals are at least maintained or at best increased in the medium and long-term.

The key areas of public finance that need to be increased are for the agricultural sector to attain the 10% allocation agreed to by African Union countries. Public financing for the environment and natural resources, tourism, wildlife and antiquities sub-sectors need to be raised. One of the key ways of ensuring better effort in biodiversity conservation is matching sub-sector allocations with releases from the Ministry of Finance as indicated in the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).

The Agricultural Sector, ENR and Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities sub-sector should provide for local government to support biodiversity conservation. This will be achieved when National agencies such as the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), National Forestry Authority (NFA), and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) provide an allocation for local government activities in the areas of wetlands management, watershed protection and biodiversity conservation, sustainable fisheries management, and tourism development at local government level.

Local governments need to raise the percentage of the local revenue for environment and natural resource management from the current 2-5% to 10%. The financing should go towards improvements in compliance and enforcement, and investments that will generate additional revenue from natural resource management.

Conservation Trust Funds: The primary benefit of Conservation Trusts is to provide financing for essential conservation services, research and sustainable development, and in many cases, support the integrity of a national park or protected area. Conservation Trusts have become established in national or regional institutions that deliver a range of long-term benefits and services. These include the following: creating economic improvement, opportunities and rural investment to improve quality of life in rural areas; enhancing transparency in project and fund management as well as government accountability; establishing long-term community buy-in to sustain nature; changing local behavior patterns around nature and the environment; building corporate and institutional partnerships; leveraging expertise to attract and manage new sources of funding; and supporting partner NGOs to explore new areas (e.g. incentive payments) and take on additional mission related projects.

Whereas conservation trusts generally fund operating expenses, spend-down or 'sinking' funds, which are typically distributed over three to five years but can extend to 10 years to execute a project or accomplish a specific objective and endowment, providing perpetual funding to sustain a park or protected area. Conservation funds are encouraged to invest in sink-funds as long as these lead to increased productivity and resilience of ecosystems.

Benefit-sharing & cost sharing: The three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable utilisation of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from such utilization. Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits is intended to ensure equitable benefit sharing in return for the use of genetic resources, acknowledging and respecting at the same time indigenous communities' rights over their traditional knowledge and genetic resources. sources of funds for benefit and cost sharing are: User fees and charges; •private and public revenue/profit-sharing (both voluntary

and mandatory); formal access and benefit-sharing regimes; village development, micro-credit, livelihood support funds ; local employment and product sourcing; community biodiversity-based enterprises; joint private-public-(community) ventures; and leases, franchises or other devolution of service provision and management

7.7.2 Innovative financing mechanisms

1 Payments for ecosystem services

In the NEMA Guidelines (2014), a payment for environmental services scheme is defined as (i) a voluntary transaction in which, (ii) a well-defined environmental service (ES), or a form of land use likely to secure that service, (iii) is bought by at least one ES buyer, (iv) from a minimum of one ES provider, and (v) if and only if the provider continues to supply that service (conditionality). The biodiversity conservation options proposed in the guidelines include, but are not limited to purchase of high-value habitat, payment for access to species or habitat, payment for biodiversity-conserving management practices, tradable rights under cap & trade regulations, and support to biodiversity-conserving businesses.

To achieve success with PES systems in biodiversity conservation, it is important to include the following considerations in design:

- (i) A pro-poor PES program is one that maximizes its potential positive impact and minimizes its potential negative impact on the poor.
- (ii) Keep transaction costs low. This is important in all PES programs, as it affects their efficiency. Keeping transaction costs low is particularly important when many potential participants are poor, as they will be relatively more heavily affected.
- (iii) Devise specific mechanisms to counter high transaction costs. When many potential participants are smallholders, transaction costs will inherently be high. Specific mechanisms should be developed to reduce these costs, such as collective contracting.
- (iv) Provide targeted assistance to overcome problems that impede the participation of poorer households. This may take the form of technical assistance or credit programs, for example.
- (v) Avoid implementing PES programs in areas with conflicts over land tenure.
- (vi) Ensure that the social context is well understood, so that possible adverse impacts are anticipated and appropriate remedial measures can be designed.

2 Biodiversity offsets

Offsets are measures taken to compensate for any residual significant, adverse impacts that cannot be avoided, minimized and/or rehabilitated or restored, in order to achieve no net loss or a net gain of biodiversity. Offsets can take the form of positive management interventions such as restoration of degraded habitat, arrested degradation or averted risk, protecting areas where there is imminent or projected loss of biodiversity.

Developers of large infrastructure projects such as hydroelectric power projects, mines, oil and gas projects and large agricultural production projects will be

encouraged to use biodiversity offsets as part of the review of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Results of cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analyses and other economic instruments will be used to demonstrate the benefits of biodiversity offsets over alternative biodiversity loss mitigation measures. The main stakeholders, beneficiaries or losers, will use available incentives of acknowledgement in publications, international media, websites and use of environmental compliance audit reports and sector reporting to encourage project developers establish biodiversity offsets.

3 Environmental fiscal reforms

“Environmental fiscal reform” (EFR) refers to a range of taxation and pricing measures which can raise fiscal revenues while furthering environmental goals. EFR measures include (i) taxes on natural resource extraction, (ii) product subsidies and taxes, (iii) taxes on polluting or harmful emissions and (iv) user charges or fees. The feasibility of EFRs depends on: (i) natural resource pricing measures, such as taxes for forests and fisheries exploitation; (ii) reforms of product subsidies and taxes; (iii) cost recovery measures; (iv) pollution charges.

- (i) **Fiscal instruments** i.e. taxes and subsidies, are mechanisms for raising and transferring funds between sectors. While economic development is critical for lifting people out of poverty and raising living standards for the broader population, it also causes harmful side effects—particularly for the environment—with potentially sizeable costs for the macro-economy.
- (ii) **Fiscal instruments** (emissions taxes, trading systems with allowance auctions, fuel taxes, charges for scarce road space and water resources, etc.) can and should play a central role in promoting greener growth. Fiscal instruments for biodiversity conservation should be employed based on three criteria: (i) *effective at reducing environmental harm*—so long as they are carefully targeted at the source of the problem (e.g., emissions); (ii) *cost-effectiveness* (i.e. they impose the smallest burden on the economy for a given environmental improvement)—so long as the fiscal dividend from these policies is exploited (e.g., revenues are used to strengthen fiscal positions or reduce other taxes that discourage work effort and investment); (iii) *strike the right balance between environmental benefits and economic costs*—so long as they are set to reflect environmental damages.
- (iii) **Charge systems:** Charges are defined as payments for use of resources, infrastructure, and services and are akin to market prices for private goods. In Uganda charge systems are used as permits. Charges include pollution charges, user charges e.g. for wetlands, betterment charges (imposed on private property which benefits from public investments), impact fees, access fees and administrative charges
- (iv) **Financial instruments:** The financial sector is the set of institutions, instruments, and the regulatory framework that permit transactions to be made by incurring and settling debts, that is, by extending credit. *All companies, regardless of sector, both impact on biodiversity and ecosystems and depend on ecosystem services.* There is an important role for the financial sector in this regard, including: the management of biodiversity risks in lending and investment decisions and setting up of new innovative financial mechanisms for pro-biodiversity businesses and

biodiversity conservation areas. Business can show leadership on biodiversity and ecosystems:

4 Performance bonds:

Environmental performance bonds and deposit refund systems are economic instruments that aim to shift responsibility for controlling pollution, monitoring, and enforcement to individual producers and consumers who are charged in advance for the potential damage. Performance Bonds require that proponents of environmentally damaging enterprises, such as mining, timber harvesting, and road building, post performance or assurance bonds. In order to be effective, bonds must be set at a level which accurately reflects all anticipated environmental damages that could result. Government agencies must monitor and enforce compliance effectively. The bonds must be held long enough to ensure the proponents have complied with their obligations.

5 Green markets through natural resource trade and value chains

Market for green products refers to the trade mechanism for products certified using criteria that support the three objectives of the CBD. Such products are either natural products including wild plant and animal products used as food sources or used for biochemicals, new pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, personal care, bioremediation, bio-monitoring, and ecological restoration, or nature-based products involving many industries, such as agriculture, fisheries, forestry, biotechnology based on genetic resources, recreation and ecotourism.

Uganda is promoting green markets products through the organic agricultural value chains, sustainable non-wood and wood forest products, and wildlife products. The NEMA Guidelines (2014) support the outcomes of the National Bio-trade Strategy and draft national organic agriculture policy.

Uganda's priorities under bio-trade are : (i) ecotourism; (ii) wildlife use rights; (iii) non-wood forest products; and natural ingredients; and (iv) carbon trade. Organic agriculture in Uganda has generally focused on agricultural product lines for coffee, cotton and fruits and vegetables. Scenarios have suggested that bio-trade and organic agriculture can grow to up to between 5 and 10% of Uganda's commodity exports.

Bio-trade and organic agriculture in Uganda will be promoted through: (i) community based interventions such as collaborative natural resource management for communities living near protected areas, as well as communities living in biodiversity-rich areas. For farming systems biodiversity conservation seeks to create premiums from certified organic agriculture production; (ii) take advantage of available indigenous traditional knowledge in developing production practices; (iii) promote growth of local and regional markets alongside international markets; (iv) take advantage of favourable climate conditions to promote various products. Therefore semi-arid areas products as well as wet area products should be promoted concurrently. In Uganda's drier areas products such as Gum Arabica, hides and skins, beef and grains will be important products, while coffee, cotton and fish are important for the wetter areas; and (v) there will be a need to attract vocational skills and entrepreneurship training for viable value chains to emerge around product and services produced.

Institutional support will be needed to ensure that products are eligible to compete for markets. The markets in Europe, the United States, Asia and within Africa require appropriate standards attainment, volumes and regularity of supply. Other considerations such as market information, transaction costs and other business skills are acquired through product based entrepreneurship training.

6 Climate finance

The more frequently implemented carbon projects focus on climate change mitigation. Communities and project developers are urged to implement voluntary carbon standards that have explicit biodiversity conservation criteria such as Plan Vivo, CCB and VCS. For CDM and REDD Plus projects, biodiversity is generally embedded in forestry projects.

Biodiversity conservation stakeholders supporting projects that could affect some form of biodiversity such as wetlands, fisheries, vegetation, insect and animal population as well as agro-ecosystems should seek specific biodiversity criteria. NEMA, UWA and NFA, among others, should indicate this dimension if EIAs are undertaken.

The development of NAMAs and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) should make provisions, such as higher scores, where necessary, to convince providers of carbon finance to integrate biodiversity into the carbon projects.

There is a need to work with partners who have a strong interest in biodiversity conservation such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the World Bank, the German, Norwegian, Belgian, Swedish and United Kingdom Governments and other development partners to integrate biodiversity in their climate change support programmes.

Buyers of carbon credits should have the option of buying bundled carbon credits demonstrated. The possible bundled should include carbon, watershed and biodiversity conservation. If premiums are earned, they should be reflected as market incentives to attract more buyers.

There is a need to upscale community carbon finance initiatives and facilities that promote bundled carbon finance with other forms of PES. The early initiatives currently being promoted should be promoted with additional facility support.

7 The Global Environment Facility and other donor-funded Projects

Uganda has been one of the most successful countries in Africa in attracting funding for biodiversity-related projects through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and also benefits from excellent bilateral cooperation in the area of biodiversity management with a number of countries. These projects typically play an important role in providing catalytic funding for innovative interventions relating to biodiversity and will directly contribute to the implementation of NBSAP2. A list of the most significant GEF funded projects and their areas presented in Annex 4.

Donor support: Between 2006 and 2010, Aid allocated to multi-sector cross cutting activities such as environmental management was only 4.2 percent (US\$266.4 million) (Development Initiative 2012). This is an average of \$53.4 million/year to environment related sectors. However, these calculations include a large amount allocated to the water sub-sector and that

the allocations to biodiversity conservation activities is small and was not clearly articulated. Over the last five years, donors have targeted watershed management, tree planting, protected area management, tourism and climate change activities related to biodiversity conservation among others. Indicated funding for biodiversity related projects in the last few years are summarized in Annex 5.

8.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF NBSAP 2015-2025

8.1 Rationale for Monitoring and Evaluation of NBSAP2

No regular monitoring and evaluation assessments were undertaken on Uganda's NBSAP1, mainly because of the weak coordination structure that was in place during that period (2001-2010). When a preliminary evaluation of the implementation of NBSAP1 was undertaken in 2009 as part of Uganda's 4th National Report to the CBD, it was a very difficult exercise as some institutions, personnel and programmes were no longer active and the action plan was highly ambitious and extensive in scope but without clearly verifiable indicators.

These lessons have highlighted the need for an effective monitoring and evaluation strategy to accompany and support the implementation of NBSAP2. It is considered critical for the following reasons:

- a) Regular monitoring and evaluation will help to assess the level of progress made by different stakeholders towards achievement of each target in the NBSAP2 strategy and action plan. Thus it will guide on areas of progress and areas of neglect and allow NEMA and the Technical Committee on Biodiversity Conservation (TCBD) to adjust and strengthen its programmes of intervention as needed.
- b) Specifically regular monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 will provide a platform to identify gaps, opportunities and weaknesses and a basis for revising the NBSAP2 when it expires in 2025.
- c) Many stakeholders will be involved in the implementation of NBSAP2. Regular monitoring and evaluation will promote the continuous involvement and participation of stakeholders in the implementation of NBSAP2.
- d) Monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 will also serve as part of an ongoing, continuous and cyclical process to align the actions outlined in the NBSAP2 strategy to Uganda's long-term development framework as articulated in Vision 2040.
- e) Monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 will help to assess the level of mainstreaming of NBSAP2 into strategic and other plans of different stakeholders or sectors.
- f) Substantial funding is required to implement NBSAP2. Regular monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 will help monitor financial resources set aside for NBSAP2 and to identify funding needs for planned biodiversity activities. This will reveal if scarce national resources are being effectively allocated and utilized.
- g) As a signatory to the CBD, Uganda is required to present national reports to the Convention every four years on biodiversity measures that have been carried out to implement the provisions of the Convention and the effectiveness of these measures. The information generated through regular monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 will facilitate this process.

8.2 Key Strategic Aims for Monitoring and Evaluation of NBSAP2

The main strategic aim of the monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 is to facilitate the effective implementation of planned activities in order to achieve Uganda's national biodiversity goals and Uganda's contribution to international biodiversity targets. The monitoring and evaluation strategy will also track the level of participation and contribution of different stakeholders to the goals of NBSAP2.

8.3 Identification of indicators to track progress towards national targets

SMART indicators and targets should be developed as soon as implementation of NBSAP2 starts to ensure effective assessment of progress towards achievement of the set national targets as well as the CBD Strategic Plan (2011-2020).

8.4 Proposed institutional arrangements for M&E

NBSAP2 will be monitored at different levels and intervals with the full involvement of different stakeholders. NEMA will be the lead organization to coordinate monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP2 with the active and structured support of the Technical Committee on Biodiversity Conservation (TCBD). It is suggested that the different institutions represented by the TCBD report back to the committee and high level stakeholders on an annual basis in terms of their progress and challenges with regard to achieving the targets and strategic goals of NBSAP2. This report should include regional and local level initiatives and should take the form of a written annual report linked to the action plan in section 5 of this document. NEMA should take responsibility to compile these reports to produce an annual state of biodiversity report, which will provide a baseline of implementation and serve as a guide for future strategic planning.

In order to ensure impartiality, an independent mid-term evaluation of NBSAP2 should be undertaken in 2020. A final evaluation of NBSAP2 can then be taken in 2025, by which time it will be possible to assess Uganda's contribution towards the achievement of the CBD Strategic Plan (2011-2020) and the Aichi Targets. The final evaluation will also provide valuable insights, lessons and direction for the development of Uganda's third NBSAP.

REFERENCES

1. Aleper, D. and Moe, S. R. 2006. The African elephant population in Kidepo Valley, National Park, Uganda: Changes in size and structure from 1967 to 2000. *African Journal of Ecology* 44: 157 – 164
2. Behnke, R. and Nakirya, M., 2012. The Contribution of Livestock to the Ugandan Economy. IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 02 – 12
3. DEAT 2006: South African Environment Outlook. South African National Department of Environment Affairs & Tourism, Pretoria.
4. Emerton, L. and E.T. Muramira. 1999. *Uganda Biodiversity Economic Assessment*. A Report prepared for the National Environment Management Authority as part of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan process. IUCN EARO. Nairobi, Kenya.
5. Glenn Bush, S.N. 2004: The value of Uganda's Forests: A livelihoods and ecosystems approach. Ministry of Water & Environment.
6. Godfray C. H. J. 2002. Challenges for taxonomy. *Nature* 417:17-19.
7. GoU., 2002. *Initial national communication to the UNFCCC*. MWE. Uganda. Kampala
8. (GoU, 2007, MWE, 2010). GoU., (2007), *Climate Change: Uganda National Adaptation Programmes of Action*. Kampala, Uganda
9. Hafashimana D.L.N, Bisikwa J., Munyuli T., and Talwana H., 2009. Taxonomic need assessment for Uganda. – UVIMA baseline review consultancy
10. IGAD, 2010: Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). 2010. *IGAD Environment Outlook*
11. Isabirye-Basuta, G., Odong, R., Kisakye, J., Baranga, D., Akol, A., Kizito, Y. and Bwanika, G. (2006). *Needs Assessment, Conservation and Development of Taxonomic Tools in Zoology*. Draft final report submitted to MUIENR (Uganda) for the BOZONET project, November 2006.
12. Kakudidi E.K. & Kabuye C. S. 2006 Needs Assessment, Conservation and Development of Taxonomic Tools in Botany- A National Consultancy Report to BOZONET
13. Langdale-Brown, I., Osmaston, H. A. and Wilson, J. G. 1964. The vegetation of Uganda and its bearing on land use. Government of Uganda, Entebbe.
14. Langlands, B.W. 1973. A Preliminary Review of Land Use in Uganda. Occasional Paper No. 43, Department of Geography, Makerere University, Kampala
15. MAAF and UBOS, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries and Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2009. Uganda National Census Report 2008. Kampala, Uganda
16. Mbuza, F., Hoona, J., Tizikara, C and Hashakimana, 1999, Current Status of Uganda's Domestic Animal Diversity, Contribution to the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.
17. MFPED 2013: Semi-Annual Budget Performance Report, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, Kampala, Also available at <http://www.finance.go.ug>
18. MPS, 2013/2014: Ministerial Policy Statement, Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Heritage, Kampala
19. MTWA 2011: Sector Budget framework Paper Trade Tourism and Industry 2010/11, Ministry Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities, Kampala
20. MTWA 2012: Uganda Tourism Assessment, Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities (MTWA), Kampala, <http://www.tourism.go.ug>
21. MWE (2007). Environment and Natural Resources Sector Investment Plan. Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), Kampala
22. MWE, (2003): Uganda Biodiversity and Tropical Forest Assessment, Ministry of Water and Environment
23. MWLE, 2003: Forest Department, Ministry of Water Lands and Environment, 2003. National Biomass Study. National Biomass Study Technical Report, Kampala

24. Namanya, Didacus B., (2009). *An Assessment of the Impact of climate change on the Health Sector in Uganda: A case of Malaria and Cholera epidemics and how to improve planning for effective preparedness and response*. Ministry of Health, Kampala Uganda
25. NARO, 2009: National Agricultural Research Organization. GEF-UNEP regional project 'Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa'
26. MWE., (2010). *Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan for the Water Resources Sector in Uganda*. Directorate of Water Resources Management, Kampala, Uganda
27. NARO. 2002. National Agricultural Research Organization, 2002. Removing barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa. Country report on Invasive Alien Species in Uganda. Summary findings from National Stakeholders Workshop, Entebbe
28. National Environment Management Policy (1994): Government of Uganda (NBI, 2010): Nile Basin Initiative, Baseline Report on the State of Biodiversity in the Nile, Uganda
29. (NBSAP, 2002): National Environment Management Authority, Kampala
30. NEMA 2007: National State of Environment Report, National Environment Management Authority, Uganda, Kampala, Uganda Available from: <http://www.nemaug.org>
31. NEMA (2008): National State of the Environment Report for Uganda, NEMA House, Kampala, Uganda
32. NEMA 2009: The integrated assessment of the potential impacts of the EU ACP Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs)
33. NEMA 2011 : Medicinal plants
34. NFA 2009 National Biomass Survey 2005, National Forestry Authority, Springs Road, Kampala
35. NFA (2011): REDD Readiness Proposal for Uganda, Ministry of Water and Environment
36. Oxfam, 2008. *Turning up the heat: climate change and poverty in Uganda*. Kampala, Uganda. Oxfam GB in Uganda
37. Plumptre, A.J., Behangana, M., Davenport, T.R.B., Kahindo, C., Ndomba, E.R., Ssegawa, P., Eilu, G., Nkuutu, D. and Owionji, I. (2003): The Biodiversity of the Albertine Rift. Albertine Rift Technical Reports Series Number 3. Wildlife Conservation Society. Website; <http://www.wcs.org>
38. Pomeroy, D. and Tushabe, H. 2004. The State of Uganda's Biodiversity 2004. Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources/National Biodiversity Data Bank. With assistance from DANIDA-ENRECA
39. Rwakaikara (2008): A Review of work on rhizosphere microbiota in Uganda. African Journal of Ecology
40. SOER 2000/2002: State of Environment Report for Uganda, National Environment Management Authority
41. Taylor, R. G., L. Mileham, C. Tindimugaya, A. Majugu, A. Muwanga, and B. Nakileza (2006). *Recent glacial recession in the Rwenzori Mountains of East Africa due to rising air temperature*. *Journal of Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L10402.
42. UBOS (2010): National Statistical Abstract 2010, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Kampala, Uganda <http://www.ubos.org>
43. UBOS. 2008: Uganda Bureau of Statistics, *Statistical Abstracts*. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
44. (UBOS, 2011): Ugandan Agricultural Census
45. UWA (2011): Uganda Wildlife Authority, Annual report
46. UWA (2012): Uganda Wildlife Authority, Annual report.
47. WMD. 2009: Report from Wetlands Management Department.

48. White, F. (1983). The vegetation of Africa. *A descriptive memoir to accompany the UNESCO/AETFAT/UNSO vegetation map of Africa*. UNESCO, Paris
49. Yaron G., Y. Moyini et al., 2003. The contribution of environment to economic growth and structural transformation. Report for the ENR working group for the PEAP revision process. MWLE/DFID, Kampala.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Members of the Thematic Working Groups, Coordinators and Consultant

COORDINATOR

Mr. Ogwal Sabino Francis

Natural Resources Management Specialist (Biodiversity and Rangelands)/

CBD National Focal Point

National Environment Management Authority

NEMA House 2nd Floor

Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road

P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.

Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256-772-517045

Fax: +256-414-257521

E-mail: fogwal@nemaug.org, sabinoframcis@gmail.com

ASSISTANT COORDINATORS

Dr. Evelyn Lutalo

National Environment Management Authority

P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.

Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 772652728

Fax: +256-414-257521

E-mail: elutalo@nemaug.org

Monique Akullo

National Environment Management Authority

P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.

Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256-754 837935

Fax: +256-414-257521

E-mail: makullo@nemaug.org

Junior Musinguzi

National Environment Management Authority

P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.

Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256-754310018

Fax: +256-414-257521

E-mail: jmusinguzi@nemaug.org

CONSULTANT

Dr. Bob Humphrey Ogwang

Greenbelt Consult Limited

P.O. Box 24854, Kampala, Uganda.

Tel: +256-772-841264

E-mail: bogwang@greenbelt.co.ug

A. Thematic Working Group on Policy, Legislation and Institutional Framework

1. Christine Akello
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mob : +256 772 595252
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: cakello@nemaug.org
2. Sarah Naigaga
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256782 436700
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: snaigaga@nemaug.org
3. Akankwasah Barirega
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities
Tel: +256-414-341242; Mobile +256-772-831348
Email: akankwasah@gmail.com/abarirega@tourism.go.ug
4. Fred Onyai
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256772 517303
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: fonyai@nemaug.org
5. Jessica Naiga
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile : +256 772 960199
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: jnaiga@nemaug.org
6. Ann Nawe
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mob : + 256 781 551316
Fax: +256-414-257521
Email : naweanna@yahoo.com
7. Akampurira Innocent
Uganda National Council for Science and Technology
+256 414 705500 / +256 312 314800. Mob: +256 782828271
Fax: +256 414 234579
Email: iakampurira@gmail.com

8. Boaz Musimenta
Office of the Prime Minister
Mob: +256 756500900/773483856
Email: musiboazi@gmail.com
9. Moses Opio
Oyam District Local Government
Mob: + 256 772676733
Email: opiomoses@gmail.com
10. Margaret Aanyu
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mob : + 256 772984826
Fax: +256-414-257521
Email : maanyu@nemaug.org

B. Thematic Working Group on Aquatic and Terrestrial Biodiversity

1. Obed Tugumisiriza
National Forestry Authority
Tel: +256 31 264 035/6, 041 230 365
Tel: +256 712200141/776 211013
Fax: +256-414 230 369
E-mail: obetug@yahoo.com/obedt@nfa.org.ug
2. Michael Opige
Nature Uganda
P. O Box 27034, Kampala.
Tel.: +256-414-540719, Fax: +256-414-533528, Mobile: +256-712-126126
Email: michael.opige@natureuganda.org
3. Justine Namara
Uganda Wildlife Authority
P.O.Box 3530, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 414 355000, +256 312 355000, Mob: +256772 413432
Fax: 256 414 34629
Email: justine.namara@ugandawildlife.org
4. Aggrey Rwetsiba
Uganda Wildlife Authority
P.O.Box 3530, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 414 355000, +256 312 355000, Mob: +256772499735
Fax: 256 414 34629
Email: aggrey.rwetsiba@ugandawildlife.org

5. George Lubega
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 705 806055/772 615222
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: glubega@nemaug.org
6. David Ochanda
Total E&P Uganda
Mobile: +256 782 637390
Email: david.ochanda@total.com/dochanda@hotmail.com
7. Dr. Festus Bagoora
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 772551340
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: fbagoora@nemaug.org
8. Richard Waiswa
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256 712079329
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: rwaiswa@nemaug.org
9. Aventino Bakunda
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
Department of Fisheries
Tel: +256 772592547
Email: aventino_b@yahoo.com
10. Dr. Esther Katuura
Natural Chemotherapeutic Research Institute
Tel: +256 776 977388
Email: katuurae@gmail.com
11. Dr. Gerald Eilu
Department of Forestry, Biodiversity & Tourism
Makerere University
Tel: +256 772642640
Email: gerald.eilu@gmail.com
12. Dr. Grace Nangendo
Wildlife Conservation Society
[Tel:+256 782 738248](tel:+256782738248)
Email: gnagendo@wcs.org

13. Simon Etimu
Department of Water Resources Management
Ministry of Water & Environment
Tel: +256 782894075
Email: simon.etimu@mwe.go.ug/simon.etimu@gmail.com
14. Norah Namakambo
Wetland Management Department-
Ministry of Water & Environment
Tel: +256 772437447
Email: namakambo@yahoo.com
15. Dr. Robert Kityo
Makerere University
Department of Biological Sciences
[Tel:+256 772945963](tel:+256772945963)
Email: jkalema@botany.mak.ac.ug
16. Dr. James Kalema
Makerere University
Department of Biological Sciences
Tel: +256 772501291
Email: rkityo@zoology.mak.ac.ug
17. Michael Mugarura
Ministry of Water and Environment
Climate Change Unit
Tel: +256 783215882
Email: mugarura.michael@ccu.go.ug
18. Isaac Ntujju
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 772699828
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: iigntujju@nemaug.org
19. Grace Birikadde
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: kbirikadde@nemaug.org

20. Mr. Ogwal Sabino Francis
Natural Resources Management Specialist (Biodiversity and Rangelands)/
CBD National Focal Point – Uganda
National Environment Management Authority
NEMA House 2nd Floor
Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256-772-517045
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: fogwal@nemaug.org, sabinofrancis@gmail.com
21. Patrick Musaazi
Kayunga District Local Government
Mob: +256 772392684
Email: mpbmusaazi@yahoo.com
22. Firipo Mpabulungi
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 712417749
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: fmpabulungi@nemaug.org
23. Solomon Musoke
Buikwe District Local Government
Mob: + 256 772460327
Email: musokesolomon@gmail.com
24. Catherine Kiwuka
Plant Genetic Resource Center
National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO)
Mob: +256 782678056
Email: kiwukakathyrn@gmail.com
25. Muhammad Semambo
Climate Change Unit
Ministry of Water and Environment
Mob: +256 704993344
Email: medi.semambo@yahoo.com

C. Thematic Working Group on Biotechnology and Biosafety

1. Dr. Evelyn Lutalo
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256 772652728
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: elutalo@nemaug.org

2. Gilbert Gumisiriza
Uganda National Council Science and Technology
Tel: +256 794-012525
Email: g.gumisiriza@uncst.go.ug
3. Christine Kasedde
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256 702 833813
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: ckasedde@nemaug.org
4. Elizabeth Mutayanjulwa
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256 772 842214
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: emutayanjulwa@nemaug.org
5. Arthur Makara
SCIFOE
Tel: +256 712 935664
Email: makakraauthur@yahoo.co.uk/scifode@scientist.com
6. Dr. David Hafashimana
National Agricultural Research Organization,
Bulindi Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute,
P.O.Box 101, Hoima, Uganda
Tel (Off.): +256- (0) 465443276 Mobile: +256- 782 964 358 / +256-750576280
Email (Off.) bulindizardi@yahoo.com
Email (private): davidhaf2000@yahoo.com
7. Dr. Andrew Kiguudu
National Agricultural Research Organization,
National Agricultural Research Laboratory, Kawanda
Mob: +256 772516652
Email: akiggundu@kari.go.ug
8. Annet Bukirwa
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: abukirwa@nemaug.org
9. Anne Nakimbugwe
Mukono District Local Government
Mob: +256 772470285
Email: mariannekavuma@yahoo.com

10. Monique Akullo
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256-754 837935
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: makullo@nemaug.org

D. Thematic Working Group on Biodiversity for Poverty Eradication and National Development

1. Aaron Werikhe
National Planning Authority
Mobile: +256 774693761
E-mail: aronwerikhe@yahoo.com
2. Ronald Kaggwa
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: rkaggwa@nemaug.org
3. Eva Mutongole
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256 756709292
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: emutongole@nemaug.org
4. Dr. Dismas Mbabazi
National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO),
National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NaFIRRI),
Aquaculture Research & Development Centre - Kajjansi
P.O.BOX 530, Kampala (Uganda)
Tel: +256414375668 (Off.) Mobile: +256-772-393452
Fax: +256-434-120192
Email: mbabazidismas@yahoo.com or mbabazi@firi.go.ug
or mbabazidismas@gmail.com
5. Martin Wamwaya
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256-772-590-522
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: mwamwaya@nemaug.org, wamwayamartin@yahoo.com

6. Junior Musinguzi
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 754 310018
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: jmusinguzi@nemaug.org
7. Dr. Daniel Babikwa
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: +256772 667066
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: dbabikwa@nemaug.org
8. Wilberforce Turyamubona
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 772 520125
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: wturyamubona@nemaug.org
9. Francis Mwaura
Economic Policy Research Centre
Makerere University
Email: mwaura@eprc.org
10. Naomi Obbo
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 774 391306
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: nobbo@nemaug.org
11. Shirley Aiik
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: saiik@nemaug.org
12. Joy Kagoda
National Environment Management Authority
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala, Uganda.
Tel: +256 - 414-251064/5/8 Mobile: + 256 772440706
Fax: +256-414-257521
E-mail: jkagoda@nemaug.org

13. Francis Waiswa
Uganda Export Promotion Board
Email: wasachief@gmail.com
14. Menyha Emmanuel
Uganda Bureau of Statistics
Mob: +256 772 889554/711 706094
Email: emenyha@gmail.com
15. Angella Rwabutomize
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Tel: +256 414 707193 Mob:+256 752537988
Email: angella.rwabutomize@finance.go.ug
16. John Lotyang
Moroto District Local Government
Mob: +256 782740147/752740147
Email: j-lotyang@yahoo.com

Annex 2: The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets

The **vision** of the Strategic Plan is a world of “Living in harmony with nature” where “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.”

The **mission** of the Strategic Plan is to “take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet’s variety of life, and contributing to human well-being, and poverty eradication. To ensure this, pressures on biodiversity are reduced, ecosystems are restored, biological resources are sustainably used and benefits arising out of utilization of genetic resources are shared in a fair and equitable manner; adequate financial resources are provided, capacities are enhanced, biodiversity issues and values mainstreamed, appropriate policies are effectively implemented, and decision-making is based on sound science and the precautionary approach.”

Strategic Goals and The Aichi Biodiversity Targets

Strategic goal A. Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society

Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably

Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems

Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio-economic conditions.

Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits

Strategic goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use

Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.

Target 6: By 2020, all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits

Target 7: By 2020, areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity

Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity

Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment

Target 10: By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning

Strategic goal C. Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity

Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

Target 12: By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.

Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.

Strategic goal D. Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services

Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.

Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.

Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building

Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.

Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.

Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.

Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties

Annex 3: Mainstreaming NBSAP in policies, strategies, plans and programmes

A. Mainstreaming NBSAP in stakeholder policies, strategies, plans and projects

Mainstreaming is the focus and central issue of the CBD Biodiversity Strategy 2011-2020. The international community has realised that it is not possible to achieve greater results in implementation of biodiversity strategies without effective mainstreaming.

The complex and intricate linkages between biodiversity and poverty eradication in Uganda demand that great attention be given to mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into all development sectors and programmes. Investment in sound conservation and sustainable utilisation of biodiversity in Uganda not only makes economic sense, but is also important for developing new opportunities to help overcome poverty, improve health and livelihoods for the marginalised and rural poor. The mainstreaming of biodiversity must thus take place at all levels of government and society. Mainstreaming can target two main levels:

- Improved understanding among decision and policy makers of the linkages between biodiversity, poverty and economic development
- Integration of biodiversity into national, regional, local and sectoral policies, plans, strategies and budgets

B. The current status of mainstreaming biodiversity in Uganda

- a) Biodiversity has been mainstreamed into NDP – mainly on ecosystem restoration – wetlands, forests
- b) The sector (outside forestry, wetlands and wildlife) in which biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed most is the energy sector – hydropower development, oil and gas sub sectors
- c) Biodiversity is among the key issues assessed during the EIA process for proposed energy projects
- d) The energy policy has provisions on environment which includes biodiversity
- e) Collaborative natural resource management and revenue sharing are embedded in legislation on environment
- f) Aspects of offset is being taken on board especially energy projects and especially hydropower projects
- g) The CSOs/NGOs contributing to mainstreaming biodiversity in development activities
- h) Biodiversity conservation is an integral part of REDD initiatives

C. Elements of biodiversity that needs to be mainstreamed

Income opportunities from the sustainable use of biodiversity: For biodiversity to be given a greater value by society there is a need to continuously provide evidence of its intrinsic value, both to the economy and wider development. Evidence on the number of biodiversity-related jobs created; the values of various ecosystem services; biodiversity-based income generating activities; and the contribution of biodiversity to poverty reduction needs to be continuously measured and communicated to decision-makers to mobilize resources and political will (see activity 1.1.4).

Ecosystem services and their importance for human well-being: Ecosystems provide both tangible and non-tangible benefits essential for human survival and development. Therefore the link between developmental processes and ecosystem services needs to be mainstreamed

and emphasized in sectoral plans and activities to ensure conservation of biodiversity and the integrity of ecosystem functioning and processes (see activity 1.1.6).

Complex terminology, which requires simplification for common understanding,: Biodiversity is a term that is poorly understood outside of the scientific community and technical experts. The need to make biodiversity messages more practical and accessible by simplifying jargon and scientific terms is a crucial means to address this problem, and will foster improved understanding of the term by non-technical stakeholders and day-to-day resource managers (see CEPA strategy in strategic objective 5).

Sustainable utilization of resources/ biodiversity / ecosystem services: Sustainable utilisation of natural resources is a cornerstone of Uganda’s approach to biodiversity conservation and provides the strategic link between conservation and long-term equitable benefit sharing. Sustainable utilisation thus needs to be promoted across all sectors (see sections ... in action plan).

Fair and equitable benefit-sharing from the use of biodiversity with special emphasis on genetic resources: Access and benefit sharing is considered a key instrument to ensure that communities benefit from the commercialisation and use of their natural resources. Institutional structures; increased funding and mechanisms for research and development; and increased awareness are all necessary so that the potential of ABS can be harnessed (see strategic objective 4 Section 6.3.4).

D. Approach to mainstreaming

A three phase approach to mainstreaming biodiversity is proposed as presented in Table 7 below covering:

- Phase 1: Making the case: poverty-biodiversity linkages
- Phase 2: Integrating biodiversity into national development processes
- Phase 3: Building implementation capacity

Simplified approach to mainstreaming biodiversity

Phase 1: Preparatory phase: Making the case: Poverty-Biodiversity linkages	Phase 2: Integrating biodiversity into national development processes	Phase 3: Building implementation capacity
Preliminary assessments Review policy processes Identify key poverty-biodiversity linkages	Country-specific evidence Integrated ecosystem assessment Economic analysis and valuation studies	Poverty-biodiversity monitoring Indicators and data collection
Show contribution of biodiversity to economic development	Influencing policy processes National processes NDPs/MDGs/Vision 2040	Budgeting and financing for biodiversity management Budget processes and finance options

Awareness raising and partnership building General Consensus and commitment	Policy interventions and programme integration of biodiversity Strategies and policy reforms	Policy and programme implementation Sectoral and local implementation
Institutional and capacity development Undertake needs assessment	Institutional and capacity development Targeted capacity building	Institutional and capacity development Longer-term strengthening
Stakeholder engagement and in-country donor coordination Involve lead agencies and other actors: Environment, finance, planning, statistics, Parliament, Inter-sectoral committees Non-Governmental Actors: Academic Institutions, private sector, civil society, media, and general public Donors: Bilateral and Multi-lateral in-country donors		

E. Institutional framework for mainstreaming

Mainstreaming requires a well-defined institutional framework to coordinate the effective integration of biodiversity issues into sectoral plans and strategies. The TWG and TCBDC are appropriate structures to convey the importance of biodiversity to the different sectors and to facilitate improved coordination of activities. It is furthermore a useful platform for integrating biodiversity considerations and opportunities into national, sectoral and local policies, plans and programmes, including those relating to poverty eradication, socio-economic development, health and natural resource management. Some of these institutions have been described in Chapter 1 of the NBSAP. Special mention should be made on the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development as well as the National Planning Authority as these are extremely crucial for the success of any mainstreaming effort.

F. Tools for mainstreaming

A variety of tools will be pursued through NBSAP2 to effectively mainstream biodiversity issues across the Ugandan society, including the following:

- **Sensitization of key stakeholders:** Communication and Dissemination is a key tool for the successful mainstreaming of biodiversity. This area is covered extensively in Objective 5 (CEPA strategy).
- **Valuations of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services:** Economic evaluations of biodiversity and ecosystem services are important tools to demonstrate the importance of biodiversity to other stakeholders and decision makers. Valuations of biodiversity through natural resource accounts has been carried out in Uganda in a few isolated studies but not on a regular basis and the results are not adequately fed into the conventional national economic accounts or disseminated to key stakeholders. This is a key target area for improvement under NBSAP2.
- **Penalties:** Possible mechanisms for penalties and incentives must be investigated as part of the implementation of mainstreaming. Penalties should be linked to strict law

enforcement around issues such as permits and quotas for the harvesting of natural resources as well as the enforcement of environmental management plans for entities such as companies and local authorities. Strengthened legislative instruments and enforcement capacity to promote sustainable development through EIAs. EIAs are mandatory for all activities that have significant negative impacts on the environment. They include environmental descriptions of the project area and the potential environmental impacts of the particular development. EIAs have been useful in improving our knowledge of local biodiversity including plant and animal species. A major challenge for the successful implementation of EIAs is that their outcomes and resulting environmental management plans are weakly monitored by NEMA and lead agencies due to limited funding as well as their limited enforcement capacity.

Decentralization Process: Through the Decentralization Policy (1993), Government empowered Districts to plan at the district and lower local government levels and to manage environmental and sectoral natural resources such as forestry and wetlands. With this process lies an opportunity for effective implementation of NBSAP2 at District and grass roots level through the District Development Plans and Sub-county Development Plans.

Annex 4: Current Global Environment Facility support for biodiversity conservation & other environment management projects in Uganda

GEF-5 Allocation and Utilization Summary (All amounts in US\$)

Focal Area	STAR GEF-5 Indicative allocation	Allocation utilized	PIFs cleared by CEO awaiting approval	Allocations remaining to be programmed
Biodiversity	3,830,000	3,830,000	0	0
Climate Change	4,640,000	3,821,000	0	819,000
Land Degradation	2,220,000	1,210,000	0	1,010,000
Total	10,690,000	8,861,000	0	1,829,000

All focal areas are still within budget for Uganda (GEF 5, 2010 – 2014).

GEF-4 Allocation and Utilization Summary (All amounts in US\$)

Focal Area	GEF-4 Indicative Allocation*	Allocation Utilized	PIFs cleared by CEO awaiting approval	Allocations remaining to be programmed
Biodiversity	3,900,000	2,402,500	0	1,497,500
Climate Change	3,200,000	2,516,400	0	683,601

* Individual Allocation Countries (Biodiversity & Climate Change) The indicative allocations for all countries were recalculated at the midpoint of GEF-4, as per Council decision, and these revised amounts and other details of the reallocation are available here. Individual allocation countries can access up to their revised indicative allocation, within the limits of available funding. GEF 4: 2006 - 2010

Annex 5: Selected donor funded biodiversity conservation-related projects in Uganda, 2009 -2014

NDP Sector	Name of Intervention	implementation Agency	Key Objectives and activities	Year	Donors	Amount\$
Forestry	Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation Project	Ministry Of Water & Environment	Forestry Support including Community Watershed Management and Tree Planting and Agricultural Enterprise Development	End 2012	Bilateral - AfDB	62.1
Forestry	Sawlog Production Grant Scheme	NFA/MWE	Support to private sector tree planting for timber	End 2012	Multilateral European Commission	19.3
Environment	Mt. Elgon Region Environment Conservation	NEMA/Min of Environment	Conservation of the vulnerable Mt Elgon Region	Ended 2011	Bilateral DFID	9.2
Environment	Conservation of Biodiversity in the Albertine Rift Forests of Uganda	Ministry of Environment	Conserve and manage rich biodiversity forests in the Albertine Rift of Uganda, allowing sustainable development for all stakeholders.	Ended 2011	Bilateral - UNDP	3.4
Environment	Extending protected areas through community based initiatives (COBWEB)	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	To strengthen the Ugandan National Protected Area (PA) network by expanding the coverage of the PA network to include the country's biologically important wetland ecosystems. The project will develop, pilot, and adapt suitable PA management paradigms in two representative wetland systems adjacent to two terrestrial protected area networks.	Ended 2011	Bilateral - UNDP	1.0
Environment	Enabling environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)	The objective of the project is to provide land users and managers with the enabling policy, institutional and capacity environment for effective adoption of SLM within the complexity of the cattle corridor production system, achieved through 3	2014	Bilateral - UNDP	2.2

NDP Sector	Name of Intervention	Implementation Agency	Key Objectives and activities	Year	Donors	Amount\$
			major outcomes plus a project management component.			
Environment	Territorial Approach to Climate change project (TACC)	Mbale District Local Government	This project will assist the Mbale region of Uganda, encompassing the three districts of Mbale, Manafwa and Bududa, to realize low carbon and climate change resilient development. Towards this objective, the project will assist the Mbale region to develop their Integrated Territorial Climate Plan (ITCP), to fully integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies into their regional development planning;	Ended 2012	Bilateral – UNDP/DFID/Welsh Assembly Government	0.8
Tourism	Wildlife, Landscapes and Development for Conservation (WILD)	Wildlife Conservation Society	(1) Biodiversity Management; (2) Environmental Education and Communication; (3) Property Rights and Resource Governance; and (4) Improved Livelihoods.	Ended 2010	Bilateral – WILD	4.8
Tourism	Sustainable Tourism in the Albertine Rift (STAR)	WCS, AWF; Global Sustainable Tourism Alliance	(1) Conserve Mountain Gorilla habitat and Northern Albertine Rift	Ended 2010	Bilateral – USAID	6.8
Environment	Environmental Management and Capacity Building II Additional	National Management Authority	To support sustainable management of environmental and natural resources at the national, district, and community levels.	Ended 2011	Bilateral – World Bank	15.0
Environment	Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use Project	UWA/Min of Tourism	Ensure effective long term conservation of Uganda's biodiversity through sustainable and cost effective management of its wildlife and cultural resources.	Ended 2010	Bilateral – World Bank	27
Environment	GEF: Protected Areas Management and Sustainable	UWA/Min of Tourism	Ensure effective long term conservation of Uganda's biodiversity through sustainable and cost effective management of its wildlife and cultural resources.	Ended 2010	Bilateral – World Bank	8.0

NDP Sector	Name of Intervention	implementation Agency	Key Objectives and activities	Year	Donors	Amount\$
	Use Project					
Environment	Second Environmental Management and Capacity Building	Ministry Of Water, Lands And Environment	To support sustainable management of environmental and natural resources at the national, district, and community levels.	Ended 2010	Bilateral – World Bank	37

Source: MFPED 2013

Annex 5

ELEMENTS OF STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

VISION

Biological diversity is adequately protected from any adverse effects of living modified organisms

MISSION

To strengthen global, regional & national action and capacity in ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health and specifically focusing on transboundary movements

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
<p>Focal area 1:</p> <p>Facilitating the establishment and further development of effective biosafety systems for the implementation of the Protocol</p> <p>To put in place further tools and guidance necessary to make the Protocol fully operational</p>	<p>Full implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety by Parties</p> <p>Enhanced performance by Parties towards the attainment of the overarching objectives of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity</p>	<p>1.1 National Biosafety Frameworks</p> <p>To enable all Parties to have operational national biosafety frameworks in place for the implementation of the Protocol</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions regarding the safety of a living modified organism are based on established regulatory and administrative rules consistent with the Protocol • Biosafety issues and the implementation of the Biosafety Protocol are integrated into the relevant sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties, in particular centers of origin, that have in place national biosafety legislation and implementing guidelines not more than 6 years after accession to/ratification of the Protocol • Percentage of the Parties that have in place administrative rules and procedures for handling notifications and requests for approval of imports of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing; contained use and for introduction into the environment • Percentage of Parties that have designated national focal points and competent national authorities • Percentage of Parties that have received notifications in accordance with Article 8 of the Protocol or appropriate domestic legislation. • Percentage of Parties that have taken import decisions in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol or appropriate domestic legislation.

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>1.2 Coordination and support</p> <p>To put in place effective mechanisms for developing biosafety systems with the necessary coordination, financing and monitoring support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved understanding of the capacity-building needs of developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition • A cohesive approach and effective mechanisms established for biosafety capacity-building • Parties have adequate and predictable financial and technical resources to enable them to implement their obligations under the Protocol in an integrated and sustainable manner • National biosafety capacity-building strategies and action plans by each Party in place and implemented • Existing resources and opportunities leveraged and more effectively used • Improved coordination and collaboration between Parties and entities implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties that have assessed their capacity-building needs, including training and institutional needs, and submitted the information to the BCH not more than 3 years after accession to/ratification of the Protocol • Percentage of the Parties that have developed national biosafety capacity-building action plans for implementing the Protocol • Percentage of the Parties that have in place training programmes for personnel dealing with biosafety issues and for long-term training of biosafety professionals • Percentage of Parties that have in place national coordination mechanisms for biosafety capacity-building initiatives • Amount of new and additional financial resources mobilized for the implementation of the Protocol • Number of Parties that have predictable and reliable funding for strengthening their capacity in implementing the Protocol • Number of Parties reporting that their capacity-building needs have been met • Number of cooperative arrangements

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved coordination and collaboration between LMO importing and exporting Parties 	reported involving LMO exporting and importing Parties
		<p>1.3 Risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>To further develop and support implementation of scientific tools on common approaches to risk assessment and risk management for Parties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on risk assessment and risk management including guidance on new developments in modern biotechnology • Common approaches to risk assessment and risk management established and adopted by Parties and other Governments, as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties adopting and using guidance documents on risk assessment and risk management for the purpose of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Performing their own risk assessment and risk management; ○ Evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers. • Percentage of Parties adopting common approaches to risk assessment and risk management • Percentage of Parties that undertake actual risk assessment pursuant to the Protocol.

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>1.4 LMOs or traits that may have adverse effects</p> <p>To develop modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modalities developed and put in place • Parties enabled to identify, assess, and monitor LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, developed by Parties and available • Number of Parties that have the capacity to identify, assess and monitor living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking into account risks to human health.

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>1.5 Liability and Redress</p> <p>To adopt and implement the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Party takes administrative and legal measures necessary to implement the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at the domestic level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entry into force of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol • Percentage of Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety having in place national administrative and legal frameworks incorporating rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage caused by living modified organisms
		<p>1.6 Handling, transport, packaging and identification</p> <p>To enable Parties to implement the requirements of the Protocol and COP-MOP decisions on identification and documentation requirements for living modified organisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All shipments of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, contained use or intentional introduction into the environment are identified through accompanying documentation in accordance with the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties that put in place documentation requirements for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing • Percentage of Parties that put in place documentation requirements for living modified organisms for contained use and for intentional introduction into the environment • Number of Parties with access to tools that are capable of detecting

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
			<p>requirements of the Protocol and COP-MOP decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to use and reliable technical tools for the detection of unauthorized LMOs are developed and made available • Existing guidance for handling, transport and packaging of LMOs is used 	<p>unauthorized LMOs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties using guidance developed for the handling, transport and packaging of LMOs
		<p>1.7 Socio-economic considerations</p> <p>To, on the basis of research and information exchange, provide relevant guidance on socio-economic considerations that may be taken into account in reaching decisions on the import of living modified organisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer reviewed research relevant to socio-economic considerations, taking into account the modality of peer review as specified in section E, Annex III of decision VIII/10 • Guidelines regarding socio-economic considerations of living modified organisms developed and used, as appropriate, by Parties • Socio-economic considerations applied, where appropriate, by Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of peer reviewed research papers published, made available and used by Parties in considering socio-economic impacts of LMOs • Number of Parties reporting on their approaches to taking socioeconomic considerations into account • Number of Parties reporting on their experiences in taking socio-economic considerations into account in reaching decisions on import of living modified organisms • Number of Parties using guidelines on socio-economic considerations

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>1.8 Transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures</p> <p>To develop tools and guidance that facilitate the implementation of the Protocol's provisions on transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties enabled to manage LMOs in transit • Guidance developed to assist Parties to detect and take measures to respond to unintentional releases of living modified organisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties having in place measures to manage LMOs in transit • Percentage of Parties having in place measures for contained use • Percentage of Parties using the guidance to detect occurrence of unintentional releases of living modified organisms and being able to take appropriate response measures

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
<p>Focal area 2:</p> <p>Capacity building</p> <p>2. To further develop and strengthen the capacity of Parties to implement the Protocol</p>	<p>Increased safety in the transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</p> <p>Effective and efficient regulatory, administrative and monitoring frameworks established by Parties for the implementation of the Protocol</p> <p>Necessary mechanisms put</p>	<p>2.1 National Biosafety Frameworks</p> <p>To further support the development and implementation of national regulatory and administrative systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Biosafety Frameworks developed and implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties with operational regulatory frameworks • Number of Parties with functional administrative arrangements

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
	<p>in place to enable Parties to make science-based risk assessments</p> <p>More transparent and expeditious decision-making</p> <p>Full use of information exchange systems</p>	<p>2.2 Risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>To enable Parties to evaluate, apply, share and carry out risk assessments and establish local science-based capacities to regulate, manage, monitor and control risks of LMOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources, including human resources required to assess risks of living modified organisms are available and administrative mechanisms are in place • Training materials and technical guidance on risk assessment and risk management developed and used by Parties • Infrastructure and administrative mechanisms established for the management of risks of living modified organisms at national, subregional or regional level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs on the BCH • Number of risk assessment summary reports in the BCH that are in compliance with the Protocol • Number of people trained on risk assessment, as well as in monitoring, management and control of LMOs • Number of Parties that have infrastructure, including laboratories for monitoring, management and control • Number of Parties that are using the developed training materials and technical guidance • Number of Parties that are of the opinion that the training materials and technical guidance are sufficient and effective

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>2.3 Handling, transport, packaging and identification</p> <p>To develop capacity for handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customs/border officials are able to enforce the implementation of the Protocol's requirements related to handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms • Personnel are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of customs officers and laboratory personnel trained • Percentage of Parties that have established or have reliable access to detection laboratories • National and regional laboratories certified with the capacity to detect LMOs • Number of certified laboratories in operation
		<p>2.4 Liability and Redress</p> <p>To assist Parties to the Protocol in their efforts to establish and apply the rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from the transboundary movements of living modified organisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An institutional mechanism or process identified or established to facilitate the implementation of the international rules and procedures on liability and redress at the national level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of eligible Parties that received capacity building support in the area of liability and redress involving living modified organisms • Number of domestic administrative or legal instruments identified, amended or newly enacted that fulfill the objective of the international rules and procedures in the field of liability and redress
		<p>2.5 Public awareness, education and participation</p> <p>To enhance capacity at the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties have access to guidance and training materials on public awareness, education and participation concerning the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties having in place mechanisms for ensuring public participation in decision-making concerning LMOs not later than 6 years after accession to/ratification of the

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		national, regional and international levels that would facilitate efforts to raise public awareness, and promote education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs	<p>safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties are enabled to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in biosafety 	<p>Protocol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties that inform their public about existing modalities for participation • Number of Parties having in place national websites and searchable archives, national resource centres or sections in existing national libraries dedicated to biosafety educational materials
		<p>2.6 Information sharing</p> <p>To ensure that the BCH is easily accessed by all established stakeholders, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to information in the BCH and sharing of information through the BCH by users in developing countries and countries with economies in transition • Tools to facilitate implementation of the Protocol are easily accessible through the BCH • Information on the BCH is easily accessible to stakeholders including the general public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of submissions to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition • Amount of traffic from users to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>2.7 Biosafety education and training</p> <p>To promote education and training of biosafety professionals through greater coordination and collaboration among academic institutions and relevant organizations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustainable pool of biosafety professionals with various competencies available at national/international levels • Improved biosafety education and training programmes • Increased exchange of information, training materials and staff and students exchange programmes among academic institutions and relevant organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of academic institutions by region offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes • Number of biosafety training materials and online modules available

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
<p>Focal area 3:</p> <p>Compliance and review</p> <p>To achieve compliance with and effectiveness of the Protocol</p>	<p>Parties are in compliance with the requirements of the Protocol</p>	<p>3.1 Compliance with the Protocol</p> <p>To strengthen the mechanisms for achieving compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Party fully implements its obligations and regularly monitors the implementation of its obligations under the Protocol • Improved reporting by Parties including by submitting complete and timely national reports • All Parties able to enforce their regulatory frameworks and decisions • Sufficient financial resources are allocated to compliance • The Compliance Committee is able to thoroughly review the implementation of obligations by Parties and to propose appropriate measures • Supportive role of the Compliance Committee is improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties that have identified and addressed their non-compliance issues • Number of Parties having approved and functional national legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol • Percentage of Parties that designated all National Focal Points • Number of Parties having in place a system for handling requests including for Advance Informed Agreement • Percentage of Parties that published all mandatory information via the BCH • Number of Parties having in place a monitoring and enforcement system • Number of national reports received under each reporting cycle • Number of Parties able to access financial resources to fulfill their obligations under the Protocol

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>3.2 Assessment and review</p> <p>To improve the effectiveness of the Protocol, including through regular assessment and review processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment and review of the Protocol, including its procedures and annexes, are undertaken on a regular basis • The Protocol, including its procedures and annexes, is adapted if new challenges are brought about by new developments in the field of modern biotechnology or to adapt to challenges of implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of assessment reports submitted and reviews published • Number of Parties modifying their national biosafety frameworks to correspond with amendments to the Protocol adopted to address new challenges

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
<p>Focal area 4:</p> <p>Information sharing</p> <p>To enhance the availability and exchange of relevant information</p>	<p>Transparency in the development and use of LMOs</p> <p>Increased compliance with national and international requirements</p> <p>Informed decision-making</p> <p>Enhanced public awareness of biosafety</p>	<p>4.1 BCH effectiveness</p> <p>To increase the amount and quality of information submitted to and retrieved from the BCH</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BCH is recognized as the most authoritative repository of information on biosafety • Information submitted to the BCH is accurate, complete and timely • A larger number of countries submit and retrieve information • Risk assessment reports are shared in a timely manner through the BCH • Facilitated access to resources and experiences related to biosafety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs • Number of publications contained in the Biosafety Information Resource Centre • Amount of traffic from users to the BCH • Number of references to the BCH • Number of countries with focal points registered on the BCH • Number of countries/regions having published biosafety laws and or regulations on the BCH • Number of AIA/domestic decisions available through BCH • Number of users of the BCH requesting improvement on accuracy, completeness or timeliness of information

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
		<p>4.2 BCH as a tool for online discussions and conferences</p> <p>To establish the BCH as a fully functional and effective platform for assisting countries in the implementation of the Protocol</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countries are better equipped with tools made available through the BCH • The BCH principles of inclusiveness, transparency and equity are applied consistently • Protocol discussions and negotiating processes facilitated through the BCH • Increased awareness of the BCH in different stakeholder groups and regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of online discussions and real-time conferences carried out through the BCH platform • Percentage of Parties participating in online discussions and real-time conferences on the BCH • Number of participants in online discussions and conferences, their diversity and background • Number of capacity building activities aimed to increase the transparency, inclusiveness and equity of participation in the BCH
		<p>4.3 Information sharing other than through the BCH</p> <p>To enhance understanding through other information exchange mechanisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing enhanced at regional, national and international biodiversity and biosafety meetings • Different modalities and opportunities used to share biosafety related information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of events organized in relation to biosafety • Number of biosafety related publications shared

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
Focal area : 5 Outreach and cooperation To expand the reach of the Protocol and promote cooperation	Increased political support for the implementation of the Protocol Increased support from and collaboration with relevant organizations, conventions and initiatives for the implementation of the Protocol	5.1 Ratification of the Protocol To achieve global recognition of the Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity become Parties to the Protocol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity that become Parties to the Protocol
		5.2 Cooperation To enhance international cooperation and collaboration in biosafety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official relationships established with secretariats of other conventions and organizations • Secretariat of the CBD invited as an observer to WTO SPS and TBT Committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of established relationships with other conventions as reflected in joint activities
		5.3 Communication and outreach To raise the profile of the Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach services of the Protocol enhanced among relevant national and international stakeholders • All Parties have designed and implemented education and communication strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of national awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety • Percentage of Parties that have in place national communication strategies on biosafety not later than 3 year after having adopted national biosafety laws

<i>Strategic Objective</i>	<i>Expected Impacts</i>	<i>Operational Objectives</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biosafety issues and Protocol activities are regularly covered by local as well as international media • Increased understanding of the relationship between the Protocol and the CBD and other biosafety-related agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties that have in place national biosafety websites, including national BCH nodes that are accessible to and searchable by the public • Number of Parties with awareness and educational materials on biosafety and the Protocol available and accessible to the public, including the diversity of these materials