



MAKERERE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF FORESTRY AND NATURE CONSERVATION  
UGANDA FORESTRY RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONS CENTER  
P.O. BOX 7062 KAMPALA  
Tel: 256-41-543204, 543647/8  
Mobile: 077- 441-993  
E-mail: [ufric@starcom.co.ug](mailto:ufric@starcom.co.ug)



---

## NAJJAKULYA PRIVATE FOREST SITE REPORT: THIRD VISIT - 2005

By

Members of Uganda Forestry Resources and Institutions Center (UFRIC)

The Members of the team include, Dr. Gombya-Ssembajjwe (*Team Leader*), Dr. Y. A. Banana (*Co-Team Leader*), Mr. Bahati Joseph (*Forester*), Ms. E. Namubiru, Mr. Daniel Waiswa (*PRA*), Mr. Sekindi Serevest - (*Plant Specialist*) and Mr. Matovu Samuel (*Forest Specialist*).

---

For copies of this report, please contact Dr. Gombya-Ssembajjwe, Director, UFRIC: Makerere University, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Kampala, Uganda.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Pages</b>
Acknowledgement	3
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1 Location of the sites</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2 Objectives of the study</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0 DATA COLLECTION METHODS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.1 General</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.2 Forest sampling method</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.3 Socio-economic data</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.1 Forest Condition: Forest data</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.1.1. General comments on Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.0 The settlements history</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.1 Major changes in the settlement and the forest resources</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.2 Social status in settlement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.3 Location of Market</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.4 Kizziko B as a settlement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.5 Usergroup</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5.0 Forest Governance</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6.0 Problems faced by Najjakulya Private Forest</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7.0 Conclusions</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	
<b>Fig. 1 One of the several water points in Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Fig. 2 Regenerating forest in formerly encroached agric land</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Fig. 3 Pitsawing Activities in Najjakulya private forest</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Fig. 4 The Nothern side of the forest</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Fig. 5 The southern side of the forest</b>	<b>12</b>

### List of Tables

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Table 1.</b> Projected stem count and species richness in Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve	<b>9</b>
<b>Table 2</b> Stem counts at different growth levels	<b>10</b>
<b>Table 3</b> Five most represented species	<b>10</b>
<b>Table 4</b> Levels of disturbance	<b>11</b>

### List of Appendices

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Appendix 1:</b> Master species list of Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve – 2004 visit	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b> List of PRA participants	<b>21</b>

## **Acknowledgement**

The Uganda Forestry Resources and Institutions Center (UFRIC) research team is grateful to Ford Foundation for the financial support that enabled conducting the fieldwork. We are grateful for the co-operation and time spent by the local communities during the fieldwork. Last but not least, UFRIC research team is grateful to Makerere University, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation for the continued permission to allow us commit time off our academic schedule to carry out the fieldwork. Last but not least, we are grateful to Mr. Najjakulya (forest owner) for the cooperation and permitting us study the forest for the third visit.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Location of the sites**

Najjakulya Site consists of Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve. The forest is privately owned; therefore the use of the forest by the surrounding communities is principally non-timber use although timber harvesting was noticed. One settlement, Kizziko B, was studied as user settlement. The site is located between 0°10' S and 32° 10'E at an elevation of 1660m above sea level in Butambala County, Mpigi District. The forest is located on private land under mailo land tenure belonging to the Najjakulya family. Overtime, its existence has been justified for consumptive and non-consumptive purposes. The forest is located on a steep hill one and half kilometers from the Mpigi - Gombe road. Originally, this area was agricultural land for cotton production, but was abandoned due to reduced soil fertility and it later grew into a forest. Thus, Najjakulya forest is a colonising forest on abandoned cotton fields.

This report details the information captured during the third visit to the same forests, the first and second revisits having been done in 1994 and 2000 respectively.

The history of this forest, its use, past research efforts are documented by Gombya *et. al* 1995 and Gombya *et. al* 2000. During the 1995 visit, more evidence of timber harvesting was recorded. Same evidence was recorded during the 2000 revisit. However, during the 2005 visits, evidence of timber harvesting was noted in one isolated location in the northern part of the forest.

### **1.2 Objectives of the study**

The overall goal of UFRIC is to study and monitor the impact of institutional arrangement and incentives on forest resources in Uganda. UFRIC is an IFRI Collaborative Research Center.

For this study, the specific objectives were:

- ◆ Assess changes in the condition of Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve and local people's livelihoods since the last visit
- ◆ Identify and document strategies developed by members of the settlement to conserve the forest

- ◆ Identify measures taken by members to implement their strategies.
- ◆ Evaluate local communities dependency on these forests by valuing and quantifying the different products that are harvested from the forests.
- ◆ Determine stocking levels in the forest since last visit.

## **2.0 DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

### **2.1 General**

As in the previous visits, IFRI data collection instruments and methodology were used during the data collection process. This included gathering information using the site overview, settlement, forest, forest plots, user groups, forest products, forest-user group relationships, organizational inventory and inter-organizational arrangements forms.

The forest is about 50 hectares. In order to sample the representative sections of the reserve, the forest was first ground surveyed and as during the second revisit, six strata, based on location, management activities, vegetation type, encroachment, past research activities, and human settlement distribution were identified and sampled. To obtain an estimate of the plant species present, their size, densities and abundance, approximately 0.9 hectare of the forest was sampled in 30 randomly selected forest plots located in the different strata. The information obtained may be used in future to calculate a) biodiversity indices, b) estimate the availability of trees, sapling, and seedlings, or c) evaluate the forest for either teaching, conservation and research purposes. Being the third visit by the IFRI team, this information may be used for comparison with the information collected during the first visit and the second revisit.

### **2.2 Forest sampling method**

### *2.2.1 Reconnaissance*

Fieldwork started with a survey of the forest external boundary by the entire research team. Geographical Positioning System (GPS) positions at corner points were compared to those captured during the second revisit in 2000. Universal Thematic Mapper (UTM) format was used for recording the position. In sampling the forest, the team tried as much as possible to sample the plots previously sampled. But because of the forest crown cover in some plots (only two plots), the GPS readings were not registered.

### **2.3 Socio-economic Data**

Socio-economic data about Kizziko B settlement and their inhabitants was collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primarily, in-depth interviews/discussions and Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) were conducted at the home of the LC 1 chairperson's home located within the settlements. Both women, children, men and LC officials attended the PRAs. In total, the attendance was of good as the visit coincided with a dry spell that had rendered people less active in agricultural activities. Discussions mainly focused on general information such as the socio-demographic, produce harvested and occupational structure of the residents in the settlement and their previous and current use of the forest resource. Secondary sources included use of recorded information available with key informants (village officials), especially about the management history of the forests and the population of the two settlements. Information about the changes in the forest and the community were investigated as well.

## **3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **3.1: Forest Condition: Forest data**

#### *3.1.1 The General Condition of the Forest*

Najjakulya Forest (NF) is about 50 hectares and is located between 0.10N and 32.10E. It lies at 1668 meters above sea level. Unlike most of the other forests studied in Mpigi district, NF lies on a hill, Kiziiko, Kibibi subcounty, Butambala county. The population around the forest is

relatively heavy. Most of the surrounding communities rely on the forest for fuelwood. One major road passes on the edge of the reserve linking Kibibi and Katabira trading center. This road separates NF from Nakuzesinge Government Forest Reserve. The official boundary of Najjakulya Private Forest has generally not changed although the encroached areas recorded during the 2000 revisit had recovered to forest. The agricultural activities noted during the first and second visit had reduced. Consequently, the forest extent has changed

A cross-section of large poles, saplings, and seeding species are present. The external boundary is clearly marked, as one of the residents was able to locate the forest boundary with ease. The forest has no permanent water points, although one water point previously used as sacred positions was still intact (Figure 1). It requires periodic maintenance.



**Figure 1:** One of the water points (previously used as sacred) in Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve

In addition, agricultural encroachers, which was found during the 2000 revisit was not as common as then. In the previously encroached areas, there was no indication of garden maintenance. Therefore, there was adequate regeneration of native species noticed (Figure 2).



**Figure 2:** Natural regeneration in the previously encroached agricultural area

In comparison to the second re-visit in 2000, NF has improved in both forest quality and tree stem quantity. During the second re-visit more evidence of timber cutting were recorded than during this visit. Only one pitsawing bed was encountered (Figure 3).



**Figure 3:** Pitsawing activities in Najjakulya during the 2005 visit

### 3.1.3 The Condition of the Trees

The tree condition of NF has improved since the second re-visit in 2000. Within the 30 forest plots, there were 103 trees recorded. A total of 61 seedlings were recorded in the groundcover. In the sampled area of NF, 81 different species were recorded compared to 72 in 1995 and 86 recorded in 2000. Among the trees, the most common were *Sapium ellipticum* (Musasa); *Cathium vulgare* (unknown locally), *Lovoa brownii* (Nkoba) and *Piptadenia africanum* (Mpewere). An average of 5.9 tree stems per sampled plot was recorded with an average density of 192 tree stems per hectare estimated (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Projected stem counts and richness in Najjakulya Forest Reserves

	First visit		Second visit		Third visit	
	<i>Saplings</i>	<i>Trees</i>	<i>Saplings</i>	<i>Trees</i>	<i>Saplings</i>	<i>Trees</i>
Total Stem Count	119	211	127	135	141	178
Projected Stem Count/ha	989	813	872	1047	1215	1061
Species Richness	69	46	54	33	56	34
Mean DBH (cm)	3.1	29	3.1	17.9	3.2	19.1
Mean Height (m)	3	15	3	11.2	3.8	8.2
Mean basal area/ha (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.1	2.7	0.1	2.5	0.2	3
Mean volume/ha (m <sup>3</sup> )	1	42	1.1	38.1	1.4	46

### 3.1.4 Condition of Saplings

An average of 4.9 saplings per plot were recorded. The highest recorded sapling stem count were 12, found in plot 16. The mean diameter and height were 4.16cm and 3.4 m respectively (Table 1)

### 3.1.5 The Condition of the Groundcover (Herbs and Seedling stock)

There was great variation in species among the plants forming the undergrowth, with about 45 species recorded. Percentage vegetation cover varied considerably from plot to plot, with the highest covering 80 percent and the lowest covering 1 percent. *Clausena anisata* (unknown locally) was the most dominant. *Calcasia* sp. was the most frequent, represented in 11 plots. This was followed by *Leptacelium* sp. And *Pittosporum manii*, represented in 14 plots respectively. Other species with high groundcover percentage were *Aspiria mossambicensis*

(unknown locally) *Bidens pilosa* (Ssere), *Blighia unijugata* (Nkuzanyana) and *Asprenum* sp (unknown locally).

The results show that the tree stem cover decreased over the years after the first visit (Table 2). The increasing population in the surrounding communities in relation to the fixed or decreasing tree stock, increasing demand for housing and furniture and inadequately management of the forest, may partly explain the decrease. However, the sapling and ground stock increased.

**Table 2:** Stem counts at the different growth levels

Vegetation growth stage	1995	2000	2005
Ground cover	141	150	157
Saplings	120	141	145
Trees	194	178	198
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>500</b>

Furthermore, there were fluctuations of species represented at the different growth levels of the forest. Table 3 shows the five most represented species and their corresponding numbers at the different growth levels in 1995 and 2000 respectively.

**Table 3:** Five most represented species at the different growth levels

Growth stage	1995	2000	2005
Ground cover	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Clausena aristata</i></li> <li>2. <i>Pittosporum manii</i></li> <li>3. <i>Acalypha volkensii</i></li> <li>4. <i>Coffea conephora</i></li> <li>5. <i>Aspiria mossambicensis</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Acalypha volkensii</i></li> <li>2. <i>Aspiria mossambicensis</i></li> <li>3. <i>Clausena aristata</i></li> <li>4. <i>Coffea conephora</i></li> <li>5. <i>Pittosporum manii</i></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Leptacelium</i></li> <li>• <i>Cymopogon sp</i></li> <li>• <i>Hyperrhennis rufa</i></li> <li>• <i>Pittosporum manii</i></li> <li>• <i>Sapim ellipticum</i></li> </ul>
Saplings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Coffe conephora</i></li> <li>2. <i>Pittosporum manii</i></li> <li>3. <i>Maerua duchesnei</i></li> <li>4. <i>Cathium vulgare</i></li> <li>5. <i>Solanum gigantean</i></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Maerua duchesnei</i></li> <li>• <i>Coffe conephora</i></li> <li>• <i>Pittosporum manii</i></li> <li>• <i>Cathium vulgare</i></li> <li>• <i>Solanum gigantean</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Sapium ellipticum</i></li> <li>• <i>Rothmania sp</i></li> <li>• <i>Maerua duchsneri</i></li> <li>• <i>Harungana madagascariensis</i></li> <li>• <i>Canthium vulgare</i></li> </ul>
Trees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Cathium vulgare</i></li> <li>2. <i>Lovoa brownii</i></li> <li>3. <i>Sapium ellipticum</i></li> <li>4. <i>Piptadenia africanum</i></li> <li>5. <i>Antiaris toxicaria</i></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Sapium ellipticum</i></li> <li>• <i>Cathium vulgare</i></li> <li>• <i>Lovoa brownii</i></li> <li>• <i>Antiaris toxicaria</i></li> <li>• <i>Piptadenia africanum</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Canthium vulgare</i></li> <li>• <i>Sapium ellipticum</i></li> <li>• <i>Antiaris toxicaria</i></li> <li>• <i>Albizia coriaria</i></li> <li>• <i>Lovoa brownii</i></li> </ul>

Based on the increasing level of disturbance within the reserve, it is shown that agricultural encroachment, timber cutting and pole cutting had decreased, but firewood collection had increased. There was a decrease in number of plots showing natural tree deaths. Furthermore, evidence of charcoal burning had compared to the second revisit in 2000 (Table 4).

**Table 4:** Level of disturbance over the years (1995, 2000 and 2005)

Disturbance type	Year of visit		
	1995	2000	2005
Natural death	2	3	2
Charcoal burning	1	4	1
Agricultural	3	7	1
Fuelwood cutting	5	5	7
Pole cutting	6	4	2
Timber cutting	7	1	1

### 3.1.3.2 Other general observations for Najjakulya Private Forest

The results show that the vegetation cover on the southern side is quite different from the vegetation cover on the northern side (Figures 4 & 5).



**Figure 4:** Najjakulya Private Forest on the Northern side of the hill



**Figure 5:** Najjakulya Private Forest on the Southern side of the hill

What is observed in Fig. 4 is that there was a decrease in the total tree count and projected volume per ha during the second revisit compared to the first and third visits. This trend of decrease is also noticed in the general forest species richness, mean DBH, mean height and basal area. During the third visit, the results show a marked increase in all the tree parameter

Figure 4 above suggests a marked decrease in the saplings during the second revisit, but a gradual increase during the third visit. The natural regeneration in the previously encroached areas and the recovery in the harvested Pine plantation may be explaining this phenomenon.

#### **4.0 The settlement's history**

The history of Kiziiko settlement dates back to 1800 (in the pre-colonial period) during the period of Kabaka (title of the King of Buganda) Kimera. The Kabaka gave this settlement to one Najjakulya who was one of his drummers and thus the first settlers were the Kabaka's drummers. He belonged to the clan of Black and White colobus monkey. However, the 1900 Agreement gave this land to Katambala<sup>1</sup> as county chief's land. In 1920, Najjakulya bought

---

<sup>1</sup> Katambala is the title for the County chief of Butambala

the land from Katambala in order to claim property rights. Since then this forest belongs to the Najjakulya family, and whoever is in charge, generation after generation is referred to as a Najjakulya.

Kabaka Kimera gave authority to Najjakulya to manage the land and to administer the forest. Ever since, the head of the family (Najjakulya) is in charge of the forest. This organisation has been involved in governing this forest for a period of 60 years. During the first visit, the forest was under the management of the 6th descendant who did not show keen interest in its future. His sole excuse for selling away trees was the need for daily subsistence requirements. However, even when these were provided by his sons, who still continued with the practice (Personal Communication – Mr. Matovu Najjakulya, current forest owner and son of the late forest owner).

Originally, there was a small population but overtime; there have been fluctuations in populations of both humans and livestock. In 1920's, the population expanded as more people came in the area to cultivate cotton. Since then, the total number of households had been increasing as 30, 40, 50, 60, 60 and 70 for the years 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995 and 2000 respectively.

#### **4.1 Major Changes in the settlement and the forest resources**

During the first visit, an average of 360 residents of the settlement resided at an average distance of 1 km from the forest. On the second visit it was a total of 435 residents, while during the third visit, it was approximately 540 residents. Regarding the settlement pattern, it was noted during the first and second revisit that households were scattered in the settlement. On the third visit, it was noted that most of the households had shifted towards the road forming a nucleated settlement. Another significant change was the increase in the literacy level, as a result of the Universal Primary Education, which was effected in 1997. The number of children attending primary schools had increased.

During the first visit, the community was mainly depending on coffee growing but most of the households lost their plantations to the wilt disease. However, although Kiziiko B is a rural

nucleated settlement, it has a high potential for development since the settlers have shifted from traditional agriculture (i.e. growing bananas, cassava and sweetpotatoes) to growing crops such as tomatoes and green pepper, which have a high market value. In addition, as a marketing strategy, farmers have locally organized themselves and they sell their products jointly.

These joint ventures have contributed to improvement and development of new infrastructure in the settlement. For instance, during the first visit, the most frequent type of house was mud brick with corrugated or sheet metal roof followed by grass, stick, wattle with corrugated or sheet metal roofing and stone, concrete or brick house with corrugated or sheet metal roofing. On the second visit, concrete and brick houses with sheet metal roofing were the most frequent type of houses followed by mud-brick houses with sheet metal roofing. Both a dispensary and a school have been built in the settlement.

#### **4.2 Socio-economic status of the settlement**

Most residents in the settlement derive their basic income from subsistence farming. Other individuals were mainly dependant on coffee but the wilt disease affected it. As of now, they have resorted to growing tomatoes. The forest does not generate income for the members of the community apart from collecting firewood. The owner, Mr. Najjakulya has become stricter in the use of the forest than during the second revisit in 2000. The residents contended that the forest is important in regulating climate and enhancing favourable conditions for agriculture. This is a good attribute of the forest, which has also been recognized by the users and has greatly contributed to its protection.

#### **4.3 Location of the market**

The most frequently used market by most residents in the settlement was a biweekly market, located in Gombe town, 8 km west of the settlement. Today, the most frequently used market is Kayenje located 2-3 miles from the settlement. This market operates once in two weeks as it was in the past. Most residents used to walk and still walk to the market. It used to take them up to two hours but is now takes then approximately one hour since they have a closer market. The establishment of a new market in the settlement area is a good indicator of development.

Probably increased agricultural production necessitated establishment of a market within the settlement area.

#### **4.4 Major changes in Kizziko B Settlement**

There has been an increase in the population of the settlement. This has been attributed to increased births in the area in addition to immigration from different parts of the country such as Kabale. The number of households has also increased. This is probably due to the fact that as individuals grow up, they become independent hence setting up their own homes. Furthermore, there has been increased immigration in the area. There is increased scarcity of food in the settlement as a result of the long dry spell in the area. There is a reported reduction in the availability of some forest products such as mushrooms.

There is a change in economic activities from Ginger growing to vegetable growing (tomatoes and onions). This is attributed to the increased restrictions on accessing the forest. There is an improvement in economic growth as manifested by the presence of more permanent house structures and small businesses in the area.

A number of changes have occurred in Kiziiko B settlement since the last visit in 2000. These changes include: a) 435 people during the second re-visit and 540 people during the third visit. Furthermore:

- There has been a reduction in population, and this has been attributed to the death of people.
- The level of poverty has increase amongst the residents. The causes are mainly the attack of coffee plantations by the coffee wilt disease that destroyed the coffee. Furthermore, the increasing dry seasons have been unfavorable for ginger. The poverty is therefore due to the loss of their commercial crops.
- There are now more permanent houses constructed by local residents using bricks and iron sheets than in the past. This is basically because of the general trend in the change of standards of living, and also the fact that building poles and thatching grass that were being used in the past have reduced in quantities.

- Najjakulya Forest extent has expanded now covering a larger area, which was originally encroached. These encroached areas are now recovering to forest vegetation.
- Some residents are now having access to clean water as a result of an intervention by an NGO that has constructed a protected well in the settlement.

#### **4.5 User groups**

##### General Information

The term user group refers to a group of people who harvest from, use and/or maintain a forest and who share the same rights and duties to products from a forest(s), even though they may not be formally organized. For all the user groups, none of the groups was self-consciously formed. The users have similar rights, which are *de facto* since most of them are subsistence users. All the individuals in the user groups live permanently in the settlement. There are nearly no cases of conflicts amongst the user groups. Most of the individuals in the settlement are tenants. The owner, Omutaka Najjukalya, has banned commercial activities completely within Najjakulya forest. However, it was reported by the forest owner and some few residents that there are some illegal activities like timber harvesting that go on within the forest, although the illegal harvesters are not identifiable. This illegal harvesting is the only and major conflict that exists between the residents and Omutaka Najjakulya.

According to the residents of Kiziiko B settlement, wealth was defined as having land tenancy, a vehicle and children whom you are able to both feed and educate. On the other hand, poverty describes a situation of being unable to own where you stay in addition to not being able to cater for your own problems. It was indicated that 3 individuals in the settlement were wealth while 10 were poor and the rest were intermediate.

#### **4.6 Description of the user groups**

There were two user groups that were identified as utilizing Najjakulya Forest. These included:

1. Men of Kiziiko B Settlement
2. Women of Kiziiko B Settlement

### *Men of Kiziiko B Settlement*

This user group consists of men who utilize Najjakulya Forest for consumptive uses. The consumptive uses include building poles and fodder for their livestock. The user group is identifiable without formal organization, coupled with the fact that most of the residents in the area graze their animals mainly at the forest edge but at times also inside the forest. It consists of about 40 men. Baganda are the most dominant ethnic group followed by Barundi and Banyarwanda while Moslems are the most dominant religious group followed by Protestants and Catholics.

The occupational structure of individuals in the user group is such that most of them are subsistence farmers and livestock keepers.

### *Women of Kiziiko B Settlement*

This user group consists of women who utilize Najjakulya forest for consumptive uses. The consumptive uses include domestic firewood and medicinal plants. The user group is identifiable without formal organization. It consists of about 60 individuals. The dominant ethnic groups are Baganda followed by Barundi while the third dominant ethnic group is the Banayarwanda. Moslems are the most dominant religious group followed by Protestants and least are the Catholics. The quantity of products being harvested from the forest is likely to reduce as most people are depending on that forest as having got restrictions on the use of Nakuzesinge Forest Reserve.

## **5.0 Forest Governance**

The role of governing Najjakulya Forest is under the landlord, Omutaka Najjakulya, since the forests is private. No other person apart from the landlord and his representatives make rules regarding forest use. In addition, no individuals in the user group acted as a leader investing time, energy, and perhaps money in trying to work out co-coordinated strategies within the group concerning maintenance, investment in upgrading the forest or harvesting forest products.

Omutaka Najjakulya is also delegating his sons to carry out forest management. He is currently being disturbed by illegal timber harvesters , who he has cautioned and even confiscated timber from them.

## **6.0 Problems Faced by Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve**

The individuals feel that the type of conservation measures adopted in relation to this forest are OK. The Usergroups identify serious problems that they and those responsible for managing the forest may face during the next five years. These problems include:

- Closing in of the forest. This will greatly affect the grazing fields currently available to the residents.
- Other than firewood and grazing fields, the forest is not seen as economically valuable to the residents
- Lack of community involvement in managing the forest.

## **7.0 Conclusions**

The following conclusions are drawn from the visit

1. The tree, sapling and groundcover condition of the forest has improved compared to the second revisit in 2000
2. There was one evidence of timber harvesting and one evidence of charcoal burning observed in the sampled plots of the forest. The abandoned gardens had recovered with sufficient stock of natural regeneration.
1. The population in the settlement studied had significantly increased due to births and polygamous cultural values (most of the residents are Moslems with more than one wife)
2. The Management of the forest has become more restrictive and now looks much better under Mr. Najjakulya.

## Appendix 1

### Master Species List 2005: Najjakulya Private Forest Reserve

Botanical name	Local name	Uses
1. <i>Acacia horckii</i>	Kasaana	Fuel wood
2. <i>Acalypha volkensii</i>	Jjerengesa	Unknown
3. <i>Acanthus pubescens</i>	Matovu	Firewood
4. <i>Albizia coriaria</i>	Mugavu	Timber
5. <i>Albizia grandbracteata</i>	Nongo	Timber
6. <i>Alchornia cordifolia</i>	Luzibaziba	Firewood
7. <i>Aningeria altissimum</i>	Nkalati	Timber
8. <i>Antiaris toxicaria</i>	Kirundu	Timber
9. <i>Antidesma laciniatum</i>	Unknown	Poles
10. <i>Argeratum conyzoides</i>	Namirembe	Medicinal
11. <i>Artocarpus heterophyllus</i>	Ffene	Fruits
12. <i>Aspilia Mossicambensis</i>	Makayi	Unknown
13. <i>Bidens pilosa</i>	Ssere	Medicinal
14. <i>Biophytum petersianum</i>	Wewumbe	Unknown
15. <i>Blighia unijugata</i>	Nkuzanyana	Timber
16. <i>Bosqueia phoberos</i>	Mugwi	Fuel wood
17. <i>Brichiaria brizantha</i>	Kifuta	Animal feed
18. <i>Bridelia micrantha</i>	Katazamiti	Poles
19. <i>Canarium schweinfurthii</i>	Muwafu	Timber
20. <i>Canthium vulgare</i>	Kasamusamu	Poles
21. <i>Cardiospermum grandiflora</i>	Lunyerekesi	Unknown
22. <i>Celtis africana</i>	Kasiisa	Fuel wood
23. <i>Chaectacme aristata</i>	Muwanika	Firewood
24. <i>Clausena anisata</i>	Musokolindo	Firewood
25. <i>Coffea canephora</i>	Mwanyi	Cash crop
26. <i>Cola gigantia</i>	Mutumbwe	Timber
27. <i>Combretum molle</i>	Mukoola	Charcoal
28. <i>Commelina sp</i>	Unknown	Unknown
29. <i>Conyza floribunda</i>	Kafumbe	Unknown
30. <i>Croton megalocarpus</i>	Musogasoga	Timber
31. <i>Cyanthea sp</i>	Kayongo	Unknown
32. <i>Cymbopogon citrata</i>	Teete	Unknown
33. <i>Dictyandra arborescens</i>	Muteganjobe	Poles
34. <i>Digitaria scalarum</i>	Lumbugu	Unknown
35. <i>Diosporus abyssinica</i>	Mpimbi	Poles
36. <i>Domea mukole</i>	Mukole	Poles
37. <i>Erlagea tomentosa</i>	Unknown	Unknown
38. <i>Ficus sur</i>	Kabalira	Fuel wood
39. <i>Ficus thoningii</i>	Kitubalu	Unknown

40. <i>Ficus urceolaris</i>	Kitonto	Fire wood
41. <i>Funtumia africana</i>	Namukago	Timber
42. <i>Harungana madagascariensis</i>	Mulirira	Firewood
43. <i>Hibiscus ludwig</i>	Lwenge	Unknown
44. <i>Hyperrhenia rufa</i>	Mbubbu	Cattle feed
45. <i>Imperata cylindrica</i>	Ssenke	Roofing
46. <i>Leptacelium sp</i>	Unknown	Unknown
47. <i>Leptapsis cochleata</i>	Unknown	Unknown
48. <i>Leucas deflexa</i>	Kafugankande	Medicinal
49. <i>Lovoa brownii</i>	Nkoba	Timber
50. <i>Maerua duchsneri</i>	Muzikiza	Unknown
51. <i>Maesa lanceolata</i>	Kiwondowondo	Fuel wood
52. <i>Maesopsis eminii</i>	Musizi	Timber
53. <i>Markhamia lutea</i>	Musambya	Poles
54. <i>Morinda lucida</i>	Kabajjansayi	Fuel wood
55. <i>Panicum maximum</i>	Mukonzikonzi	Unknown
56. <i>Phoenix reclinat</i>	Mukindukindu	Craft
57. <i>Phyllanthus discoides</i>	Ngwabuzito	Fuel wood
58. <i>Piptadeniastrum africanum</i>	Mpewere	Timber
59. <i>Pittosporum manii</i>	Nabuluka	Firewood
60. <i>Polyscias fulva</i>	Setaala	Fuel wood
61. <i>Prunus africana</i>	Taseesa	Medicinal
62. <i>Pseudathia confertiflora</i>	Kikakala	Unknown
63. <i>Rhothmania urcelliformis</i>	Unknown	Poles
64. <i>Rhubus kaniensis</i>	Nkenene	Fruits
65. <i>Rhus natalensis</i>	Kakansokanso	Firewood
66. <i>Rhus vulgaris</i>	Museese	Firewood
67. <i>Salacia elegans</i>	Unknown	Unknown
68. <i>Sapium ellipticum</i>	Musasa	Charcoal
69. <i>Scolopia rhamnophylla</i>	Nkanaga	Poles
70. <i>Securinega virosa</i>	Lukandwa	Firewood
71. <i>Senna spectabilis</i>	Gasiya	Poles
72. <i>Senserveria dawei</i>	Kigogwa	Fiber
73. <i>Teclea nobilis</i>	Nzo	Firewood
74. <i>Trichilia dregeana</i>	Ssekoba	Timber
75. <i>Triumpheta roimboidea</i>	Luwugula	Unknown
76. <i>Vangueria acituloba</i>	Tugunda	Fruits
77. <i>Vernonia amagdalina</i>	Mululuza	Medicinal
78. <i>Vernonia auriculifera</i>	Kikokoma	Firewood

## Appendix 2

### List of PRA participants

1. Edmund H.Lubega
2. Kato Hussein
3. Sajjabi Stanley
4. Tusaba Deborah
5. Rehema Namulondo
6. Lwanga Joseph
7. J. Nabukenya
8. Moses Kyakwambala
9. Ben Kiboneka
10. Kassujja Disan
11. Semwanga Swiliki
12. Nalule Mariam Sophie
13. Sarah Nabatanzi
14. Nabajja Rehema
15. Rehema Namayanja
16. Ruth Kulyaningi
17. Jowelia Nansamba
18. Namyalo Dezilanta
19. Nabunya Aisha
20. Sikyagatema
21. Nansamba Sophia
22. Nassaka
23. Annet Kasule
24. Kasule Ronnie
25. Samson Bukeya
26. Babirye Gladys
27. Kasozi Namusera
28. Hajjat Nuhu
29. Joyce Lubega
30. Nabukera Jamida
31. Omutakka Najjakulya

