

Strengthening local organisations gives farmers more say in local policy

RIU

Validated RNRRS Output.

Rural livelihoods are improving thanks to stronger social capital and the creation of conditions in which local people can help to start and effect policy change. Despite recent decentralisation, local communities in the highlands of Uganda were still not able to influence policy and the take-up of new natural resources management solutions. To be effective, decentralisation must be supported by strong local institutions or mature social capital. This methodology is used by professionals working with rural communities to improve their livelihoods using participatory approaches. It is currently used by CIAT's Enabling Rural Innovation project in Uganda, Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, D.R. Congo, Rwanda and Burundi.

Project Ref: **NRSP17:**

Topic: **6. Promoting Success: Partnerships, Policy & Empowerment**

Lead Organisation: **CIAT, Uganda**

Source: **Natural Resources Systems Programme**

Document Contents:

[Description](#), [Validation](#), [Current Situation](#), [Current Promotion](#), [Impacts on Poverty](#), [Environmental Impact](#),

Research into Use

NR International
Park House
Bradbourne Lane
Aylesford
Kent
ME20 6SN
UK

Geographical regions included:

[Africa](#),

Target Audiences for this content:

[Crop farmers](#), [Livestock farmers](#), [Fishers](#), [Forest-dependent poor](#),

Description

NRSP17

A. Description of the research output(s)

1. Working title of output or cluster of outputs.

Strengthening Social Capital for Improving Governance of Natural Resources in Highlands of Eastern Africa

Working title: **Strengthening Social Capital for NRM**

2. Name of relevant RNRRS Programme(s) commissioning supporting research and also indicate other funding sources, if applicable

RNRRS Programme: Natural Resources Systems Programme (NRSP),

Other funding sources: East and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA)

3. Provide relevant R numbers (and/or programme development/dissemination reference numbers covering supporting research) along with the institutional partners (with individual contact persons (if appropriate)) involved in the project activities. As with the question above, this is primarily to allow for the legacy of the RNRRS to be acknowledged during the RIUP activities

R7856 and R8494

Partner institutions and contacts

1. International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)

Dr. Pascal C. Sanginga (Project Leader)

Senior Scientist

Email: P.Sanginga@cgiar.org

P.O. Box 6247, Kampala,

UGANDA

Mob Tel : +256 77 531055

Office Tel: +256 (41) 567670 (general); +256 (41) 566749 (direct)

Fax: +256 (41) 567635

2. Africa Highlands Initiative (AHI),

Rick N. Kamugisha

Research Associate

rnkamugisha2000@yahoo.com

3. Natural Resources Institute (NRI), University of Greenwich

Adrienne M. Martin

Principal Scientist and Leader Livelihoods and Institutions Group

Email; A.M.Martin@greenwich.ac.uk

4. Describe the RNRRS output or cluster of outputs being proposed and when was it produced?

For more than two decades, **participatory methodologies** have proved effective in enabling people to take greater control of the development process. However, there is still a critical gap for participatory research to address **policy change**, or how to build new policies for improved **natural resources management (NRM)**. Recent **decentralisation** efforts have shown good potential for greater participation of local communities in the policy decision-making process. However, decentralisation has not resulted in improvements in NRM, nor has it affected the capacities of local communities to influence policy and adopt **NRM innovations**. To be effective, decentralization must be supported by strong **local institutions** or mature social capital. **Social capital** is an important asset upon which poor people who largely depend on the natural resource base draw in pursuit of their livelihood objectives, and for ensuring greater **inclusiveness** of the rural poor in development and policy interventions. Therefore, strengthening social-capital and creating conditions in which local people are able to participate in policy processes to initiate and effect policy change is a key strategy for improving **rural livelihoods**.

R7856 (2000-2004) aimed at strengthening farmers' organisations and rural community capacities to initiate, formulate, review and implement community byelaws that promote the **adoption and wider impact** of NRM innovations in the **highlands of Uganda**. Through participatory **social learning processes**, the pilot communities developed six different **byelaws** for NRM, which were implemented with different levels of success and produced different **outcomes**. Research increased understanding of how the different dimensions of social capital are activated in the pursuit of livelihood outcomes, and particularly how access to (or exclusion from) social capital can assist or impede access to other forms of capital, and hence influence livelihood choices and outcomes.

One year later, a **tracking** study (2005) was undertaken to investigate and document the generic and specific **outcomes**, potential impacts and conditions for sustainability of strengthened social capital. Results revealed considerable improvements in different components of **rural livelihoods**. However, a major finding was that the main outcome of increased social capital is generally the production of more social capital. Social capital can be not only productive, but also persistent. With an appropriate catalyst, social capital can become an important factor that enables poor people who are largely depend on natural resources to improve their livelihoods. The output was produced between 2002 and 2006.

5. What is the type of output(s) being described here?

Product	Technology	Service	Process or Methodology	Policy	Other -Please specify
			x	x	

6. What is the main commodity (ies) upon which the output(s) focussed? Could this output be applied to other commodities, if so, please comment

Natural Resources Management (soil and water conservation). The methodologies and processes for understanding and building social capital and linking with policy formulation and decision making, are relevant to other contexts where common pool resource management policy could be positively influenced by local people's

participation or where other types of community action could lead to positive policy change in support of sustainable livelihoods.

7. What production system(s) does/could the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options. Leave blank if not applicable

Semi-Arid	High potential	Hillsides	Forest-Agriculture	Peri-urban	Land water	Tropical moist forest	Cross-cutting
x P	x	x	x P		x P	x P	

The output is not system specific, but is relevant for a range of production systems where community consensus and policy decisions are fundamental in influencing natural resources management and sustainability.

8. What farming system(s) does the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options (see Annex B for definitions).

Leave blank if not applicable

Smallholder rainfed humid	Irrigated	Wetland rice based	Smallholder rainfed highland	Smallholder rainfed dry/cold	Dualistic	Coastal artisanal fishing
			x	x P		

9. How could value be added to the output or additional constraints faced by poor people addressed by clustering this output with research outputs from other sources (RNRRS and non RNRRS)? (max. 300 words).

A key challenge in broadening the impacts of this output like any other policy related output, is time, continuity, resources and commitment to sustain such processes and linking with national level policy structures. One important consideration for adding value should therefore be to promote continuity of the approaches and dissemination of the lessons learnt, by developing wider institutional partnerships for uptake promotion, validation, adaptation and up-scaling of project outputs in other districts, institutions and organisations both in Uganda and other countries. Broadening this analysis over time to include lasting livelihood changes and attributing impacts to different dimensions of social capital, or their combinations is still an important challenge.

Given that effective innovation in the policy and institutional arenas is generally location and context specific, understanding the scaling up process and the sustainability of such intensive social learning processes in different institutional, political, production and farming systems would clearly add value to the present outputs. Understanding and promoting the conditions under which such participatory processes could transform into functional innovation platforms for articulating demand from communities and for providing quality services to rural communities is an important area for comparative action research. Post-project tracking will further document the actual outcomes and ultimate impacts of project's outputs, both on natural resources and on poorer households.

Please specify what other outputs your output(s) could be clustered. At this point you should make reference to the circulated list of RNRRS outputs for which proformas are currently being prepared.

There are possible links between our “use of social capital” output and a number of NRSP’s output clusters: improving NRM through CBM and PAPD; community-led improved NRM; policy knowledge for alternative NR livelihoods; public governance mechanisms for NRM, and improving NRM strategies and access to CPRs.

The results, products and lessons learned from R7865 (Scaling up process), R8381 (Uptake promotion), R8362 (community led mechanisms), R8258 (Decentralized environmental decision-making); and R 8334 (Building and sustaining consensus for change) have potential to add value and address some of the above constraints.

Validation

B. Validation of the research output(s)

10. How were the output(s) validated and who validated them? (max. 500 words).

The outputs have been validated and adapted in four different ways: action research in existing and new sites; studies and surveys on social capital and byelaws effectiveness; capacity building workshops; publications and communication in seminars, conferences and meetings involving different stakeholder groups. A set of action research projects on collective action and participatory decision-making for byelaw formulation and implementation were conducted in Uganda (Kabale and Kapchorwa), Ethiopia (Ginchi and Areka), Tanzania (Lushoto) and Rwanda by AHI national research and development partners with funding from the Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI www.capri.org), and the European Union through the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa. These projects aimed to establish mechanisms and platforms for collective decision-making and for linking community byelaws to government processes for formulating and implementing byelaws and local policies for improving watershed management and sustainable land management in the highlands of Eastern Africa.

In Uganda, a survey covering 36 districts, by the International Food Policy Research Institute, was inspired by the outputs of this project. It aimed to assess the level of awareness and participation in formulation and implementation of byelaws in NRM and examined relationships between poverty levels, social capital and byelaw effectiveness. The study validated some of the findings with regard to the effectiveness of byelaws and role of social capital. At the international and regional level, the CAPRI recently organised a CGIAR wide workshop on byelaws. The CGIAR Science Council has also recognized the importance of research work on rural institutions and their governance as a key priority area (5C) for sustainable production, natural resources management and livelihoods improvement. Recently, the World Bank organized a workshop on mobilizing rural institutions for sustainable livelihoods and equitable development (www.mobilizinginstitutions.org), including a set of case studies in 8 countries.

The case study methodology and survey on social capital have been used by research and development partners in CIAT’s projects in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Uganda and Kenya. A collaborative project of the African Soil Biology and Fertility Network (AfNet) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) that is being implemented in six African countries (Uganda, Kenya, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Ghana and Burkina Faso) has

included and adapted the social capital methodology in their project areas. Similarly, the Consortium for Improving Agricultural-based Livelihoods in Central Africa (CIALCA) used this methodology for baseline and participatory rural appraisal exercises in Rwanda, DR Congo and Burundi. These baselines were targeted to male and female headed households, farmers associations and rural communities.

Several training workshops have also been organised to build capacities of national research and development partners in participatory approaches for facilitating community visioning and action planning; and for strengthening social capital of rural communities. These include the Rural Sector Support Project (RSSP) and ISAR in Rwanda for their watershed management projects. Several other agricultural research and development organisations, government extension staff in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Uganda, DR Congo, Mozambique, etc. were trained in community visioning and participatory action planning. As the result of this training, many of the participants have conducted participatory diagnosis and implemented action plans with rural communities.

11. Where and when have the output(s) been validated? (max 300 words).

Outputs	Where	Production and Farming Systems	Countries
Strengthening Social Capital	<p><u>Uganda</u>: Kabale, Hoima, Masindi, Mukono, Tororo,</p> <p><u>DR Congo</u>: Sud-Kivu, Nord-Kivu, Bas-Congo</p> <p><u>Rwanda</u>: Umutara, Kibungo, Ruhengeri, Byumba, Kigali-Ngali, Gitarama, Gikongoro, Kibuye</p> <p><u>Malawi</u>: Dedza, Ukwe, Kasungu</p> <p><u>Zimbabwe</u>: Kadoma</p> <p><u>Mozambique</u>: Buzi, Beira</p> <p><u>Ghana</u>: Tamale</p> <p><u>Burundi</u>: Kirundo, Gitega, Bujumbura</p> <p><u>Tanzania</u>: Lushoto, Arumeru, Hai, Moshi, Morogoro, Tanga</p>	<p>Hillsides High potential</p> <p>Smallholder rainfed highland</p> <p>Semi-Arid</p>	Uganda, Rwanda, DR Congo; Malawi, Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Burundi
Participatory byelaw formulation	Kabale, Kapchorwa Lushoto, Arumeru Umutara, Butare, Ruhengeri Ginchi, Areka	Cross-cutting	Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, Ethiopia

Community visioning and Planning	Uganda: Kabale, Hoima, Masindi, Mukono, Tororo, DR Congo: Sud-Kivu, Nord-Kivu, Bas-Congo Rwanda: Umutara, Kibungo, Ruhengeri, Byumba, Kigali-Ngali, Gitarama, Gikongoro, Kibuye Malawi: Dedza, Ukwe, Kasungu Zimbabwe: Kadoma Mozambique: Buzi, Beira Ghana: Tamale Burundi: Kirundo, Gitega, Bujumbura Tanzania: Lushoto, Arumeru, Hai, Moshi, Morogoro, Tanga	Cross-cutting Semi-Arid	Rwanda, DR Congo; Uganda, Malawi, Tanzania, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Burundi
Conflict management	Kabale, Kapchorwa, Kisoro, Karamoja; Tana River,	Cross-cutting Smallholder rainfed highland High potential Hillside	Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, Kenya, Madagascar

Current Situation

C. Current situation

12. *How and by whom are the outputs currently being used? Please give a brief description (max. 250 words).*

These outputs are primarily used by community development professionals and agricultural researchers who work with rural communities to improve their livelihoods using participatory approaches. These include community development workers, extension officers, agriculture and NRM researchers, rural service providers, local government planners and policy makers, as well as leaders of farmers' associations.

The outputs have been used in a number of different ways, including:

- Designing and facilitating the process of community visioning and community action planning.
- Training workshops and courses on approaches, tools, skills and principles for designing and implementing a participatory process of community planning.
- Designing and conducting surveys and action research by integrating more innovative participatory approaches and process-oriented methodologies and for engaging with rural

communities to plan agricultural and development projects.

- Conducting participatory planning in agricultural and NRM and sustainable development initiatives;
- Strengthening community capacity and empowering farmers and rural communities to value the best of what they have, and to seek more of it;
- Establishing dialogue with rural communities and stimulate self-awareness and collective learning and analysis of livelihood assets, opportunities, strategies and outcomes;
- Facilitating the development of community action plans based on desired future conditions and livelihood opportunities;
- Catalyzing policy dialogue and linking bottom-up processes to higher level policy processes, stimulating participatory policy analysis, supporting policy action and policy process management.

13. *Where are the outputs currently being used? As with Question 11 please indicate place(s) and countries where the outputs are being used (max. 250 words).*

Outputs	By Whom, When and Where	How
Methodology for diagnosis and assessment of social capital	CIAT's Enabling Rural Innovation (ERI) RDC When: From 2004 to date Where: Uganda, Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, DR Congo, Rwanda, Burundi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify what 'social capital' exists over what socially differentiated groups, and how it can be strengthened or built where necessary • To indicate which strategies for improving NR management and productivity have relevance for which groups and what additional policy changes and capacity building are needed for their implementation? • To illustrate how social capital, informal social networks and formal organizations influence access to resources and the outcomes of their utilisation; how some people can pursue a trajectory of increasing assets while others are unable • To guide in the development of approaches that strengthen the capabilities of men and women to engage in new forms of association that can be a forum for their democratic participation and influence over wider policy processes in support of natural resources management.

Community Visioning Guide	African Soil Fertility Network of the Tropical Soil Biology Institute (TSBF) in Harare (2-13 October 2006), and in Nairobi.... Catholic Relief Service CIAT Learning Alliance CARITAS Burundi CIALCA RSSP ICRA-ARC	In September 2006, we facilitated a workshop where A total of 34 scientists and community development workers from Kenya, Uganda, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Ghana and Burkina Faso were trained in visioning and participatory approaches for working with farmers, including facilitating policy dialogue at local levels Research and Development partners in Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Tanzania are increasingly using the “The Power of Visioning” as an innovative approach for conducting participatory diagnostic and for engaging with rural communities to identify opportunities and facilitate community action planning for change to achieve better livelihood outcomes.
Participatory byelaws formulation and implementation	African Highlands Initiative DFID NRSP	Brief on Linking research, policy and livelihoods: challenges and contradictions
Tracking social capital outcomes	CIAT	This output is integrated in the community-based participatory monitoring and evaluation systems implemented at different levels with ERI partners in Malawi, Uganda, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. CAPRi partners have also used this output to document the negative outcomes of social and institutional innovations

14. *What is the scale of current use? Indicating how quickly use was established and whether usage is still spreading (max 250 words).*

These outputs are being currently used at different scales, by a variety of partners for different purposes:

- Household level (baseline and farm and household level surveys)
- Farmers groups (strengthening organisational capacity)
- Community or village (for developing community visions of desired future conditions and community action plans, conflict management and formulating byelaws for improving natural resources management)
- Watershed (involving several communities and villages for collective action,
- Districts (for policy dialogue and participatory byelaw formulation)
- Institutional level (in identifying research areas and priority setting, developing proposals, designing research on social capital, training and building capacity, supporting research and development projects in selected benchmark sites)
- Regional (through comparative action research case studies supported for example by AHI in

Uganda, Tanzania and Ethiopia; or baseline studies by CIALCA in Rwanda, DRC and Burundi)

- International level through publications in international journal, participation and presentation in scientific meetings and international conferences

15. *In your experience what programmes, platforms, policy, institutional structures exist that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the output(s) proposed here and in terms of capacity strengthening what do you see as the key facts of success? (max 350 words).*

The programmes and institutions listed above (CIAT, TSBF, CRS, CARITAS Burundi, CIALCA, ICRA-ARC, AHI, and DFID NRSP) have been important in assisting with promotion and adoption of the outputs. The growing emphasis on rural institutions in the international policy context has also stimulated interest in the project experience. Capacity strengthening of national research and development partners has focused on building hands-on facilitation skills for community visioning and action planning. Key factors in success include ensuring full involvement and commitment of stakeholders at different levels, and redefining the role of communities and the state in a dynamic way.

Current Promotion

D. Current promotion/uptake pathways

16. *Where is promotion currently taking place? Please indicate for each country specified detail what promotion is taking place, by whom and indicate the scale of current promotion (max 200 words).*

Countries	By Whom	Scale of promotion
Rwanda	Rural Sector Support Project	Nation-wide capacity building of 20 local development organisations
Rwanda	ISAR	Scientists in national programmes and research stations and their NGO partners and local government
Uganda	NARO AFRICARE UEEF Africa2000Network	Rural communities and community-based organisations Community Development Facilitators
Malawi	DARS Plan International	District level and institutional level; Community Development Facilitators; National Scientists; Department of Agricultural Research Services.
Zimbabwe	TSBF	National partners, NGO, Agricultural technical and Extension Department (AGRITEX)
Mozambique	TSBF CARITAS	Non Governmental Organisations

Ethiopia, Tanzania, Uganda , Rwanda	Africa Highlands Initiative	Regional with national agricultural and extension services
DR Congo	CIALCA	Rural communities; NARS and NGOs
DR Congo, Rwanda, Uganda	FARA-SSA CP	Regional, Lake Kivu Pilot Learning site

17. *What are the current barriers preventing or slowing the adoption of the output(s)? Cover here institutional issues, those relating to policy, marketing, infrastructure, social exclusion etc. (max 200 words).*

The policy and institutional frameworks in some countries (e.g. DR Congo, Kenya, Zimbabwe, and Malawi) do not provide a very fertile environment for the participation of local communities and their local stakeholders in the policy process, as is the case in Uganda where the outputs were developed. To be effective, participatory byelaw formulation and implementation need decentralisation with effective devolution of power to lower levels. Another barrier is related to the limited human capacity at different levels, from farmers groups, rural service providers to policy makers and government institutions (e.g. Rwanda, Malawi, Burundi, DRC) which results in slow adoption and use of the outputs.

The benefits of such social processes and NRM technologies are not immediate and require time to be seen.

18. *What changes are needed to remove/reduce these barriers to adoption? This section could be used to identify perceived capacity related issues (max 200 words).*

Building the capacity of people and institutions should be considered as an integral function of putting research into use. This should involve action research and social learning processes to identify means of strengthening rural organizations and their governance mechanisms and processes, and the influences they exert because of their increased bargaining power. Few institutions have the capacity to meet all the varied challenges associated with strengthening social capital, NRM, policy processes and participatory decision-making. Forming local multi-stakeholder partnerships or innovation platforms where local, national, regional and international stakeholders interact, is the means to address complex issues related to institutional and policy change. A further need is for action research into mechanisms and processes for strengthening decentralisation, and promoting innovative institutional arrangements and policy options that promote the role that rural institutions and their governance

The dynamics of power and politics in policy processes should not be overlooked. Identifying and supporting individual champions and engaging with the factors influencing their actions and building constituencies for change are critical to ensuring sustainability of policy processes. If researchers wish to influence policy, they must be able to diagnose the relevant policy environment to identify key points of leverage, and recognize short-term opportunities associated with related legislative calendars, planning and budgeting activities, changes in key leadership positions, political appointments and government personnel; identifying and capitalizing on crisis situations. Reaching and influencing policy-makers depends on a number of key issues including: building effective networks of influence, identifying and supporting champions of NRM initiatives at various levels of local government who demonstrate keen interest for advancing policies that promote NRM. These political and community leaders consistently play an important role in any policy and community initiatives. It is important to note however, that Influencing policy may take at least as long again as conducting research. This requires time, continuity and commitment to influence policy change,

19. *What lessons have you learnt about the best ways to get the outputs used by the largest number of poor people? (max 300 words).*

- Building capacity of “implementers” and providing incentives for implementation through small grants and other mechanisms.
- Facilitating more interactive platforms for sharing information and knowledge
- Developing manuals and field guides, and other communication materials
- Supporting collaborative and comparative research involving a number of stakeholders and institutions.

Impacts on Poverty

E. *Impacts on poverty to date*

20. *Where have impact studies on poverty in relation to this output or cluster of outputs taken place? This should include any formal poverty impact studies (and it is appreciated that these will not be commonplace) and any less formal studies including any poverty mapping-type or monitoring work which allow for some analysis on impact on poverty to be made. Details of any cost-benefit analyses may also be detailed at this point. Please list studies here.*

The poverty impacts of social processes are usually long-term and need more complex procedures to measure. Unlike physical and natural capital, which are usually tangible and obvious to external observers, social capital is not as easy to find, see, and measure. Social capital, by contrast, may be almost invisible unless serious efforts are made to inquire about the ways in which individuals organize themselves and the mechanisms and norms that guide their behaviour. However, R9484 was a “tracking” study intended to provide the evidence-base for the uptake and dissemination of the processes and approaches for strengthening social capital.

Results show that strengthening social capital has had positive outcomes on at least three key components of sustainable livelihood assets: social, human, and natural capitals. There was evidence of significant improvements in social capital expressed in terms of sustained participation in mutually beneficial collective action, participation in byelaw implementation, increased cooperation and compliance with byelaws, networking and linking with the local government structures and other rural service providers. One key outcome of the project was improvement in human capital, expressed as increased awareness, skills and knowledge; changes in behaviour and attitudes, self respect and self worth, ability and confidence to speak in public, and to effectively participate in decision-making. Most farmers interviewed (95.6%) indicated that women’s participation in community activities over the last three years had improved. In two of the four communities, women groups have been awarded district tenders for maintaining rural feeder roads. While men have succeeded in getting their wives (41.4%) to effectively participate in the community byelaws meetings, only 13.7% of women have managed to convince their husbands to participate. A number of women were holding leadership responsibilities in their respective groups, despite low literacy levels. Through improving social capital, particularly aimed at increasing women’s involvement, and increasing dialogue between researchers, policy makers and local communities, local stakeholders have been able to better understand NRM issues and actively improve local policies. Strengthening social capital has also increased the ability of local communities to manage conflicts, minimize their destructive

effects, and transform conflict situations into opportunities for mutually beneficial collective action. Tangible outcomes of the participatory byelaw formulation and implementation process relate to adoption and use of soil conservation measures.

21. *Based on the evidence in the studies listed above, for each country detail how the poor have benefited from the application and/or adoption of the output(s) (max. 500 words):*

- *What positive impacts on livelihoods have been recorded and over what time period have these impacts been observed? These impacts should be recorded against the capital assets (human, social, natural, physical and, financial) of the livelihoods framework;*
- *For whom i.e. which type of person (gender, poverty group (see glossary for definitions) has there been a positive impact;*
- *Indicate the number of people who have realised a positive impact on their livelihood;*
- *Using whatever appropriate indicator was used detail what was the average percentage increase recorded*

These two outputs are relatively recent (2000-2005) and no livelihood impact study has been conducted in countries where they are being used. However, a recent study of sustainable land management in Ethiopia (Amede et al. 2006) showed that ensuring full involvement and commitment of stakeholders at different levels, building the capacity of local institutions, and redefining the role of communities and the state in a dynamic way are essential prerequisites for success.

Environmental Impact

H. Environmental impact

24. *What are the direct and indirect environmental benefits related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 300 words)*

The two projects dealt with the issues of overcoming land degradation in the intensively cultivated and densely populated highlands of Eastern Africa where major environmental degradation (soil erosion, deforestation, wetlands reclamation, bush fire...) is occurring in the midst of rural poverty. The more widespread awareness of NRM byelaws and the dissemination of appropriate technologies have resulted in soil erosion control and sustainable management of natural resources. Both the Ugandan tracking study and the Ethiopian case study showed that strengthening social capital and empowering rural communities to participate in policy formulation and implementation has considerable positive outcomes on sustainable land management through collective action in tree planting, terracing, erosion control, fire control, etc. Results show that the project increased the ability of local communities to manage conflicts, minimize their destructive effects, and transform conflict situations into opportunities for collaboration for mutually beneficial collective action.

25. *Are there any adverse environmental impacts related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 100 words)*

No

26. *Do the outputs increase the capacity of poor people to cope with the effects of climate change, reduce the risks of natural disasters and increase their resilience? (max 200 words)*

A systems approach for climate change adaptation should emphasise action research to build local community capacity, planning and governance of NR, and identifying creative points for livelihood improvement. These outputs are useful in understanding how social capital can be activated and mobilized to cope with climate change. The two outputs contribute to strategies, approaches and institutions that can help poor people to strengthen their organizational capacities to adapt to climatic variability, and develop community strategies, mechanisms and regulations (byelaws) that help them to adapt and cope with climate change.

Strengthening adaptive capacity of communities in face of climate change requires building and strengthening local institutions and their governance mechanisms to and building their collective capacity for social resilience. The community visioning approach emphasises building on capabilities and assets of the poor, and for empowering poor people to take advantage of opportunities. Climate change may bring increased incidence of conflicts, as people compete for the reduced natural resources to survive and improve their livelihoods. Byelaws constitute alternative mechanisms, norms and regulations to prevent and manage such conflicts.
