



## APPENDIX 1: CASE STUDIES THE MANAGERS PERSPECTIVE



*Gorilla on wall separating park from farms, Rwanda. A.Plumptre, WCS*

### **Introduction**

The first two papers focus on the management of crop raiding by wildlife. The first paper presents a breakdown of Kenya's recently developed Conflict Resolution Concept. The author (Kagiri) identifies the source of conflict as being competition between people and wildlife for various resources including land. He suggests this conflict is confounded by the colonial legacy of a 'wildlife preservation policy' that has "succeeded in alienating people and wildlife to the detriment of the latter.". This theme of alienation of rural people and wildlife runs through several of the presentations, including Biryahwaho and Hill, and has been discussed at greater length by various authors including (Anderson, 1987) and (Naughton-Treves, 1999).

According to Kagiri Kenya is advocating a multi-pronged approach – where possible promoting wildlife as a source of revenue for rural populations through wildlife tourism, and the development of Problem Animal Control (PAC) measures, including use of honorary game wardens to assist in dealing with life-threatening problem animals, game-proof barriers, and restructuring of compensation schemes where appropriate. These measures will be developed and implemented at the regional level in recognition of the fact that there may be locally specific conditions/requirements with respect to PAC.

The second paper in this section by Biryahwaho outlines the management process being developed to reduce the impact of crop raiding by wildlife on local farmer's living alongside Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, southwestern Uganda. This project was in the early stages of consultation and development at the time of

the workshop. However, initial signs suggest that while certain planned interventions such as stone wall barriers can be successful deterrents for some crop raiding species, encouraging local long-term commitment to maintenance of such structures depends on good collaboration between the Parks, the local communities, and supporting institutions.

These two contributions highlight some of the issues that are central to this workshop document, namely the development of successful management strategies and the need to involve local communities in the development and maintenance of crop protection systems.

Anderson, D. and Grove, R. (1987). The Scramble for Eden: past present and future in African conservation. In: *Conservation in Africa: people, policies and practice*. Eds: D.Anderson & R.Grove. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Naughton-Treves, L. (1999). "Whose animals? A history of property rights to wildlife in Toro, Western Uganda." *Land Degradation & Development* **10**: 311-328.

## **Human – Wildlife Conflicts in Kenya: A Conflict Resolution Concept**

**Joachim Kagiri**  
Kenya Wildlife Service

### **Source of conflict**

The resource base for Kenya is shrinking at a fast rate due to the accelerated growth in the human population. Combined with this, there is a general population movement trend from the predominantly high potential areas to the relatively drier and ecologically more fragile environments. There has also been a remarkable transition from semi-nomadism to sedentary semi-agricultural settlements, and the development of small-scale farming in areas that have historically been known to be prime wildlife habitats, migration corridors or natural wildlife buffer zones. In an endeavour to get enough food, water, shelter (habitat) and space, both people and wildlife have found themselves in competition for the aforementioned resources. This competition has given rise to an unprecedented conflict: a conflict for survival. The colonial legacy of adopting a “wildlife preservation policy” only succeeded in alienating people and wildlife to the detriment of the latter. Consequently, wildlife has been largely viewed as the property of the state.

### **Results of the conflict**

The end result of this conflict of interest has far reaching economic and social effects. The problems associated with wildlife include:

- loss of human life
- injury to human beings
- destruction of crops
- destruction of farm infrastructure
- creation of an environment of fear

Wildlife is a major foreign exchange earner at the national level. However, it is perceived by some disadvantaged communities as a cause of poverty and a source of hunger and disease for livestock. There is no doubt therefore that wildlife related costs, outside the National Parks, Reserves, and the gazetted forests, should be reduced significantly.

Human-wildlife conflict is, in most aspects, a land use conflict which spills across and beyond the jurisdiction of the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS). In this regard, effective conflict resolution strategies will use “dialogue” as a major tool between various stakeholders. To this

end, ways and means are being explored in an attempt to effectively involve landowners and other interested groups in the process of identification, planning, and decision making in the management of wildlife outside the protected areas. The time has come to appreciate that people are the solution to the conflict rather than the problem.

With this in mind, the process of forming village and sub-locational wildlife management committees has already started. Formation of partnerships and grass-root capacity building is being given more attention than ever before. The training of community game scouts is a move in the right direction. In addition, the establishment of community-based conservation units (sanctuaries), and the promotion of commercial activities accruing from tourism, are sure and modern ways of changing the wildlife related liability to a source of income. In this latter case the problem automatically becomes an opportunity. In addition, there is adequate evidence to support the fact that the promotion of wildlife is a viable and competitive land use strategy within the savannah zone in Kenya.

#### **Problem Animal Control (PAC)**

Upon zonation of the entire country one recognizes the impracticability of mixing wildlife and arable farming in the high potential areas. Conflict resolution in the agricultural and heavily settled areas is achieved through scaring the animals, shooting them, translating or driving them away, or restricting their invasions through the creation of game-proof barriers. It is the policy of the conflict resolution office to remove or destroy dangerous and destructive animals from the midst of people. Local communities will be encouraged to deal with small and illusive pest species through trapping, though the use of poison will be discouraged.

In view of the magnitude of the problem, and taking cognisance of the fact that KWS resources are limited, reputable honorary game wardens will be encouraged to deal with life-threatening problem animals. The honorary game wardens will work closely with the Area Partnership Officers.

At locations where communities border the conservation areas the option of creating game-proof barriers will be explored. The type and magnitude of the barrier will be determined by:

- problem animalspecies
- type of land use
- social - political set up
- climatic conditions

- funding
- ability to sustain the barrier

Priority will be given to areas or districts with the most severe human-wildlife conflict problems. Indeed, every region is presently working out a conflict resolution strategy based on the prevailing local peculiarities. Emphasis will be placed on the management of individual “conflict cells”. The region strategy should be simple, attainable, and socially and environmentally acceptable. Each regional strategy will include monitoring and evaluation systems.

Animal movement calendars, conflict seasons, and crop ripening periods will be monitored and assessed over time. Each region will have a fully trained and well equipped PAC unit. The burden of compensation for damages accruing from wildlife will, upon approval of the proposed wildlife management bill, be passed to a third party - preferably a reputable insurance firm. It is envisaged that this will enhance the efficiency of the compensation process and remove the delays that are presently being experienced by claimants.

### **Capacity building**

In order to fulfil effectively the broader objective of protecting people and their property from wildlife, a training curriculum has been formulated for different classes of problem animal control cadre.

The curriculum targets the following groups of people:

- game scouts
- wildlife management committees
- association/forum members
- partnership rangers
- community fence attendants
- KWS fence attendants/technicians
- partnership officers
- forest guards
- other stakeholders

With the formation of a fully pledged partnership department, and through the restructuring process where the focus for wildlife management is at regional level, human-wildlife conflict is expected to be reduced to lower, manageable and acceptable levels.

## **Community Perspectives Towards Management of Crop raiding Animals: Experiences of Care – DTC with Communities Living Adjacent to Bwindi Impenetrable and Mgahinga Gorilla National Parks, Southwest Uganda**

**Byamukama Biryahwaho,**  
Problem Animal Control Officer, CARE – DTC project, Bwindi, Uganda

### **Introduction**

Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (BINP) and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park (MGNP) are of high conservation value as rare examples of afro-montane rainforest and most especially, as home to half the world's population of the highly endangered mountain gorilla (CARE, 1997). As such the Government of Uganda, NGOs and the local community are interested in the long-term conservation of the two parks. A number of innovative conservation initiatives are being implemented by a variety of stakeholders with a view to the sustainable management of the two parks.

CARE's Development Through Conservation (DTC) project supports the management of BINP and MGNP to meet some of the management objectives as provided for in the management plans of each park. The project's park management and community conservation section co-ordinates the program of support while park staff implement it with the communities concerned. The project's objective under this section is to ensure that a framework for effective and sustainable park management is established which involves the active participation of all relevant stakeholders and the equitable sharing of costs and benefits between parks and local communities. One of the outputs of this project is that management systems for problem animal control are developed and operational in affected communities.

Before Bwindi and Mgahinga were gazetted as national parks in 1991, local communities had almost unlimited access to forest resources notably timber, bee-keeping and wild honey collection, gold mining and harvesting of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). This was

stopped when the forests were gazetted as national parks, creating a great deal of tension between the people and park authorities. Some local communities have been allowed access to park resources through the innovative multiple use programs. This is where community members, organised into forest societies, enter into collaborative management arrangements with park authorities and, in return, are allowed to harvest NTFPs. This has improved community-park relationships with those communities that are benefiting already. Besides being denied access to forest resources, local communities were stopped from practising some of the traditional ways of controlling crop-raiding animals, presumably because these were conflicting with conservation principles.

In our experience community perspectives towards the parks stem from a variety of contributing factors including loss of access to resources and income generated from the parks, crop depredations by wild animals, exclusion from participation in decision making, planning and management, and low levels of awareness concerning the importance of wildlife conservation (Kiss, 1990). While the depredation of crops by wildlife serves as a contributing factor to the generation of local community hostility towards wildlife, it warrants consideration as a major problem to wildlife managers in its own right due to its magnitude and complexity. Raiding of crops is a burden to farmers adjacent to BINP and MGNP where the economic damage from crop raiding probably exceeds potential benefits from the parks to individuals, which has resulted in heightened community attitudes towards crop raiders (UNP, 1995; UNP, 1996).

The impacts of crop depredations are not only restricted to economic losses on the part of the farmers but also carry a high social component in terms of time and labour expended. For example school aged children are involved in crop guarding, physical insecurity is caused by animals themselves, and in severe instances there is migration by entire families due to persistent and severe crop depredations. It is important to realise that dissatisfaction among local communities is based on the perception that authorities are not adequately addressing community concerns about crop raiding. Communities advocate for direct monetary compensation to individuals who lose their crops, but this is not a sustainable option at the present time.

The costs of conservation paid by individual households in the form of damage to crops are great. It is often assumed that communities benefit from community development programs but the benefit may not be significant to individual households. The distinction between

returns to the community and to the individuals within the community is often lost, even though this may determine the individual's attitudes to wildlife conservation. During our interactions with communities adjacent to the two parks it has been established that individuals differ in the share of community benefits they receive, or they have different priorities, which determines individuals' participation in the implementation of crop raiding control measures. It is the individual's perception of crop raiders that collectively form community perspectives. Therefore, individuals' views and suggestions, based on local experience, have an important function in developing crop raiding control methods suitable to the local conditions, and helping to enlist community support during their implementation.

### **Uganda's legislation on the management of problem animals**

National policies and practices towards local communities can directly or indirectly influence the success of long term conservation efforts. The Uganda Wildlife Statute (1996) guides the implementation of crop raiding control measures at both BINP and MGNP. The statute is a piece of legislation guiding the management of all wildlife in the country within and outside protected areas. Section 3 (1) (f) calls for the promotion of ecologically acceptable control of problem animals. The statute calls for the conservation of wildlife throughout Uganda so that their abundance and diversity are maintained at optimum levels commensurate with other forms of land use, in order to support sustainable utilisation of wildlife for the benefit of the people of Uganda.

Section 6 of the statute on functions of the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) charges the Authority with the responsibility of monitoring and controlling problem animals, and to provide technical advice on the control of vermin. Section 59 (2) states that where the vermin animal(s) are of value the Executive Director shall at all times advise the local communities about the value of the animal(s), and recommend the appropriate methods for controlling such animal(s). Section 15 (1) provides that the Executive Director, with the approval of the UWA Board of Trustees, can enter commercial or collaborative arrangements with any person for the management of a species or a class of species of animals or plants. The statute further states that for the better achievement of the purposes of the statute UWA, and every person responsible for the administration of the statute, it shall ensure that any measures taken or instituted under the statute are based on results of scientific investigation in as far as it is economical, including the monitoring of species status and habitat condition, as well as taking into account the views of the affected community.

The Uganda Local Government Act (1996) gives the responsibility of managing crop raiding animals that have been declared as vermin by the UWA to the districts in which the animal(s) fall. However, until recently, no such animals have been declared as vermin around the two parks, therefore UWA management still maintains the overall responsibility of managing all crop raiding animals. At the same time the districts are still reluctant to take up this responsibility. This further complicates the implementation of crop raiding control measures. Communities end up feeling that they are neglected and their concerns are not adequately addressed, which further influences their attitudes. Therefore designing measures for the management of crop raiding animals around BINP and MGNP requires careful consideration of the policy guidelines, the conservation status of the two parks, and the biodiversity therein.

The Ugandan parliament has not yet enacted the statute to put in place laws and clear guidelines for the implementation of the police on management of problem animals and crop raiders in particular. Once the laws and guidelines are in place it is hoped that there will be smooth implementation of crop raiding control measures, with no contradictions, at different sites within the country.

#### **Crop raiding situation around BINP and MGNP**

Crop raiding animals presenting significant problems to communities and park management at MGNP include buffaloes (*Syncerus caffer*) and porcupines (*Hystrix africaeaustralis*). Crop raiding by buffaloes has, however, been contained with the construction of a stone wall. Baboons (*Papio anubis*), elephants (*Loxodonta africana cyclotis*) and bushpigs (*Potamochoerus porcus*) present significant problems to Bwindi communities and park management. Records of crop raiding by L'Hoest monkeys (*Cercopithecus lhoesti*), chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla beringei*) around Bwindi exist but are infrequent, and present a minor problem relative to the other species named above. All major food crops suffer damage from crop raiding animals to varying degrees. The majority of crop depredations occur during the day; exceptions include crop losses to the nocturnal bushpig, elephants and buffaloes that may forage into the night. Seasonal raiding by elephant is known to occur in certain sectors of the community (UNP 1995; UNP 1996).

Studies conducted around BINP and MGNP, and field experience, reveal that in some cases local community claims of crop damage are frequently inaccurate and exaggerated. Similar studies elsewhere have come up with the same conclusions (see for example Mwathe, 1992 and Wakely, 1981). Other studies suggest that while naming the crop raiding animals that

inflict the greatest damage, big animals such as elephants, buffaloes, wild pigs and baboons receive disproportionately large amounts of blame for the damage caused. On the other hand, smaller animals such as rodents and birds, which cause the greatest cumulative damage over time, are less frequently complained about. Similarly, domestic animals may cause considerable damage to crops yet the damage does not elicit strong community resentment (Graham 1992).

In a recent knowledge and attitude survey that was conducted by CARE – DTC in parishes adjacent to the two parks, 75% of the respondents (n = 124) indicated that the most pressing problem from the parks is crop raiding. In the same study 44.3% of the respondents indicated that the benefits from the park are greater than the problems, while 54% indicated that the problems are more than the benefits. However, when asked to compare themselves with people living far away from the park, the majority (50.9%) of the respondents indicated that they were better off, with only 45.7% indicating that they were worse off. It was noted that there were some contradictions among respondents (18.5%), where respondents would indicate that the benefits from the parks were more than the problems faced, yet on being asked whether they were better off than people living far away from the park boundary, their response would be that s/he was worse off. This contradiction could be attributed to crop raiding, and the fact that some indicated that it was their place of birth and therefore they did not have any other place to live. However, the survey covered the entire parish, therefore there is need to treat such results with caution since it is usually community members who live right at the park boundary that are mainly affected by crop raiding animals. Most community members feel that the parks are not giving them enough help, considering the problems caused by the crop raiders.

### **Crop raiding situation in community gardens adjacent to MGNP and management actions undertaken**

#### *Crop raiding by buffaloes*

When Mgahinga was gazetted as a national park there were a number of evictions for those community members that had encroached on the then Forest Reserve. Due to this encroachment, animals had been driven into the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) but soon they returned in big numbers. Buffaloes were major crop raiders and communities raised this issue with park staff authorities. Park authorities hoped that scare shooting would scare them and control the problem. This proved to be ineffective. In 1995, with support from CARE – DTC project, the local communities, supervised by park staff, constructed a stone

wall (4km long) along the northern park boundary from the Congo border. Community leaders, through the local council, mobilised community members. The wall proved very effective against crop raiding by buffaloes and an additional 5km was constructed. Planting *Erythrina abyssinica* and *Solanum species* reinforced some sections of the stone wall. Construction of the stone wall stopped at the gully from Mt. Muhabura since buffaloes could not cross the steep cliff.

Responsibility for maintaining the stone wall was left to the community since they were the primary beneficiaries. This has been achieved through the formation of stone wall maintenance committees, comprised of the local councils (LCs) of the villages bordering the park. However, no formal agreement on stone wall maintenance was put in place. As time went by crop raiding by buffaloes was no longer a problem to the communities and eventually maintenance of the stone wall was no longer a priority, resulting in some of the sections collapsing. During our discussions with community members it was evident that the stone wall is perceived as being more beneficial to the park, and therefore there is limited willingness amongst some sections of the community to maintain it without payment. Some look at it as a barrier to them accessing the park for grazing, firewood and herbal medicine collection, and as a permanent boundary for the park. With support from CARE – DTC discussions between the communities and park staff are going on with the aim of developing formal arrangements for stone wall maintenance.

At the beginning of the first week of January 2000, about 60 buffaloes crossed over from the DRC and raided farmers' gardens. Maize gardens were most severely hit. Most buffaloes crossed through the Uganda-Congo border area where there is no stone wall. However, a few of them crossed through sections of the stone wall that had collapsed. In response to this communities have repaired those sections through which the buffaloes crossed. While they did take action they still feel that park management should pay them for repairing the stone wall, provide compensation for the crops lost, and provide them with food supplements.

#### *Crop raiding by porcupines*

The porcupine (*Hystrix africaeaustralis*) remains a major crop raiding animal that is raising a lot of complaints from the local community. In response to this and in line with principles of good conservation practice, CARE – DTC has supported a study to investigate the extent of crop damage by porcupines. A consultant (Andama Edward) undertook this study with supervision from the Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC). One of the major

findings of the study is that while incidences of crop raiding were recorded where the stone wall was not constructed, no crop raids were recorded at sites bordering the stone wall. Community members reported buffaloes, porcupines and birds as the worst crop raiders respectively. These findings contradict community claims that crop raiding by porcupines occurs throughout the entire park boundary region. The study has thus recommended the extension of the stone wall to cover the entire park boundary as a solution to minimise crop raiding by porcupines.

Assigning blame to particular crop raiders corresponded to the perceived origin of the raiding animal rather than the amount of crop lost or frequency of raiding incidences. For instance, porcupines were perceived as causing more crop damage yet study findings indicate that birds caused more damage (Andama, 1999). Secondly, porcupines cause intensive damage to crops and mainly raid Irish potatoes, which is a major crop grown in the area for both domestic use and for income. This study has produced interesting findings and MGNP management, CARE- DTC and ITFC will review the recommendations, and appropriate management actions will be implemented.

#### *Challenges and lessons learnt*

It is important to note that constructing the stone wall has proved to be a good action to mitigate the extent of crop damage at MGNP. This measure has restored hope amongst community members who perceive park management as willing to address their concerns. It is worth noting that there is a need to constantly remind the communities of their role in managing crop raiding animals so as to sustain the measures already in place. The major challenge with crop raiding by buffaloes at MGNP is how to deal with buffalo incursions through the DRC border. This is an international issue that can not be addressed by park management and the local communities but rather by the ministries of foreign affairs for the respective countries.

#### **Crop raiding situation in community gardens adjacent to BINP and management actions undertaken**

Crop raiding is one of the sources of the poor community-park relations at BINP. In a study that was conducted in parishes bordering BINP, 20% of the households reported crop raiding (n=402) with each household affected losing an average of 36% of the crop (n=62). Nine percent of the respondents indicated that the park was not of value to them because of crop

damage by wild animals (MUIENR, 1993). Communities allege that the extent of crop raiding has increased since Bwindi was gazetted as a national park.

Crops raided around Bwindi are millet, sorghum, sweet potatoes, Irish potatoes, cassava, peas, beans, bananas, coffee, yams, cabbages, passion fruits, ground nuts, tobacco, wheat, sugarcane, pumpkins, pineapples and sunflowers. Baboons are the most destructive crop raiding animals around BINP. In a study that was conducted in communities around the park, 84.9% of crop raiding incidences were reportedly caused by baboons (n =2065) and baboons were mentioned as causing the most intensive crop damage (Mwesigye, 1996).

Various forums have been organised by UWA and attended by all the interested partners, including the affected communities, to address the issue of crop depredations by wildlife around BINP. As of 1995 there were growing demands around Bwindi, from some sections of the communities, that if park management could not provide a viable alternative to traditional practices of controlling crop raiding, then the community should be allowed to return to their old measures (UNP, 1995).

#### *Collaborative management arrangement between UWA and the communities*

The management plan of BINP recognises the need for park authorities to take action in order to safe-guard community property and well being. It further points out that any action must either be consistent with a long term strategy to resolve the otherwise chronic problem, or be recognised as a short term policy enacted while other long term solutions are being sought (UNP, 1996). This was discussed in a crop raiding workshop, organised by BINP management and supported by CARE – DTC, where strategies and designs for control measures were suggested. Present were representatives of the local communities, district authorities and institutions supporting the two parks, namely CARE – DTC, Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT), ITFC and International Gorilla Conservation Program (IGCP). The workshop participants recommended that a pilot problem animal control program be initiated and implemented in selected communities, where alternative control measures would be tried, and their effectiveness in reducing damage to crops monitored and evaluated.

In accordance with section 15 (1) of the Uganda Wildlife Statute (1996), the program is to be implemented through collaborative arrangements between UWA and the districts of Kabale, Kisoro and Rukungiri, represented by the local communities in respective parishes. The five

pilot parishes are Rubuguri, Kashasha, Muramba of Kayonza, Bushura and Karangara. A series of community consultation meetings have been held in order to get recommendations of the appropriate control measures from the communities. These have resulted in draft Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) between UWA and each of the parishes involved in the pilot collaborative management of problem animals. The MoUs have been reviewed by the interested stakeholders and are awaiting approval by UWA head quarters. The process has been necessarily slow and some communities have complained about this. However, DTC project and park staff alike are always updating the communities on the progress and reaffirming to them UWA's commitment to the implementation of the program. This has kept the communities hopeful and confident that the MoUs will be approved and the proposed measures implemented.

Planting of live fencing alongside the park boundary on community land, using *Ceasalpinia decapetala*, has been suggested, and is being carried out by some community members in Rubuguri and Mpungu parishes. However, Rushaga community in Rubuguri has been reluctant to maintain it, citing the absence of an approved MoU as a problem. Initially, some community members thought that they would get paid for establishing and maintaining the live fence but when it was made clear to them that it was for their own benefit there was laxity in maintaining it. This is a clear indication that community members consider their participation in the management of crop raiding animals to be an extra cost that should not be met by them. Communities argue that it should be park management and supporting institutions that meet the cost of controlling crop raiders, rather than the affected communities.

Research on ecology and crop raiding behaviour of baboons (by Mwesigye, 1996) and the population status and distribution of bush pigs (by Musasizi, 1999) has been conducted around Bwindi. The studies adopted a participatory research approach with the active involvement of community members. Their findings and recommendations therefore include substantial inputs from the communities in as far as community perspectives are concerned, and will be useful in the implementation of the recommended control measures. Research findings indicate that community members are hostile towards baboons and bush pigs because they are considered the most notorious crop raiders. Farmers in one of the communities ran out of sympathy for baboons and in October 1999 four adult baboons were killed! Park management took quick action and the culprits were arrested and tried according to the law.

*Challenges and lessons learnt*

It has been established that research into crop raiding is very important in developing appropriate control measures. Control of crop raiding is a very delicate issue that should not be handled by park management alone, but requires substantial input by the affected communities and supporting partners. The community consultation process raised a lot of expectations in the proposed pilot collaborative management of problem animals. These expectations have not been met so far, and some community members have lost trust in the process, which has increased the strained community attitudes. The delay in approving the MoUs has complicated the problem, and communities feel that park management is not committed to solving the crop-raiding problem.

**Conclusion**

CARE – DTC’s experience in working with communities living adjacent to BINP and MGNP shows that crop raiding remains a major problem to address if improved community attitudes towards the conservation of the two parks are to be encouraged and maintained. As a general observation, community perceptions towards crop raiders will change as long as the communities feel that there is deliberate action to address the problem. The only problem is that the communities want immediate action, which may not necessarily be sustainable in the long term. Management and supporting institutions at the two parks are interested in identifying long term solutions to crop raiding, but at the same time are being very cautious of the measures implemented. It may take some time to evaluate the effectiveness of particular control measures, and therefore the negative community attitudes to crop raiders may equally take a long time to change.

It is important to note that there is a need to involve community members in the design and implementation of any crop raiding control program. It is when the communities meet the challenges involved in the implementation that they will understand the magnitude of the problem, and appreciate efforts being undertaken. This is because they will own the process, and therefore be willing to sustain the control measures.

Implementation of the control measures should be done in a systematic way developed by all the stakeholders concerned. A memorandum of understanding where the roles and responsibilities of the interested parties are clearly spelt out should guide the implementation of crop raiding control measures. This is important in order to build trust and confidence

among community members, that will in turn affect the way in which they perceive the crop raiders.

Community awareness created during community consultation meetings, and other conservation awareness programs around the two parks, have helped communities to understand the importance of protecting all the wildlife, including crop raiders. It is hoped that community perspectives will increasingly change in favour of crop raiders as some of the control measures are implemented. It has been established that a community's attitudes towards crop raiders are selective. Some crop raiders are perceived as of more importance than others, and community attitudes towards these are not so bad. We should build from this and help the communities to develop positive attitudes towards all crop raiders.

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank the Wildlife Conservation Society for organising and providing sponsorship for this workshop. Special thanks go to Dr. Andrew Plumtre and Dr. Kate Hill for initiating the workshop. This paper was developed with input from project staff. Special thanks go specifically to Project Manager Jackson Mutebi, Levand Turyomurugendo and Beda Mwebesa for the helpful comments made.

### **References**

- Andama, E. (1999) *An Assessment of wildlife crop damage around Mgahinga Gorilla National Park. A particular emphasis on porcupines*. Unpublished report to CARE – DTC
- CARE (1997) *Project Document, Development Through Conservation Project Phase III July 1997 June 2002*. CARE International
- Kiss, A. (1990) *Living with Wildlife. Wildlife resource management with local participation in Africa*. World Bank Technical Paper Number 130. Africa Technical Department Series. Washington D. C.
- Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources (1993) *Bwindi Impenetrable Forest. Baseline study report*. Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources, Kampala
- Mwathe K. M. (1992) *A Preliminary Report on Elephant Damage on Farm Bordering Shimba Hills National Park*. Kenya Wildlife Service. Elephant Program
- Mwesigye (1996) *Crop raiding by baboon (Papio anubis) around Bwindi Impenetrable National Park South West Uganda*. Unpublished MSc. Thesis, Makerere University

Uganda National Parks (1995) *Bwindi Impenetrable National Park Management Plan 1995 – 1999*

Uganda National Parks (1996) *Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Management Plan 1996 – 2000*

Uganda Government (1996) *The Uganda Wildlife Statute 1996*. Uganda Government Gazette No. 321 Volume LXXXIX. Government printer, Entebbe.