ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283490374

LOCAL PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES AND NEW DEMANDS SINCE INCEPTION OF MULTIPLE USE PROGRAMME IN BWINDI IMPENETRABLE NATIONAL PARK, S. W UGANDA

Research · November 2015

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2987.2081

CITATION
1

READS
219

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project Hydrological Assessments in the Lake Edward Basin, W. Uganda View project

Project Water quality Monitoring project of Bwindi Impenetrable National Park View project

All content following this page was uploaded by Robert Bitariho on 04 November 2015.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

LOCAL PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES AND NEW DEMANDS SINCE INCEPTION OF MULTIPLE USE PROGRAMME IN BWINDI IMPENETRABLE NATIONAL PARK, S. W UGANDA



Robert Bitariho[1], Benon Mugyerwa[2], Robert Barigyira[1] and Edwin Kagoda[2]
Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation[1] and Uganda Wildlife Authority[2]
August 2004

(i) Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the local communities especially the Batwa from the parishes of Nteko, Remera, Nyamabare, Kashasha, Kaara, Kitojo, Mpungu, Karangara, Ntungamo, Rutugunda, Masaya, Byumba and Bujengwe and Kifunjo that participated in this consultation process. This report would not have been possible without them. The CSO members of Kisoro Foundation for Rural Development (KFRD) led by Simon Nzaramba, African International Christian Ministries (AICM) led by Rev. Enoch Kayeye and Rukungiri Functional Literacy Resource Center (RFLRC) led by Abel Kakuru were of great help as Facilitators during the exercise. Edith Kabesiime and Sam Besigye of CARE-REPA programme are also acknowledged for the technical support rendered in the formulation of the consultation process and participating with us during the exercise. The community consultation process was funded by the UNESCO's Enhancing Our Heritage fund (EoH) through the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) with Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC) acting as the implementer of the process. The participation of the Local CSOs was supported by CARE Uganda-REPA programme.

(ii) Table of Contents

(i) Acknowledgements ___ ***2***

(ii) Table of Contents ___ ***3***

(iii) List of acronyms used ___ ***4***

(iv) Executive Summary ___ ***5***

1. Introduction ___ ***8***

2. Problem statement ___ ***8***

3. Objective of the consultation process ___ ***10***

4. Methodology ___ ***10***

4. Results and discussions ___ ***11***

4.1 Batwa group ___ *11*

4.2 Other local people ___ *13*

4.2.1 Beekeepers ___ *13*

4.2.3 Plant resource harvesters ___ *13*

5. Conclusion and recommendations ___ ***14***

8. References ___ ***18***

7. Appendix ___ ***19***

7.1 The multiple use review process ___ *19*

7.2 List of resources demanded by the local people ___ *20*

Local communities of Nteko ___ ***21***

Local communities of Remera Parish ___ ***22***

Local people of Nyamabare, Kashasha, Kaara and Nshajare ___ ***22***

Batwa of Mpungu-Buremba Parish ___ ***23***

Local people of Mpungu ___ ***24***

Batwa of Byumba ___ ***25***

Local people of Karangara ___ ***26***

Batwa from Rutugunda ___ ***26***

Local people of Rutugunda ___ ***27***

Local people of Masya/Kifunjo ___ ***28***

(iii) List of acronyms used

AICM: African International Christian Ministry

BINP : Bwindi Impenetrable National Park

CSO : Civil Society Organisation

EoH : Enhancing Our Heritage

ITFC : Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation

KFRD: Kisoro Foundation for Rural Development

MoU : Memorandum of Understanding

NTFPs: Non-Timber Forest Products

REPA : Rights Equity and Protected Areas (A programme of CARE)

RFLRC: Rukungiri Functional Literacy Resource Center

UWA : Uganda Wildlife Authority

(iv) Executive Summary

Since the inception of multiple use programme in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (BINP) in 1994, many changes have taken place. Local community demands for resources from the park have changed and evidently the programme has not addressed park resource needs of some key stakeholders. Specifically the needs of the Batwa were not met and as result were marginalized. The Multiple use MoU's were supposed to have been revised after every two years but this was never done. This report is a result of a community consultative initiative undertaken in July 2004 by a team from Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC), CARE Uganda (REPA programme) and local civil society organizations of African International Christian Ministries (AICM), Kisoro Foundation for Rural Development (KFRD) and Rukungiri Functional Literacy Center (RFLC). The team sought to assess local community attitudes and new demands ten years after inception of multiple use programme in BINP. The local community new requests and demands will ultimately be used while negotiating for a review of the multiple use MoU's in BINP.

A participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) method was used to asses the attitudes and demands of the local people. The later were divided in two groups of the marginalized (Batwa) and the other local people (Bakiga and Bafumbira). Free exchange of ideas was encouraged by the PRA team in order to get unbiased ideas from the people.

From the interviews, it was quite clear that the Batwa have been marginalized since the inception of the multiple use programme of BINP. The Batwa highly value some forest

products considered 'illegal' by the park management. The Batwa requested to be allowed collect wild honey and wild yams from the park. They also requested to be allowed carry out fishing in some rivers of BINP. Other local people's demands included products not allowed by park management like hoe handles, walking sticks, tree logs for beer boat making and some food products like mushrooms and fruits of *Myrianthus holstii*. The local people already participating in plant resource extraction requested for increase in the allowed plant resource offtake quota and increase in areas allowed for plant harvesting. Beekeepers requested to be allowed collect medicinal and basketry weaving plant material concurrently with beekeeping activity in BINP.

In conclusion, we feel that local people's demands for forest products from BINP is still high. The perceived low interest in multiple use by the local communities is because people's demands for forest resources has been changing over time and yet the required resources are not permitted by the park management. Some of the resources demanded from BINP are not permitted for extraction and yet are highly valued by the local people.

We recommend that the Batwa be allowed to collect wild honey, wild yams and also carry out fishing activities as longer as they are not in conflict with biodiversity conservation. This should be after consultations with the studies carried out on wild honey, wild yams and fish in BINP by Byarugaba (1998), Byarugaba (2001) and Kasangaki (2002) respectively. Together with the Batwa involvement, park management and ITFC could determine non-destructive methods of wild honey and yams collection and fishing in BINP. We also recommend an urgent need for revision of the present

multiple MoU's to cater for the new changes that have taken place since the inception of multiple use in BINP.

1. Introduction

Multiple use is a collaborative program that allows local community members work with protected area managers in the conservation of biodiversity and at the same time accessing non-timber forest products (NTFPs). In Uganda, the Multiple use concept in National parks started in Bwindi Impenetrable National park in 1994 as a pilot programme in three zones of Mpungu, Nteko and Rutugunda. Other parishes like Kitojo, Nyamabare and Kaara in 1994 were also allowed to place their beehives in the park. Since then, other new parishes such as Karangara, Remera and Masya were also allowed to harvest medicinal and basketry weaving material from the park.

Before the communities were allowed access to the NTFPs, a dialogue process between park management and the local communities was undertaken to ensure a collaborative approach, planning and implementation process. The process led to the development of a memorandum of understanding (MoU) to be adhered to Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and resource users in the three pilot parishes. Later on other zones were created for plant resource extraction and beekeeping and these were, Kitojo, Ndego, Nshanjare, Karangara, Remera, and Masya/Kifunjo zones.

2. Problem statement

The Batwa involvement in the multiple use programme in BINP was under-looked during the inception of the multiple use programme in 1994 and yet are the major forest dependant people. They lived and depended on the forest before they were chased out

when Bwindi was made a national park. To-date the Batwa still depend on the forest though illegally and constitute the poorest of the poor in Bwindi. The Batwa have a high interest in Bwindi park resource but have low power and yet are key stakeholders in the multiple use programme. Most of the "illegal" activities such as fishing on river Ishasha, wild honey and yam collections are often blamed on the Batwa by the UWA rangers. Some civic society organisations (CSOs) such as AICM and Bitariho *et al* (2004) have advocated for the Batwa involvement in the multiple use programme of BINP.

It is now a decade since the first multiple use MoUs were signed. Since then new changes have taken place. For example, Mpungu and Rutugunda multiple use zones in 1994 were in Rukungiri district and are now in Kanungu district. Also Mpungu then was a parish but is now a sub-county. Plant resource demand is not static but changes over time, new plant resources are continually being demanded by the local people. The present multiple use MoUs were supposed to have been revised after every 2 years but have never been revised. The present MoUs are too old and need changing to suit the presently prevailing conditions. Evidently there has been a general decline in multiple use activities by the local people (Bitariho *et al* 2004) as a result of inadequate benefits. One of the major reasons advanced to explain this decline is that the local communities were given low offtake quotas for harvests and this seemed to have reduced their morale.

It was therefore deemed important to consult the local communities, local leaders and resource users on multiple use issues and get to know their attitudes and new demands. These issues would then form a basis for a review of the multiple use programme in

BINP. The Uganda Wildlife Authority is willing to negotiate with the local people for use and management of these important resources.

3. Objective of the consultation process

1. To assess the local people's attitudes and new demands on multiple use programme since its inception.
2. To assess attitudes and demands of the marginalized Batwa community members on multiple use programme.

4. Methodology

A participatory rural appraisal method (PRA) was used to get peoples attitudes and demands. The community members were divided into two groups of marginalized (the Batwa) and other local community members that are already benefiting from multiple use. The two groups were met separately to ensure equal participation and avoid suppression of the marginalized Batwa's demands and attitudes. The PRA team comprised of: members of civic society organization (CSOs) from Kisoro, Kabale and Kanungu districts (acted also as a facilitators), community conservation warden and ranger from BINP, warden research and monitoring from BINP, ITFC senior field officer and Herbarium technician, Field Coordinator CARE-REPA and area LC 1 and 2 chairpersons. The CSOs involved were Kisoro Foundation for Rural Development (KFRD), African International Christian Ministries (AICM) and Rukungiri Functional Literacy Resource Center (RFLRC).

Presentations from the community conservation warden were made on the objectives, roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in Multiple use. Also research and

monitoring results from ITFC were presented to the communities. The presentations were aimed at focusing the discussions to multiple use. Questions, supplements and discussions were sought out from the community members. An open ended discussion was then carried out freely to encourage free exchange of views about the multiple use programme, problems and questions between the PRA group leaders and the community members.

The consultations involved the community members from all the eleven multiple use zones of BINP. These were Nteko, Remera, Nyamabare, Kashasha, Kaara, Kitojo, Mpungu, Karangara, Ntungamo, Rutugunda, Masaya and Kifunjo. Batwa community members were interviewed from Nteko, Remera, Mpungu, Byumba, Bujengwe and Rutugunda parishes.

4. Results and discussions

4.1 Batwa group

Batwa community members interviewed in all the parishes pointed out a need to be accepted in the multiple use programme of BINP. The Batwa reminded us of how the old multiple use MoUs marginalized them in favour of the other local community members (Bakiga and Bafumbira). There was general agreement by all the Batwa in all the parishes that they needed wild honey (Obuhura and Obwoki), wild yams (Ebihama) and fish from BINP. They also pointed out a need for medicinal and weaving plants (see appendix 7.2). When asked to rank what they thought was important for them. The wild honey (Obuhura) was ranked highest followed by fish, firewood and medicinal herbs in the ascending order. The ranking surprisingly was similar in all the Batwa parishes. They

also asked for collection of wild fruits of *Myrianthus holstii* (Ekyufa), mushrooms and game meat (especially wild pigs and duikers). Although some few Batwa asked for the game meat, the majority of them did not agree with them. Batwa group from Nteko parish requested park management to identify for them alternatives for game meat such as livestock keeping (piggery especially) and if possible guinea fowl farming.

Other issues not related directly to multiple use were mentioned by the Batwa such as a need for land not near the park as they have been affected greatly by crop raiding animals. They also pointed out a need for hoes and seeds to plant and UWA to help them with funds to educate their children. The Batwa also complained of being marginalized when park authorities are assigning out jobs like boundary clearings. They mentioned that despite their low level of education the park should still employ them as guides or porters. Byarugaba (1998) carried out a study on stingless bees and the indigenous Batwa knowledge in BINP. Such study results and recommendations could be used as a basis of allowing the Batwa harvest the wild honey. It was observed during this consultation process that the most pressing issue for the Batwa in BINP is wild honey collection and others like fishing and wild yams collection. Other studies still ongoing by Kasangaki (2002) and Byarugaba (2001), could be used to assess the sustainability of fishing and wild yam collection by the Batwa in BINP. This would be one way of involving the Batwa in Multiple use programme of BINP. The present BINP management plan allows only extraction of plant resources and beekeeping and is silent on resource extraction such as those important to the Batwa (wild honey and yam collections and fishing).

4.2 Other local people

The local people interviewed were those whose parishes were participating in plant resource extraction and beekeeping. The demands and issues raised by the people depended on what they used the multiple use zone for.

4.2.1 Beekeepers

All the beekeepers from the interviewed parishes (Kaara, Nyamabale, Kashasha, Kiyebe and Kitojo) wanted to extract plant resource for medicinal and weaving purposes apart from beekeeping (see appendix 7.2). When prompted to prioritize, they found it difficult to substitute beekeeping with plant resource extraction. They mentioned that they would prefer to extract the plant resources at the same time continue with beekeeping. Other resources demanded by the beekeepers were: bamboo stems for granary and beehive making, old boundary trees and dead tree logs in the park for beehive making, tree seedlings from the park, bamboo rhizomes and to increase the number of beehives in the forest for better chances of beehive colonisation. Plant resource extraction in the beekeeping zones though not allowed is going on and this was noted by Bitariho *et al* 2004, when they noticed fresh bark harvest of *Rytigynia kigeziensis* (Nyakibazi) in Kitojo a beekeeping zone. Could such resource extraction be allowed alongside beekeeping? The BINP management plan is silent on this issue.

4.2.3 Plant resource harvesters

In all the plant resource extraction zones (Nteko, Remera, Mpungu, Karangara, Rutugunda and Masya/Kifunjo zones) the local communities pointed out the need to

increase on the offtake quotas and also increase the areas that were zoned as multiple use zones. The resource users of Remera, Mpungu and Karangara complained of their harvest quotas being too low and the areas zoned for resource extraction needed to be expanded so that they could access more resources. They also mentioned a need for new resources (see appendix 7.2) such as fish, walking sticks and handles for hoes. The need for other forest products such as game meat, timber and gold was also manifested during the interviews by a few people. The local people also pointed out the need to update the resource user lists as some of the resource users had died and/or emigrated. Some resource users said they had lost their identity cards and feared to go to the forest without them. Law enforcement rangers were accused of harassing resource users. Bitariho *et al* 2004 noted a need to increase the offtake quotas of *Rytigynia* (Nyakibazi) and *Ocotea* (Omwiha) from the original 1% to an initial 3% as a way of increasing community participation in the multiple use programme. Bitariho *et al* 2004, also noted that harvest of some plant resources such as bark from *Rytigynia* and *Ocotea* trees has been on the decline since 1994. The resource users agreed and pointed out that some resource users who were charged with harvesting the bark had either died or had emigrated away from the multiple use parishes. They also noted that some other activities like tea growing could have affected the resource users going into the forest, since they tend to be busy looking after their tea plantations.

5. Conclusion and recommendations

It is evident from the interviews that local peoples demands of resources from BINP is still high. This demand has not been static but changes over time. Some resources seen by park authorities and researchers as detrimental to the health of the forest are still highly

valued by the local people. For example the collection of wild honey in BINP is a high valued activity by the forest dependent Batwa and yet has often been blamed for introducing forest fires in both BINP and MGNP. Without getting the marginalized groups such as Batwa on board, then they will continue harvesting the wild honey 'illegally' and crudely and end up setting up forest fires. Non destructive wild honey collection, wild yam collection and fishing methods could be developed together with the Batwa as away of involving them in multiple use programme of BINP.

It is also evident that despite the other local communities' involvement in the multiple use programme, they continue to demand for resources such as hoe handles, walking sticks and firewood that are not allowed by park authorities. This demand will always continue and the local people will continue harvesting them illegally unless a solution is sought. Olupot (2004) observed a lot of pole cutting and fire wood collection activity along the BINP forest boundary.

Thus we recommend the following.

1. The Batwa living adjacent BINP forest should be involved in multiple use as a matter of urgency. The Batwa should be treated as special group and granted special permission to access some of the resources that are important to them while at the same time not compromising biodiversity conservation. Studies by Byarugaba (1998), Byarugaba (2001) and Kasangaki (2002) could be used to determine the possibility of Batwa harvesting wild honey, wild yams and fish.
2. There is an urgent need to revise the present multiple use MoUs of BINP to cater for new changes that have taken place since the inception of multiple use in

BINP. There has also been new local community demand of resources that were not envisaged in the old MoUs.

3. The beekeeping zones in BINP could also be allowed harvest plant resource important to the local people. Regulated bark harvest for medicinal use from plants such as *Rytigynia* and *Ocotea* could be allowed to take place alongside beekeeping.
4. The old boundary trees demanded by the beekeepers for beehive making could be granted to them as long as they agree to plant new ones. Some of the boundary trees are exotic, invasive and undesirable to the forest and could be removed and replaced with non invasive trees. Eucalyptus for example could be invasive if not well managed.
5. The demand for some of the forest resources such as game meat, gold and timber should not be granted as they are destructive to biodiversity conservation Development organization working around BINP could consider providing alternatives such as animal husbandry and tree planting in the local communities gardens. The park authorities can provide tree seedlings to the local communities for planting.
6. There need by UWA to revise the present 20% of the area supposed to be under multiple use. Presently almost all the 20% multiple use area coverage has been utilized and yet the communities continue to demand for more. Some multiple use zones like Nteko and Rutugunda are too big and tend to take up most of the 20% cover.

7. Sensitization and training of resource users in recording and bookkeeping is needed for them to accurately record offtakes from the forest.

8. References

Bitariho R, Mcneilage A, Babaasa D and Barigira R (2004). Plant harvest impacts and sustainability in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, S.W Uganda.

Byarugaba D 1998. Stingless bees (Hymenoptera, Apidae, Meliponinae) and Abayanda honey-hunters: A study linking bee ecology and indigenous knowledge, Unpbl MSc thesis, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

Byarugaba D (2004). Availabilty, abundance and distribution of wild yams (Dioscorea spp) in and around Bwindi Impenetrable National Park. PHD thesis in Prep, Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST), Mbarara

Kasangaki A (2002). Effects of anthropogenic disturbance on stream fish assemblages of Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Implications for sustainable use.A PHD proposal, Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST), Mbarara.

Olupot W (2004). Boundary Edge effects in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Unpl report, ITFC, Ruhija.

7. Appendix

7.1 The multiple use review process (workplan

Activity	Responsibility	Date
Core team planning meeting	CCW WR&M, REPA staff, local CSO representatives, ITFC staff	1st half of June 2004
Community mobilization and sending invitation letters	CCRs, CCW LCs, parish chiefs and chairpersons of resource users	1st to 20th June 2004
Community consultation meetings	CCR,s CCW, WR&M, ITFC staff, CARE staff and Local CSO members	20th 31st June 2004
Report writing	CCW, WR&M (UWA) and SFO (ITFC)	2nd 15th July 2004
Discussion of the report and final editing of the report	Core members (CCR,s CCW, WR&M, ITFC staff, CARE staff and CSO members	Date to be agreed upon in July
Workshop for dissemination of report	UWA, CARE &ITFC	Date to be agreed in August
Dissemination of	CCW WR&M, REPA staff,	Date to be agreed upon

consultation report to the local communities including recommendations of the multiple use workshop	local CSO representatives, ITFC staff	
Multiple use MoU Reviews (renegotiations)	UWA, ITFC, CARE, local CSOs and community leaders etc	Date to be agreed
Draft MoUs	UWA, ITFC CARE and community leaders etc	Date to be agreed
MoU presentation to the communities/ editing as per community discussion	UWA, ITFC, CARE, local CSOs and community leaders etc	Date to be agreed
Signing of MoU	UWA, ITFC, CARE, local CSOs and community leaders etc	Date to be agreed

7.2 List of resources demanded by the local people

<u>Batwa requests in Nteko Parish.</u>

1. Wild yams (Ebikwa and Ebihama – *Dioscorea)*
2. Wild honey (Obuhura and Obwoki)
3. Ebyenyanja Ensozi (Fish)
4. Emigyega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides)*
5. Ebihungye.(*Raphia farinifera*)
6. Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*).

7. Obukozo (Gum from *Symphonia globufera)*
8. Obukogosho. (*Marantochloa leucantha*)
9. Enshuli (*Smilax anceps*)
10. Ebitatara (*Marantochloa mannii)*
11. Eshwiga (Solanum nigrum –Edible vegetation)
12. Rukokota (*Piper guineense*).
13. Omwiha (*Ocotea usambarensis*)
14. Omuruguya (Hoe handles from *Carapa grandiflora*)
15. Omushabarara (*Drypetes* sp.)
16. Emishe (*Urera Hypselodendron*)
17. Omunbya (*Laportea aestuans*)
18. Omwiru (*Marantochloa purpureum*)
19. Omungo (*Polyscias fulva*)
20. Encurebwa (Fish)
21. Obutuzi, Obushaza and obushingiri (Mushrooms)
22. Gold
23. Enkyakara (guinea fowl)
24. Emisese
25. Embugwe
26. Building poles
27. Game meat (Duikers and wild meat)
28. Eminaba (*Triumfetta sp*.)
29. Emigushagusha (*Hibiscus sp*.)
30. Emikore (*Dombeya goetzenii*)
31. Walking sticks (from Drypetes and Cassipourea)

Local communities of Nteko

1. Obuhura (Wild honey
2. Ensonzi (Fish).
3. Walking sticks (from *Drypetes* and *Cassipourea)*
4. Tree Seedlings

Local communities of Remera Parish

1 Hoe handles
2 Obuhura (Wild honey
3 Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)
4 Omujega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
5 Obukozo (Gum from *Symphonia globufera)*
6 Emishe (*Urera Hypselodendron*
7 Emigushagusha (*Hibiscus sp*.)
8 Emyiru (*Marantochloa purpureum*

Local people of Nyamabare, Kashasha, Kaara and Nshajare

1 Wild honey (Obuhura)
2 Bamboo stems for beehive making
3 Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)
4 Old boundary trees for beehive making
5 Enshuri (*Smilax anceps*)
6 Wires and nails for tying beehives
7 Emijega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
8 Emikore (Dombeya goetzenii)
9 Emishe (*Urera Hypselodendron*
10 Emigushagusha (*Hibiscus sp*.)
11 Eminaba (*Triumfetta sp*.)
12 Obunyurasaka (*Securidaca welwitschii*)
13 Endengamatare (*Pristimera sp*.)
14 Bwara (*Salacia sp*.)
15 Enchenche (*Draceana sp*.)
16 Omwatamabare (*Rytigynia sp*.)
17 Ekijge (Mushroom)
18 Engomera (*Mitrogyna rubrostipulata*)
19 Omugesi (*Hagenia abyssinica*)
20 Omuna (*Sericostachys scandens*)
21 Omufurura (*Gounnia longispicata*)

22 Rukambura

23 Omushekyera (*Pittosporum sp*.)

24 Omusinga (*Hibiscus fuscus*)

25 Omushura

26 Omukaka (*Bersama abyssinica*)

27 Kitinwa (*Ajuga remota*)

28 Omurangara (*Croton macrostachys*)

29 Orubugore (*Adenia sp.*)

30 Omutana (*Clausena anisata*)

31 Omugyi (*Bridelia sp*.)

32 Omufa (*Myrianthus holstii*)

33 Tree seedlings

34 Bamboo rhizomes for planting

35 Increase number of beehives placed in the park

36 Train beekeepers in honey management skills

Local people of Kitojo and Kiyebe

1.Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)

2 Omwiha (Ocotea usambarensis)

3. Rukokota
5. Omumba
6. Omushaga
7. Omugorora
8. Banyamunkiro
9. Emigano (bamboo)
10. Enshuri (*Smilax anceps*)
11. Bwara
12. Endengamatare
13. Emijega
14. Enchenche
15. Entaro
16. Emikore

Batwa of Mpungu-Buremba Parish

1. Obuhura and obwoki (Wild honey)
2. Ensonzi (Fish)
3. , Enshuri (*Smilax anceps*)
4. Emijega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
5. Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)
6. Ebihama and Ebikwa (Wild yams)
7. Obukozo (Gum from ***Symphonia globufera)***
8. Enyama (Game meat of Wild pigs and duikers)
9. Rukokota (*Piper guineense*)
10. Enchenche (*Draceana laxissima*)
11. Entaro (*Securidaca sp.*)
12. Ebitatara (*Marantochloa mannii*)
13. Obutami (*Setaria plicatilis*)
14. Obukogoso (*Marantochloa leucantha*)
15. Emyiru **(*Marantochloa purpureum*)**
16. Omwiha (*Ocotea usambarensis*)
17. Omwihura
18. Omushaga (*Zanthoxylum gillettii*)
19. Omumba (*Prunus africana*)
20. Omugabagaba
21. Bwara (*Toddalia asiatica*)

Local people of Mpungu

1. Ensozi (Fish)
2. Emijega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
3. Omwiha (*Ocotea usambarensis*)
4. Hoe handles
5. Dead trees for making beehives

6. Ebihunje (*Raphia farinifera*)
7. Paths through the park

Batwa of Byumba

1. Eshuri (*Smilax anceps*)
2. Emijega *(Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
3. Obukogoso (*Marantochloa leucantha*)
4. Ebitatala (*Marantochloa mannii*)
5. Emyiru (*Marantochloa purpureum*)
6. Enchenche (*Draceana laxissima*)
7. Entaro (*Securidaca sp*.)
8. Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)
9. Mukuru (*Pachycarpus sp*.)
10. Rukokota (*Piper guineense*)
11. Ebihama (Wild yams)
12. Ensonzi (Fish)
13. Enyama (Game meat)
14. Hoe handles
15. Walking sticks
16. Endahi (Guinnea fowl)
17. Building poles
18. Timber trees
19. Tree seedlings
20. Omuguruka (*Maesopsis eminii*)
21. Omutoyo (*Newtonia buchananii*)
22. Emiyovi (*Entandrophragma sp*.)
23. Enkoba (*Lovoa sp*.)
24. Obutuzi, Obusanza, Obusokori, Obukokwe and Obukarangwa (mushrooms)
25. Omuturibare

26. Enku (Firewood)
27. Game meat
28. Obuhura and Obwoki (Wild honey)

Local people of Karangara

1 Rukokota (*Piper guineense*)
2 Omutanwa (*Clausena anisata*)
3 Omwatamabare
4 Bwara (*Salacia sp*.)
5 Obuzibira
6 Omumara
7 Endengamatare (*Pristimera sp*.)
8 Obukogoso (*Marantochloa leucantha*)
9 Ekyoyokyembwa *(Iodes sp*.)
10 Emijega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
11 Obutuzi, Obukokwe and Obusanza (Mushrooms)
12 Ensonzi (Fish)

Batwa from Karangara:

1. Enyama (Duicker meat)
2. Ensonzi (fish)
3. Enshuri (Smilax anceps)
4. Obutuzi (Mushrooms)
5. Obukozo (Gum from *Symphonia globufera*
6. Obuhura and Obwoki (wild honey)

Batwa from Rutugunda

1. Enyama (Game meat)
2. Ensonzi (Fish)
3. Ebihama and Ebikwa (wild yams)
4. Obutuzi, Obukarangwa, and Obusanza (Mushrooms)

5. Obuhura and Obwoki (Wild honey)
6. Eshwiga (*Solanum nigrum*- Edible vegetable)
7. Mukuru (*Pachycarpus sp*.)
8. Rukokota (*Piper guineense*)
9. Omwiha (*Ocotea usambarensis*)
10. Omumara (*Rynchosia sp*.)
11. Omukyafumbizi
12. Ebiryambire
13. Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)
14. Orusigwa
15. Ebitanda bye Mpundu (Chimpazee nests)
16. Kamaramahano
17. Obukogoso (*Marantochloa leucantha*)
18. Enku (fire wood)
19. Emyiru (*Marantochloa purpureum*
20. Ebitatara(*Marantochloa mannii*)
21. Enshuri (*Smilax anceps*)
22. Endengamatare (*Pristimera sp*.)
23. Emijega (*Loeseneriella apocynoides*)
24. Ebizogwa (*Draceana laxissima*)
25. Engomera (*Mitrogyna rubrostipulata*)
26. Omusomora (*Ficus exasperata*)

Local people of Rutugunda

1. Ebikwa (wild yams)
2. Mushrooms
3. Ensonzi (Fish)
4. Gold
5. Mukuru (*Pachycarpus sp*.)
6. Obutumbwe
7. Increase area under multiple use zone

Local people of Masya/Kifunjo

1. Endangamatale (*Pristimera sp*.)
2. Ebyeyate
3. Enfunda
4. Rukokota (Piper guineense)
5. Obuhunje (*Raphia farinifera*)
6. Emigushagusha (*Hibiscus sp*.)
7. Enchenche (*Draceana laxissima*)
8. Obukogoso (*Marantochloa leucantha*)
9. Emyiru (*Marantochloa purpureum)*
10. Eminaba (*Triumfetta sp*.)
11. Orubungwe
12. Ebitatara (*Marantochloa mannii*)
13. Obuhura (wild honey
14. Omuremankobe (*Zanthoxylum gillettii*)
15. Engomera (*Mitrogyna rubostipulata*)
16. Omwiha (*Ocotea usambarensis*)
17. Omwatamabare
18. Omuna (*Sericostachys scandens*)
19. Omuremanjojo (*Combretum sp*.)
20. Harahara
21. Rutasikura
22. Omutima gwensi
23. Omujeje (*Myrica salicifolia*)
24. Omuragaza (*Albizia sp*.)
25. Obujembajembe (*Cardus sp*.)
26. Nyakibazi (*Rytigynia kigeziensis*)
27. Obutuzi (mushrooms)
28. Obuhura and Obwoki (wild honey)

29. Ebihama and ebikwa (wild yams)
30. Enyama (game meat)
31. Ebyufa (*Myrianthus holstii* fruits)
32. Amatehe (*Afromum sp*.)
33. Enchenzi (*Eleusine indica*)
34. Gold
35. Enku (firewood)
36. Emihini (Hoe handles)
37. Walking sticks
38. Beer boat from Omwiha, Omutoma and Omulehe
39. Timber

View publication stats