

# Stakeholder Consultation and Feedback Virtual Meeting TEEB for Agriculture and Food, Uganda

27<sup>th</sup> September 2021, EAT 11:00

## Key Summary

- Political stakeholders to the TEEB AgriFood project in Uganda convened virtually to discuss the scoping report prepared by the research partner, the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI).
- NBI proposed to model ecosystem services under three alternate scenarios concerning policy interventions, land cover change, and the environmental protections in the Mabamba Bay Wetland System: green; grey-green and grey.
- Stakeholders advised that the legal status of Mabamba Bay Wetland System and associated implications for land use be factored into scenario modelling.
- The list of ecosystem services in the Mabamba Bay Wetland System will need to be refined based on data availability and policy priorities.
- The next step is for NBI to submit a complete draft of results, which will be shared with the wider stakeholder group for discussion and review at the next consultation and feedback meeting.

---

## Opening Remarks

1. Opening the event, **Mr. William Speller** (UNEP TEEB) first called for a round of introductions and provided the context to the project, indicating that a couple of workshops and stakeholder consultation meetings<sup>1</sup> had already taken place. The Food Systems Summit<sup>2</sup>, taken place on September 23<sup>rd</sup>, also provided a strong narrative basis, as member states, civil society, and the private sector have come together to address the challenges surrounding the food and agricultural sector globally. As such, the TEEBAgriFood Uganda project fits strongly with the call for action, whose overall objective seeks to measure the overall trade-offs as implicit in policy choices with regards to food and agricultural development.
2. TEEB has been working in Uganda since December 2020, with partnership with the stakeholders and has partnered with the Nile Basin Initiative to undertake the technical research. However, the critical part of the TEEBAgriFood framework is to ensure that the work is driven by the demands and needs of the stakeholders, with strong policy relevancy, and helps to inform decision-making to those who need the information. As such, the objective of the meeting seeks to take stock of the feedback from stakeholders, and particularly the political stakeholders from the Ugandan Ministries.

## Nile Basin Initiative, Presentation

For the full presentation and scoping report, please see <http://TEEBWeb.org>.

3. On behalf of the Nile Basin Initiative research team, **Mr. Leonard Akwany** (NBI) presented on the scoping report for the TEEBAgriFood Study for the Mabamba Bay Wetlands scenario analysis, as based upon the TEEBAgriFood evaluation framework for policies for urban and peri-urban agriculture and wetland restoration.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://teebweb.org/our-work/agrifood/country-implementation/small-grant-projects/uganda-sgp/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.un.org/en/food-systems-summit>

4. The study site was first introduced for the Mabamba Wetland System and the associated administrative jurisdictions; Wakiso and Mpigi. The study approach was also introduced, remarking upon the four capitals to be assessed as part of the TEEBAgriFood Evaluation Framework. With specific regard to societal and human capital, the study will be assessed in the context of One Health, community livelihoods, land rights and tenure issues, food security, and farmers cooperatives.
5. The methods that will be employed to support the project were discussed, including: stakeholder mapping and analysis; land-use and cover mapping; mapping of ecosystem services and valuation; identification and mapping of urban and peri-urban agricultural value chains; literature reviews and stakeholder consultations; and the scenario analysis of policy options for development pathways. In particular, the InVEST (Integrated valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs) modelling software will be used to run indicative models on ecosystem services, as dependent upon data availability.
6. Mr. Akwany discussed the situational appraisal for the Mabamba Bay Wetlands, outlining the power dynamics between the stakeholders at the site, the agricultural systems present, the relevant national and local policies, and the drivers of ecosystem change at site-level. The ecosystem services identified as part of the consultations were similarly listed and contextualised by the stakeholders to whom the services were most utilised by.
7. Finally, the three policy scenarios options were discussed, with acknowledgement of the drivers of change being population increase, urbanisation, and climate change impacts.
  - I. *Business as Usual Scenario (BAU)*
    - This is the baseline projected scenario with no intervention.
    - The Mabamba Bay Wetlands exhibit a high land cover change to arable land, and a greater amount of encroachment of unsustainable agricultural and settlements due to the growing demands of agriculture and food production.
  - II. *Alternative Green Scenario*

The Mabamba Bay Wetlands exhibit a low land cover change to arable land, as there is sound land use planning, biodiversity protections, and green infrastructure development. The development of an agricultural production system is equally resilient, with a strong enforcement of policies and regulations.
  - III. *Alternative Green-Grey Scenario*

The Mabamba Bay Wetlands exhibit a medium land cover change to arable land, and there is an optimal expansion of sustainable UPA. A hybrid develop is evidenced in both conservation and sustainable UPA growth, with only a moderate Mabamba Wetlands encroachment.
8. To close, Mr. Akwany highlighted the targeted questions which the Nile Basin Initiative would find the most useful from the political stakeholders in the open-floor discussion.
  - Are there any critical capitals or associated elements not captured?
  - Have there been other agricultural systems not captured?
  - Have there been any other stakeholders not captured?
  - Can recommendations for data sources (e.g. spatial data and shapefiles) be provided?
9. Mr. Eugene Muramira (Nile Basin Initiative) provided additional comments, highlighting that further field assessments will continue to take place this week, and productive consultation meetings have taken place with the Wetlands Management Department of the Ugandan

Ministry of Water and Environment. Going ahead, there will be effective support provided in consultations at the field-level and through technical support by provisioning of mapping.

10. Notably, the designated Ramsar site area in the Mabamba Bay has been revised and expanded, therefore new mapping resources will be provided and integrated into the study design and application. The NBI team have also been advised of a number of people who have also been working at the district-level, including the District Environmental Officers and Natural Resources Officers in Wakiso, who will be important institutional sources of contact.
11. Regarding urbanisation and settlements, the NBI team has been focusing on the major towns to apply the study application (Mpigi, Wakiso, Kampala, and Entebbe), however there are a number of urban growth centres which are driving change upon the Mabamba Bay wetlands which will be given further assessment and modelling attention in the study. Such include towns on Bussi Island (Bussi-Seeta, Tebankiza-Bwaise, Bugera, and Kinywante).

### Open Floor Remarks and Discussion

12. **Ms. Lucy Iyango** (Wetlands Management Department, Ministry of Water and Environment) firstly revisited Mr. Muramira's discussion on the revised Ramsar designation site area and the reviewed site management plan which would be provided to the NBI team. This will seek to answer any issues concerning stakeholders, to provide an update on the current land use practices taking place at the site-level, and finally, provide details on the expanded boundary of the Ramsar site. Otherwise, Ms. Iyango reflected that the information has been well-captured by the presentation.
13. **Mr. Nathan Mununuzi** (Ministry of Water and Environment) also reflected that the information has been well-captured, and highlighted in sufficient detail, however a few concerns must be raised. Firstly with most importance, that the Mabamba Bay is a Ramsar designated site and the legal aspects surrounding the land use activities. They expect to obtain and have addressed the information concerning all activities and land use claims, ensuring that they meet the legal requirements. This will be critical for the study and scenarios that are designed and developed in the applications.
14. Mr. Mununuzi also raised the concern that the drivers of urbanisation, as closely related to the issues of urban population growth, must seek to address the concerns of agricultural urbanisation, in addition to the urbanisation of settlements and construction activities. Projections made in development of the scenario analysis must therefore be cognisant that priorities in urbanisation and growth may differ in the future, from what is proposed in the present. At the catchment level, Mr Mununuzi noted that it may also be useful to think about what can be addressed in the surrounding neighbourhoods to the Mabamba Bay Wetlands. Such may include agricultural activities taking place off the wetland, instead leaving the site intact and only tapping the water for irrigation.
15. Finally, Mr Mununuzi remarked that the National Environmental Policy of 2017 should be instead corrected to 1994. The one currently addressed may be a policy which is under review and has not yet been uploaded by the Cabinet.
16. **Mr. Fred Muwanika** (National Environmental Management Authority) raised concerns on the legal restrictions on all activities taking place at the Mabamba Bay Wetlands Ramsar site which do not comply with conservation priorities, echoing Mr. Mununuzi's concerns. As such, the scenario design taking into account different types of activities do not arise, as the site is already protected against such agricultural and urbanisation activities. Mr. Muwanika similarly advised that when assessing UPA, it entails for the production of agriculture in small spaces outside of wetland areas, without the issues of encroachment.

17. Regarding the report, Mr Muwanika acknowledged the wetland production functions which were listed for assessment and enquired about the sources of data to obtain this information. The data from existing household surveys (such as those from Kammengo and Kasaje) are not representative enough to draw inference on such wetland production functions. The same can be implied for data concerning water use and water availability in the system, when data should reflect not only the end-user, but the inputs from the system.
18. Mr Muwanika finally reflected upon the stakeholders providing inputs in the study, where valued perspectives could be obtained from the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry, and Fisheries (MAAIF) and the peoples who are running and managing the Ramsar site to obtain balanced opinions.
19. Mr. Speller reflected that the list of ecosystem services which have been preliminarily chosen for assessment are comprehensive, and may require a focused re-prioritisation given time, modelling, and data availabilities. Mr. Akwany noted the key understanding of legal protections of Ramsar sites and where this could be better articulated and emphasized in the reporting and scenario design. In particular, the Mr. Akwany asked for clarification on the protections provided by Ramsar-listed sites and whether it serves as only a designation for human activities to also take place, as personally seen in other East African countries and Ramsar sites.
20. Ms. Iyango detailed that a Ramsar site that is designated as an international site of importance, mainly due to the unique biodiversity that is contained therein and is protected against activities which are ecologically corrupt. More widely, all wetlands in Uganda, both with and without Ramsar protections, are protected by Ugandan policies. It is important to acknowledge this and integrated in the scenarios. Ms. Iyango also encouraged the NBI to take note of the main stakeholder in Mabamba which maintains an important control, the Catholic Church.
21. Mr. Akwany also acknowledged the comments made concerning a catchment-wide approach to assessing the wetland functions and activities, where the mapping considerations will be reflected to address this. The issues of data availability will also be addressed in the coming weeks as the available resources will be assessed, and the types of data available (proxy or otherwise).
22. Mr. Muramira acknowledged that NBI and the scenario analysis would address the land use and resource use transgressions that occur on the Mabamba Bay Wetlands, under the designations of protection. The study would also consider the interactions at the Ramsar site and the different parameters that have been identified, such as land use change. Regarding the data availability, Mr. Muramira highlighted that there may be reliance upon secondary data where primary data is not available, however the productivity of the wetlands can be assessed and estimated by the fieldwork activities led by NBI.
23. Ms. Iyango further suggested the NBI team to draw upon the National Environmental Act 2019 which has already been operational, as opposed to the policy which may be changed.
24. [Mr. Levis Kavagi](#) (UNEP Africa) highlighted the wetlands work undertaken by UNEP in Uganda, leading to the Presidential Directive on Wetlands, and where wetland data availabilities could be provided to NBI where possible as a result. A team in Uganda and NEMA was trained in data interpretation and assessment as part of this work, and so connections could be made in this regard. Another point was raised by Mr. Kavagi, noting that countries are obliged to establish protections and conservation measures upon changes in protection designation from wild lands, thereby granting automatic protections. This aspect of Ramsar designated sites should be taken into consideration as such. To this, Ms. Iyango clarified that although Ramsar sites are not legally protected areas, they are obligations that a country has to fulfil once it has declared the existence of a Ramsar site to prevent

ecologically corrupt activities from taking place. Major transgressions would otherwise lead to the country being removed from the Montreal Record, as the Ramsar site is protected as well at an international level due to the composition of unique biodiversity at the site.

25. Mr. Kavagi particularly noted the challenges observed as part of the assessment of wetlands leading to the Uganda Wetlands Atlas (Volume I and II)<sup>3</sup>, where the activities have such a great impact and advancement that restoration to return the site to original conditions is impossible. This is a consideration that was acknowledged by the government in their assessment, and it may be equally important to consider for the NBI-led study.
26. The GEF-funded UNDP project<sup>4</sup> was also raised in conversation by Mr. Kavagi, and whether there is overlap with the TEEBAgriFood application in the Mabamba Bay Wetlands. Ms. Iyango clarified that there is no overlap, as the GEF-funded project is taking place in the Eastern and South-western part of Uganda and applied in 22 districts. However, the revised Mabamba Bay management plan addresses the concerns of threats and conflicts, and will be able to further inform the NBI project.
27. Mr. Speller thanked the colleagues for the discussion, and revisited to the issue of legalities for activities and the status of the Ramsar site and Mabamba Bay area, remarking that this is an issue that comes up frequently in the application of the TEEBAgriFood Framework. The work predominately taking place concerns scenarios, and must be presented and treated as such. It is acknowledged that the scenarios create attention towards activities may be in contravention with national obligations and law, and this is similarly observed in other TEEB project countries, however the challenge here lies in the presentation and description of scenarios and results to prevent the perceived advocacy of illegal activities. This is a discussion that can continue to take place with the NBI team as the scenarios and parameters are refined.
28. Ms. Sassen (UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre) further remarked that scenarios are designed as plausible futures, and does not suggest that futures should be moving towards a certain direction. Scenarios are designed with a particular purpose in mind, and from a wetlands conservation perspective, it could be important to include scenarios with negative impacts to showcase undesired futures and their implications on various ecosystem services, both locally and more broadly for Uganda and the obligations towards international conservation entities such as the Ramsar Convention. Scenarios are meant to explore potential sustainability implications of various outcomes.
29. Mr. Speller added that scenarios may also be useful to make the case for enforcement, or to meet obligations under the Ramsar Convention by showing the impacts on ecosystem services if the obligations are not met. By presenting these results we can make this case, and it is where the communications of results may be an important element to involve.
30. Ms. Iyango highlighted the last comment, indicating that we must be clear about what the scenarios are going to be used for and the objectives of such scenarios. Mabamba Bay was also highlighted as an Important Bird Area (IBA), as well as a Ramsar-listed Wetland of International Importance. The Ramsar Convention does not negate the coexistence of humans and the environment, however it encourages this in the wise use principles – (1) integrity of the wetlands, (2) benefits to the people, and (3) the posterity of these benefits.

---

<sup>3</sup> Uganda Wetlands Atlas, Volumes I and II:

<https://www.ug.undp.org/content/uganda/en/home/library/SustainableInclusiveEconomicDevelopmentProgramme/UgandaWetlandsAtlas-Volumell.html>

<sup>4</sup> GCF “Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda.” <https://www.greenclimate.fund/project/fp034>

Once this comes out clearly in the articulation of the study design and application, the message will instead draw more attention to conservation than the degradation of the site.

31. Mr. Speller finally remarked on the parallel UNEP Economy Division project taking place, also regarding UPA in Kampala. There is a large scope for collaboration and information sharing, and will seek to have their participation in meetings going ahead.

## Next Steps

32. Mr Speller outlined the next call for the wider TEEBAgriFood Uganda project team to take stock of the preliminary results in about one month's time. In the meantime, the NBI continue to discuss with stakeholders in Uganda, to further refine the scenarios, and to take into account the revised management plan, dimensions of the National Environment Act, the Ramsar designation and legalities, and the data needs and availabilities.
33. Mr Akwany similarly concluded, thanking and acknowledging to take on board the stakeholder's comments as provided. The study intends to clarify and refine the scenarios to align best with the policy priorities, meanwhile emphasising the wetlands in their designation for the conservation of the environment, the flora and fauna, and importance for human livelihoods.

---

## Appendix

### Appendix 1: Participants List

#	Name	Affiliation
1	Fred Roland Muwanika	National Environmental Management Authority, Uganda
2	Leonard Akwany	Nile Basin Initiative
3	Levis Kavagi	UNEP Africa
4	Lucy Iyango	Ministry of Water and Environment
5	Maroushka Kanywani	Nile Basin Initiative
6	Eugene Telly Muramira	Nile Basin Initiative
7	Naomi Young	UNEP TEEB
8	Nathan Mununuzi	Ministry of Water and Environment
9	Patrick Mwesigye	UNEP Africa
10	Peter Businda	Rikolto
11	Marieke Sassen	UNEP WCMC
12	William Speller	UNEP TEEB