

**Advocacy and Influencing Impact Reporting Tool: CARE International in Uganda: Focus on FOREST Programme  
Advocacy outcomes – July 2018**

Success:	
<p>1. What is the advocacy or influencing win? Include details such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of the win, and how it was achieved</li> <li>• start date and end date</li> <li>• any incremental wins that happened along the way</li> <li>• the main decision makers that CARE influenced to achieve this win</li> </ul> <p>2. Why is this advocacy or influencing win significant? What was the reality prior to the advocacy/influencing win that the win aims to address?</p> <p>3. If this win is part of a larger advocacy or long-term program goal, please describe the larger advocacy/influencing goal?</p>	<p><i>CARE International in Uganda has been implementing The Forest Resources Sector Transparency Programme (FOREST) in partnership with national civil society organisations. The advocacy campaign was premised on 2 campaign agenda: Forest financing and strengthening Law Enforcement, with the key message being “Save Forests, Save Humanity”. The advocacy activities started June 2013 and ended December 2017.</i></p> <p><i>The advocacy win was about cancellation of 154 land titles that had been issues in Central Forest Reserves (CFRs). Issuance of land titles in CFRs was done irregularly because of corruption and lack of transparency in the forestry sector. The titles were given to powerful individuals and companies. This denies opportunities to communities mainly women to access benefits and resources from CFRs for household needs.</i></p> <p><i>The main decision makers who were influenced are the Ministry of Water and Environment, National Forestry Authority, Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development to cancel all titles in the Central Forest Reserves that have been issued</i></p> <p><i>Other stakeholders were the media to amplify forest law enforcement and governance issues, putting them onto the public agenda for public debate and putting more pressure to the duty bearers to take action.</i></p>
Contribution:	
<p>4. On a scale from high, medium, or low, how would you rate CARE’s contribution to the advocacy/influencing win? <i>(please refer to the scale below the table)</i></p> <p>5. Describe CARE’s contribution, specify CARE’s unique role as well as the role of other main actors including partner organizations and coalitions.</p> <p>6. What evidence is there that supports our claim to have contributed to this win?</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>CARE’s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Commissioned journalists who conducted investigations that unearthed the corruption that was leading to issuing land titles in Central Forest Reserves.</i></li> <li>• <i>Trained journalists on forest laws and policies to understand the principles and the gaps in the practise.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provided financial resources to the CSOs.</i></li> <li>• <i>Technical assistance in reviewing documentation to offer a balance of persuasion rather than confrontation in advocacy.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Anti-Corruption Coalition Uganda(ACCU):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Organising Dialogue meetings with Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, National Forestry Authority and other relevant agencies.</i></li> <li>• <i>Additional Evidence gathering on illegal land acquisition in central forest reserves.</i></li> <li>• <i>Follow up meetings and discussions with key decision makers.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Water and Environment Media Journalists Network (WEMNET):</b></p> <p><i>Conducted investigations and continuously amplified forest governance deficits in the forest sector, corruption and rights abuse in prominent print and audio media outlets.</i></p>
Potential Impact/Reach:	

<p>7. What is the impact population that is expected to benefit from the advocacy/influencing win? Describe how the win will translate into a better life for these participants?</p> <p>8. If the change we have influenced is fully implemented, can you quantify the number of lives that could potentially be reached by this advocacy win? <i>Please explain how you calculated this number.</i></p>	<p><i>Women and men adjacent central forest reserves. They will be facilitated to negotiate legitimate access to resources including land for tree growing that will later facilitate economic benefits for the participation households. At least 1000 men and women are expected to benefit directly and 5000 dependants will benefit indirectly.</i></p>
<p><b>Actual Impact/Reach:</b></p>	
<p>9. Do we have any evidence to date that these expected outcomes have been achieved? If so, please describe how the win has translated into a better life for the impact population.</p> <p>10. Can you quantify the number of lives that have been improved? <i>Please explain how you calculated this number.</i></p>	<p><i>We shall undertake monitoring in 2018</i></p>
<p><b>Reflection and Learning:</b></p>	
<p>11. What were the main challenges you faced, and were they overcome? If so, how?</p> <p>12. What influencing tactics were particularly effective/ineffective?</p> <p>13. What would you do differently next time?</p> <p>14. What are the next steps or follow-up actions for this advocacy/influencing win?</p>	<p><i>Some of the officials in the government agencies connive with land grabbers and hence lack of accountability of the institutions. The challenge was overcome by building a critical mass among CSOs. All CSOs were rallied behind the cause. The Uganda Forest working group particularly submitted a petition to back up ACCU.</i></p> <p><i>The tactics that worked was evidence gathering, publication of issues briefs and continuous engagement with strategic and key departments that were mandated to make decisions.</i></p> <p><i>The next steps to follow up is field validation of whether actions have been taken towards remove of land grabbers and communities are beginning to participate in decision making.</i></p>

**Rating scale<sup>1</sup>:**

High: There is reason (evidence) to believe that the change would not have happened without CARE's efforts. This could also include significant actions from partners which we support technically or financially.

Medium: There is reason to believe CARE contributed substantially, but along with other partners

Low: CARE was one of a number of actors that contributed, but this change may have happened regardless of CARE's involvement

<sup>1</sup> This rating scale has been used by Save the Children to measure contribution in advocacy work