



UNESCO / ITALY funds-in-trust co-operation

JOINT DECLARATION ON CO-OPERATION CONCERNING
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE PROTECTION

AFRICA MOUNTAINS

Trevor Sandwith and Margaret Sandwith

*Report on the UNESCO/IUNC Monitoring Mission to the Rwenzori
Mountains WH Sites, Uganda,*

May 2003



*In the framework of the UNESCO/Italy Funds in Trust Cooperation
for the preservation of World Heritage*

Report on the UNESCO/IUCN Monitoring Mission to the Rwenzori Mountains World Heritage Site, Uganda

from 5 to 11 January 2003

Report compiled by Trevor Sandwith and Margaret Sandwith

Members of Mission:

Eric Edroma (Mission Leader)

Patrizia Rossi (UNESCO consultant)

Trevor Sankey (Programme Specialist UNESCO)

Trevor Sandwith (IUCN consultant)

Contents

Contents	(i)
Acknowledgements	(ii)
Executive Summary	(iii)
1. Terms of Reference and background to the Mission	1
1.1 Inscription history	1
1.2 Examination of the State of Conservation of the Site by the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Bureau	1
1.3 Justification for the Mission	2
2. National context for the preservation and management of the World Heritage Property	2
2.1 Protected Area legislation	2
2.2 Institutional framework	3
3. Identification and assessment of issues	3
3.1 Factors affecting the property	3
3.2 Assessment of the State of Conservation of the Site	4
4. Management requirements to maintain the integrity of the Site	5
4.1 Security	5
4.2 Extent of RMWHS	6
4.3 Institutional/policy context	7
4.4 Management framework	7
4.5 Boundary	8
4.6 Staff capacity	9
4.7 Management infrastructure	9
4.8 Community interaction	10
4.9 Communication with District and other authorities	10
4.10 Tourism	11
5. Conclusions and recommendations	12
5.1 Evaluating the nature and extent of the threats to the Site	12
5.2 Measures that the State Party plans to take to protect the outstanding World Heritage values of the Site	12
5.3 Recommendations for any additional action to be taken by the State Party, including draft recommendations to the World Heritage Bureau/Committee	13
Figure 1. Map of the Rwenzori Mountains National Park	14
Appendix 1. Terms of reference	15
Appendix 2. Detailed field programme	16
Appendix 3. List of persons consulted	17
Appendix 4. Documents provided to the Mission	20

Accompanying CD-ROM containing photographs taken on the Mission.

Acknowledgements

The Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and its staff are thanked for hosting the UNESCO/IUCN Mission to Uganda (the Mission) and to the Rwenzori Mountains World Heritage Site. Arrangements for the Mission were extremely well co-ordinated and the carefully planned programme enabled a comprehensive and useful consultation with key stakeholders as well as field visits to various locations in the Site.

In particular, Dr Arthur Mugisha, Executive Director of UWA, Moses Mapesa, Deputy Director Field Operations, Nuwe John Bosco, Chief Warden, and Ignatius Achoka, Senior Warden of Rwenzori Mountains National Park (RMNP), made available staff and facilities and co-ordinated arrangements for meetings and site visits. The Mission appreciated the efforts to ensure that the Mission was regarded as an interaction to develop responses to enhancing the status of the Site, and the members of the Mission regarded the opportunity as a privilege to both visit the Site and develop a relationship with the managers and other interested parties.

The Mission would also like to acknowledge the time and contributions made by the Uganda National Commission for UNESCO, the Ministry of Museums and Antiquities, UNESCO MAB National Committee, the Kabarole, Bundibugyo and Kasese Local Councils and District Commissions, EcoTrust, Rwenzori Mountaineering Services, Abanya Rwenzori Mountaineering Association and the Ruboni Community Conservation and Development Project.

I would like to thank my colleagues on this Mission, Prof Eric Edroma, Dr Patrizia Rossi, Trevor Sankey and Margaret Sandwith for contributing to the effectiveness of this Mission and the contents of this report.

Trevor Sandwith
January 2003

Executive Summary

A joint UNESCO/IUCN Mission (the Mission) visited Uganda from 5 – 11 January 2003 to assess the State of Conservation of the Rwenzori Mountains World Heritage Site, at the request of the World Heritage Committee at its 25th session held in December 2001. The Mission considered the overall **Integrity** of the Site, and found the following characteristics:

- A largely secure boundary;
- A low incidence of poaching;
- The reduction of population size of some mammalian species, including buffalo and elephant, and possibly duikers;
- A reported reduction of the amount and duration of snow cover, and extent of glaciers;
- Visitor impacts on the central hiking circuit;
- Management staff in control of the Site;
- No security forces occupying any part of the Site;
- No illegal occupation of the Site.

The Mission concluded that the integrity of the Site had **not been significantly adversely impacted** by activities during the period in which it has been listed as World Heritage in Danger. The conditions that resulted in the Site being inscribed on the list of World Heritage in Danger had improved dramatically. Yet, the integrity of the Site remains vulnerable to factors that threaten it.

The Mission observed and noted several **threats** to the RMWHS, which if not managed or controlled, could potentially adversely impact the integrity of the Site. These include (see report for details):

- Progressive ecological isolation of the Site from the surrounding landscape;
- A growing and predominantly poor human population living in areas adjacent to the Site;
- Growing impacts of tourism, concentrated in certain key locations;
- Global warming;
- Flooding and landslides;
- Potential continued insecurity;
- A demand for land for development.

The Mission found that UWA and its partners were aware of these threats and had identified, where possible, measures to avoid or contain them. A special set of management measures to avoid or mitigate threats and ensure that these do not progressively impact the integrity of the Site remains a priority. The Mission noted that many of these threats operated at the time that the RMNP was listed as a World Heritage Site and appreciate that they require management and mitigation. The ability to achieve this was impeded by the situation of insecurity that prevailed over the period 1997 to 2001, and the generally sub-optimal availability of resources to enable effective management.

It is clear at the present time that the State Party will need to accord greater priority to the level of budget appropriation that will ensure that essential management of the Site is effectively carried out, in accordance with the obligations conferred by the World Heritage Convention and the listing of the Site. It is clear also that the Site is worthy of increased assistance, both financial and technical, from external sources, to ensure that the essential management actions are identified and implemented.

It is recommended that:

- (i) The State Party, represented by UWA, should carefully assess the recommendations made in the report, and compile a response report which would **indicate those recommendations it deems appropriate to implement and the time scale of this implementation**. This report could serve as a basis on which to negotiate further support from external funders and to lobby support for enhanced funding for the management of the Site.
- (ii) It is further recommended to IUCN and UNESCO that, on the basis of the response report from UWA, which would indicate the State Party's commitment to address the management measures required to ensure the integrity of the Site, that a recommendation be forwarded to the World Heritage Bureau/Committee **that the Site be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger**.

1. Terms of Reference and background to the Mission

This assignment was conducted in accordance with the Terms of Reference (Appendix 1). The monitoring team consisted of Prof Eric Edroma (Consultant to UNESCO and Leader of Mission), Dr Patrizia Rossi (Consultant to UNESCO), Trevor Sankey (Programme Specialist UNESCO - Nairobi), and Trevor Sandwith (WCPA Member and Consultant to IUCN).

The Mission was hosted by the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and involved meetings with key stakeholders and a field visit to the Rwenzori Mountains World Heritage Site (RMWHS). The Itinerary (Appendix 2) and List of Persons Consulted (Appendix 3) are attached. Documents were provided to the Mission (Appendix 4). As far as possible, the Mission attempted through site visits and discussions to corroborate and verify information and observations.

1.1 Inscription history

The Rwenzori Mountains of Uganda were originally gazetted as a forest reserve in 1941 encompassing all terrain above 2100m. The area was declared as the Rwenzori Mountains National Park (RMNP) in 1991 and inscribed as a World Heritage Site in 1994.

The Rwenzori Mountains National Park (RMNP) was inscribed in the WH list as a natural property under two criteria: Criterion (iii) for great scenic beauty and superlative natural phenomena; and Criterion (iv) for containing the most important and significant natural habitats for threatened species. The six main massifs of the central Rwenzori with their equatorial glaciers, snowfields, waterfalls and lakes provide an alpine setting unparalleled in Africa, are the most permanent sources of the River Nile, and a vital water catchment area (Criterion iii). The park also provides critical and viable habitat for populations of several endemic species such as the giant heathers, groundsels, ericas and lobelias of the alpine zone. Also present are globally threatened mammals, including chimpanzees, L'Hoest's monkeys and the three-horned chameleon. In addition there is a large area of montane cloud forest within the park (Criterion iv).

1.2 Examination of the State of Conservation of the Site by the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Bureau

In May 1999, the IUCN noted that since 1997, anti-government rebel forces had occupied parts of RMNP, effectively preventing UWA from managing the park which was also closed to visitors. All management staff had been withdrawn from the RMNP, and conditions of insecurity prevailed in the adjacent districts of Kasese and Bundibugyo.

The 23rd Ordinary Session of the World Heritage Bureau held in July 1999 noted the reports on lack of resources, suspension of projects and serious security issues at the RMWHS and that a greater part of the Site was not being monitored by RMNP staff because of the security situation. In accordance with the request by the Executive Director of UWA, the Bureau recommended that the RMWHS be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At the 23rd Session of the World Heritage Committee held in November/December 1999, the Committee expressed its serious concerns regarding the security situation at the RMWHS, and requested the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to work closely with UWA, conservation NGOs and other international organisations present in the region, to seek and apply means to support effective site management. The Committee inscribed the RMWHS on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

In June 2000, the World Heritage Bureau noted the continuing and worsening insecurity situation in and around the RMWHS, the activities of the Uganda Peoples' Defence Force (UPDF) to address the threats, and the lack of resources of UWA to conduct effective management and rehabilitation. It was recommended that the RMWHS be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and that an international financial assistance package be developed to assist in protecting the integrity of the Site. The 24th Session of the World Heritage Council endorsed these recommendations.

In June 2001, the World Heritage Bureau noted the improvement in the security situation and the planned re-opening of the RMNP to visitors. UWA had identified essential communications and other infrastructure that required repair or replacement and had submitted an emergency assistance request for funding. The Bureau also noted that illegal activities had persisted or had increased, including poaching and pit-sawing. The 25th Session of the World Heritage Committee held in December 2001, noted the improved situation and approved a sum of \$64 000 in emergency assistance. The Committee proposed that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN field a mission to the Site in 2002 with a view to providing a detailed report on the State of Conservation of the Site, including an assessment of the feasibility of its early removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger to the 27th Session of the World Heritage Committee in 2003.

1.3 Justification for the Mission

In accordance with the decision of the World Heritage Committee, a monitoring mission, organised jointly by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and IUCN, was conducted during the period 5 January to 11 January 2003 to evaluate the State of Conservation of the Site.

The Mission commenced with a briefing by the Executive Director and senior staff of UWA, attended by representatives of: the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities, the Uganda National Commission for UNESCO and MAB National Committee and IUCN Uganda. It was followed by a discussion with representatives of NGOs involved with aspects of RMWHS management. The TOR for the Mission were discussed at these meetings, and important issues were highlighted. The Mission then conducted a series of meetings in the Kasese, Kabarole and Bundibugyo Districts adjacent to RMWHS, meeting in each case the representatives of Local Councils at the District level (LC3) and the Resident District Commissioners and staff, representing the District Administration. In addition, some key community groups who are closely associated with RMWHS were consulted. In all cases, except in the meeting with the Rwenzori Mountaineering Services, UWA staff were present at these meetings.

It was agreed that the Mission would conclude with a wrap-up meeting, to which all of the attendees of the Briefing Session were invited. This meeting took place on 11 January 2003 at which the preliminary findings of the Mission were presented and discussed. Further clarification of specific issues identified during the Mission was provided.

2. National context for the preservation and management of the World Heritage Property

2.1 Protected Area legislation

The RMNP was designated a National Park by Statutory Instrument No. 26 of 1991, amended by Statutory Instrument No. 3 of 1992. The RMNP is managed by the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), a statutory authority with a Board of Trustees, established by the Uganda Wildlife Statute, 1996 (Supplement 8, Uganda Gazette No. 32, Volume 99).

The RMWHS includes the entire extent of the RMNP. In Uganda, there is no buffer zone beyond the RMNP boundary other than the North Rwenzori Forest Reserve which serves as an extension to the RMNP on its northern boundary. On the eastern and southern boundaries of the Site, there are settlements of people and cultivation and extractive uses of natural resources right up to the RMNP boundary. For approximately 50 km along the western boundary with the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), there is the Parc National des Virunga which includes the west-facing slopes of the Rwenzori Mountains massif.

2.2 Institutional framework

The RMNP site is under the direct management responsibility of UWA and is managed together with other protected areas in a regional management structure known as the Queen Elizabeth Conservation Area. The Chief Warden of the Queen Elizabeth Conservation Area and the RMNP Warden-in-Charge head the RMNP management. The Warden-in-Charge is assisted by 4 Wardens with specific portfolios, including law enforcement, tourism, community conservation and finance, as well as 49 law enforcement rangers, 6 community conservation rangers, 2 information clerks and 2 support staff. There is currently no professional ecologist assigned to RMNP and therefore no assigned responsibility or capacity for ecological monitoring. Some professional services are rendered by UWA headquarters, e.g. there is a Planning Unit, which can assist with the development of management plans. For management purposes, the RMNP is divided into 2 main sectors, Kasese and Bundibugyo/Kabarole with six ranger outposts in Bwera, Bundibugyo, Kilembe, Katebwa, Kazingo and Nyabithaba respectively.

Management was initially guided by a Management Plan prepared in 1948, and a second Management Plan prepared in 1961, emphasising the importance of water catchment protection. The purpose of the USAID/WWFUS Rwenzori Mountains Conservation and Development Project, which operated from 1990 until 1998, was to contribute to the Overall Goal of conserving RMNP's unique features and watershed value. The objectives were to strengthen the institutional capacity of RMNP, reduce human pressures on the protected area and strengthen relations between RMNP and neighbouring communities. An aspect of this initiative was to prepare a new management plan for RMNP, a process that was initiated but not concluded by the time that the project was suspended in 1998 owing to insecurity. UWA was also in the process of developing a protocol for protected area management planning, but it was deemed inappropriate to attempt to conclude this for RMNP while management was not fully operational. A Medium Term Operational Plan (MTOP) for the period 1998 – 2001 was developed by the RMNP management team. It addressed urgent and feasible management operations under conditions of insecurity, and provided a platform for continuing planning and management in an integrated manner. The activities were grouped under eight topics: Management Planning, Resource Management, Community Conservation Programmes, Law Enforcement, Visitor and Tourism Facilities, Protected Area Infrastructure, Finance and Administration, Research and Monitoring. Implementation of the MTOP was hindered by the prevailing situation of insecurity, the lack of resources allocated to the park and a high turnover of management staff. Management currently operates without reference to a management plan, and the basis for management is an Annual Plan of Operations negotiated between the protected area management team and UWA headquarters.

3. Identification and assessment of issues

The threats to the RMWHS have been adequately documented in the Phase II Evaluation of the Rwenzori Mountains Conservation and Development Project conducted in April 1998 (Ratter, et al., 1998) and in the Medium-Term Operational Plan concluded in December 1998. It is acknowledged that long-term effective management is required to address or mitigate these threats, which could otherwise impact on the values for which the Site was established as a National Park and inscribed as a World Heritage Site. UWA was involved in a process to strengthen the management of the RMWHS when the conditions of insecurity became so severe that continuing with management activities was largely untenable, and even surveillance and monitoring of the operation of these threats/impacts was impossible. The Mission noted that it was not that threats continue to confront the RMWHS but the management opportunity to address these threats had been impeded that resulted in RMWHS being inscribed on the list of World Heritage in Danger.

3.1 Factors affecting the property

The Mission observed and noted several threats to the RMWHS, which if not managed or controlled, could potentially adversely impact the integrity of the Site. These include:

- **Progressive isolation of the Site from the surrounding landscape.** The activities of communities living adjacent to the Site has resulted in a sharp ecological boundary coinciding with the RMNP boundary, apart from the north where the North Rwenzori Forest Reserve provides an ecological corridor through to lower altitudes. This has interrupted the ecological gradients from the higher slopes to the lower slopes, and has impeded/will impede the movement of biota along these gradients, and possibly impact on long-term resilience of the Site to climate change.
- **A growing and predominantly poor human population living in areas adjacent to the Site.** Cessation of hostilities in the area adjacent to the Site has resulted in the rapid resettlement of displaced communities and a continuation of consumptive use of natural resources and extensive cultivation that is progressively reducing the extent of previously undisturbed natural habitat in areas outside of the RMNP boundary.
- **Growing impacts of tourism, concentrated in certain key locations.** The re-opening of the park for tourism has resulted in a rapid escalation in the volume of visitors to the Central Circuit Trails under conditions where management is not completely geared to manage visitor activities and impacts. Although localised, these impacts affect some important values of the Site, including wetlands.
- **Global warming.** Long-term monitoring of the extent of glaciers, quantity and frequency of snow cover has indicated a progressive decline;
- **Flooding and landslides.** Vegetation clearing and cultivation has resulted in the instability of slopes and a progressive creep of erosion gullies towards the RMNP boundary. Flooding at lower levels has been attributed to the protected area rather than to the destructive land-use on steep slopes, creating dissatisfaction among communities and authorities with the existence of the park.
- **Potential insecurity.** Despite the effective control of the security situation, there remain isolated pockets of rebel activities in the sub-region, though not in the Site itself, and hence the potential for security-related incidents. There remains uncertainty regarding the precise location of anti-personnel weapons such as landmines within the Site, although no evidence was provided that confirmed that there were ever landmines placed within the Site.
- **Demand for land for development and calls for the de-gazettement of certain portions of the Site.** Although there has been no invasion/occupation of the RMWHS, the adjacent North Rwenzori Forest Reserve has extensive areas of illegal and uncontrolled cultivation, suggesting a demand for land and threat of pressure to excise portions of the RMWHS.

It is important to note that these conditions prevailed prior to the listing of the Site as a World Heritage Site and remain challenges to management in maintaining and enhancing the integrity of the Site.

3.2 Assessment of the State of Conservation of the Site

The Mission considered the overall integrity of the Site, and found the following characteristics:

- **Largely secure boundary.** The boundary of the Site is virtually intact, with minor incidences of cultivation in certain peripheral locations, resulting from a poorly-defined boundary;
- **Low incidence of poaching.** Monitoring and patrol records indicate that there have been incidences of poaching in certain locations. Some of the reported poaching may have been associated with the occupation of the Site by security forces and rebels during the period of insecurity. A possible exception is in the southern part of the park where the possibility of landmines continues to inhibit patrols and poaching of primates was reported as taking place.
- **Reduction of population size of some mammalian species, including buffalo and elephant, and possibly dulkers.** There is no systematic monitoring of the site, but ranger observations and sampling by the Wildlife Conservation Society indicate the continued

presence of a small population of elephants (<10), the apparent absence of buffalo which used to occur in the RMNP (but which had disappeared before the Site was listed as a World Heritage Site), and the apparently reduced range of duikers to higher elevations.

- **Reduction of amount and duration of snow cover, and extent of glaciers.** There has been a progressive reduction of glaciers and the quantity and frequency of snow. The Rwenzori Mountaineering Services report that they have had to modify their approach to climbing the high peaks because of the recent absence of snow and ice, not previously experienced over a century of mountaineering activity on the mountain.
- **Visitor impact.** There is progressive damage to the hiking trails on the Central Circuit, including wetlands of global significance, and possible incidences of water and solid waste pollution emanating from visitor facilities;
- **Management staff in control of the Site.** UWA staff are in control of the Site and all of its facilities;
- **No security forces occupying any part of the Site.** The UPDF and other security forces are no longer occupying the Site or any of its facilities, although periodic patrols are conducted in association with UWA staff.
- **No illegal occupation of the Site.** There are no people illegally occupying the RMWHS.

The Mission concluded that the integrity of the Site had not been significantly adversely impacted by activities during the period in which it has been listed as World Heritage in Danger. The conditions that resulted in the Site being inscribed on the list of World Heritage in Danger had improved dramatically. **Yet, the integrity of the Site remains vulnerable to factors that threaten it. A special set of management measures to avoid or mitigate threats and ensure that these do not progressively impact the integrity of the Site remains a priority.**

The Mission found that UWA and its partners were aware of these threats and had identified measures to avoid or contain them. These factors were discussed with UWA staff during the Mission and during the wrap-up session. They are elaborated in Section 4 below.

4. Management requirements to maintain the integrity of the Site

Through interviews with UWA staff, District Councils, District Administrations, NGOs, community-based organisations and through field observations, the Mission identified **ten major categories of concern to management**, which if addressed collectively by the State Party and its partners would contribute towards the maintenance of the integrity of the RMWHS.

4.1 Security

The Mission noted:

- The withdrawal of all security forces from physical occupation of the Site. This was favoured by UWA as the presence of UPDF forces in the site had impacted on RMNP's facilities and the perceptions of visitors;
- That there had been no incidences of insecurity either in the Site or in the surrounding Districts since RMNP had re-opened in July 2001;
- Maintenance of security surveillance in the form of the mobile Uganda Peoples' Defence Force (UPDF) Alpine Brigade;
- Continued suspicion of remnant pockets of rebels in neighbouring Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC);
- That there remained some landmines placed by the UPDF in known locations in and/or around the Site, that there was the possibility of landmines placed by rebel groups in unknown

locations, but that there had been no reports of landmine incidents in any of the Districts surrounding the Site;

- That the threat of landmine placement, whether justified or not, was sufficient to inhibit decision-making regarding the expansion of tourism activities in the Kazongo region of the Site, frustrating community-based tourism ventures such as Abanya Rwenzori Mountaineering Services (AMA); and
- The high level liaison between the UPDF and UWA headquarters, good liaison between RMNP staff and local UPDF commanders and intelligence personnel, and the invitation by the Resident District Commissioners for RMNP staff to work closely with the District Security Committees and in the case of Bundibugyo District, to sit on the District Security Committee.

It is recommended that:

1. RMNP law enforcement staff accept the RDC invitations to work with District Security Committees.
2. RMNP staff engage with the Security forces to declare key areas for tourism as landmine free zones.

4.2 Extent of the RMWHS

The Mission noted:

- The offer by Rwenzori Mountaineering Services (RMS) of an important piece of land in the upper Mubuku Valley, the main visitor entrance to the Site. RMS had pointed out that transfer of this land had not yet taken place, and UWA was urged to respond to the offer and to take transfer of the land. It would provide an important buffer between the trailhead village at Nyakalengija and the boundary of the Site, and enable the more effective management of visitors and rescue operations. RMS had pointed out that, although the land had been offered for the siting of a park headquarters for RMNP, there were no conditions attached to the offer.
- The purchase by EcoTrust of a further 27 hectares of land in the upper Mubuku Valley adjacent to the park boundary, on which visitor and park infrastructure could be established;
- The high biodiversity value of the Rwenzori North Forest Reserve, contiguous with the Site and managed by the Uganda Forestry Department. Despite encroachment of portions of this site by communities for cultivation, it provides the only intact high to low altitude ecosystem gradient in the Rwenzori Mountains, and would prove to be a valuable addition to the Site.
- The opportunity to engage with the management of the Parc National des Virungas in the DRC in transboundary co-operation, including the monitoring of migratory animal populations. There was also an opportunity to seek assistance from international development agencies to develop a transboundary co-operation programme, and to consider greater networking with other similar sites. Consideration could be given to developing a Biosphere Reserve or even a Transboundary Biosphere Reserve for the RMWHS.

It is recommended that:

3. UWA finalise the transfer of the RMS land to UWA.
4. UWA investigate the possibility of the extension of the Site by the addition of the North Rwenzori Forest Reserve.
5. UWA engage at a strategic level with UNESCO and IUCN, and with counterparts in the DRC in terms of developing transboundary co-operation and possibly a Biosphere Reserve in the Rwenzori Mountains, and networking with other transboundary protected areas and World Heritage Sites.

4.3 Institutional/policy context

The Mission noted:

- There was recognition of the World Heritage status of the Site at the Local Council, District Council and NGO level, but it was indicated that this information needed to be promoted to the local population. There was insufficient signage to indicate the presence of the Site and the signage that existed did not sufficiently profile the World Heritage status of the Site.
- The level of resources allocated to the management of RMNP by UWA appeared to be sub-optimal in relation to the priority management programmes that required to be implemented in the RMWHS. It was acknowledged that during the period of insecurity, when management was inhibited and visitor programmes had been suspended, that scarce resources were required elsewhere in the portfolio of UWA's responsibilities. Now that management programmes were being re-established there was a need to raise the level of management of RMWHS and restore management effectiveness through appropriate budget allocations and staffing. Staff indicated that there were inadequate staff numbers, insufficient vehicles to monitor the Site and insufficient budget to operate the programme, but that budget appropriations and the support of the Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use (PAMSU) programme would shortly address these inadequacies as the funding for this programme was scheduled in the coming financial year.
- That staff had indicated that decision-making appeared to be centralised in UWA headquarters with long delays in decisions, frustrating RMNP staff. Putting this in perspective, the Executive management indicated that delegation of authority was an objective of management, requiring the capacity and willingness of field-based staff to accept responsibility. RMNP staff were largely responsible for planning management programmes and submitting appropriate budgets, and allocations were made on priorities across the organisation. The overall budget allocation to UWA remained insufficient to achieve effective management and growth in all areas.

It recommended that:	
6.	Improvement of signage in all Districts and Sub-Districts around the Site, including an indication of the WH status of the Site.
7.	UWA rapidly examine staffing, infrastructure and budgetary deficiencies at RMNP to restore management effectiveness at a level justified by the World Heritage status of the Site.

4.4 Management framework

The Mission noted:

- There was no Management Plan for the Site and consequently no clearly stated vision for present and future management. The lack of a Management Plan has delayed strategic planning, setting of goals and identification of management priorities. The CEO of UWA regards this as a priority and considers that within eight months the Management Plan should be in place. Donor support had been pledged to assist with the development of the RMNP Management Plan, and would largely be allocated to a participatory process to involve relevant authorities in the process of plan development. Management planning and implementation needed to be regarded as parallel activities necessary to ensure adaptive management, rather than the development of a static document.
- UWA staff were unable to identify the location of documentation, data, records, literature or specimen collections for the Site which had been moved during the closure of the Site. These records were subsequently tracked down to UWA premises in Kampala, but had been poorly

stored and had suffered some damage. The records had been moved to the UWA library to be processed prior to re-establishing at RMNP headquarters.

- There were no monitoring or evaluation programmes being run at the Site, although it was acknowledged that comprehensive resource monitoring was unlikely to be practical owing to the nature of the Site. Key issues such as the movement of people in and out of the Site, the use of natural resources in terms of resource co-management agreements, and the impact of tourism on the Site, all need to be monitored and managed adaptively.

It is recommended that:

7. The development of a management plan be pursued as a matter of priority but that an integrated approach to management planning be adopted.
8. Documents and records for the Site are reorganised and kept securely at UWA library until such time as a suitable headquarters is established at the Site with premises adequate for the safe storage of documents and records.
9. Park management monitor and evaluate the key issues of tourism, resource sharing and movement of people across the park boundary in accordance with the monitoring plan developed in the USAID/WWF project prior to 1998.

4.5 Boundary

The Mission noted:

- The extensive and highly complex boundary of the RMNP. Due to the nature of the terrain, and the boundary being defined as an altitudinal contour (between 2100m and 2200m), the actual boundary is virtually inaccessible except by ascending to the boundary point via the myriad of ridges forming the spurs of the Rwenzori Massif. There is extensive community settlement between the access roads at the base of the mountain and the actual RMNP boundary. It is thus important to survey and mark the boundaries in such a way that they are recognisable to both protected area management staff and communities living adjacent to the Site.
- The boundary survey project was incomplete at the time of the Mission. Once this was complete the next stage was to mark the boundary with live markers in the form of non-invasive *Eucalyptus* trees. There is an urgent need to complete this activity as it is the only way to reduce illegal entry and activities within the Site. Common recognition of the Site boundary both by park staff and neighbouring communities would allow more effective patrolling and enable park staff to take action against boundary infringements. UWA indicated that the marking of the boundary would commence in March 2003.
- The recognition of the park boundary by neighbouring communities was dependent on co-operative marking of the boundary by management staff and representatives of the community through the Community Protected Area Institutions (CPIs) and Local Councils (LC5). This would result in the greatest possible acceptance of the boundary marking process.
- Patrolling of the boundary should be a regular activity conducted in close cooperation with District and Local Councils. The involvement of local communities in monitoring and information provision on boundary infringements would serve the joint purpose of reducing the load on park staff and building community responsibility for the Site.

It is recommended that:

10. The completion of the boundary marking be considered a priority activity and that the Local Council structures support be enlisted to ensure the greatest possible acceptance by the community and authorities.
11. A map indicating the precise surveyed and marked boundary should be compiled and lodged with the World Heritage Centre.

4.6 Staff capacity

The Mission noted:

- The excellent capacity of the middle management staff in the RMNP, as these had benefited from a long tenure and experience of the park, as well as the strengthening programmes conducted over several years including the USAID/WWF RMCDP. There is cause for concern over the discontinuity of senior park management through rapid transfer of senior staff at the Site.
- Guard training courses and general training courses had been conducted as well as exchange visits to other operational parks. Specialised training courses for dealing with co-management agreements and for responsible tourism in mountain environments was needed.
- That UWA management consider that RMNP is understaffed. However, the continued concerns regarding the security situation, and the need to avoid problems at all costs, had demanded that rangers be deployed with climbing parties, effectively reducing regular patrol responsibilities. Key positions remain unfilled, e.g. for ecological monitoring. UWA management indicated that a Management Information Systems study was underway to guide the balance between staff numbers and equipment needed.

It is recommended that:

12. The management planning exercise be used as an opportunity to prioritise the staff establishment requirements in relation to key functions to be performed, and that a training needs analysis targeted to priority management functions be undertaken and implemented.

4.7 Management Infrastructure

The Mission noted:

- There was no headquarters for the Site, and no final decision had been made as to where this would be located. This was essential as it will become the focal point for administration and tourism activities. The current building on loan from RMS (a steel uniport) was entirely inadequate both for its purpose and to project an image of a World Heritage Site. UWA management indicated that management infrastructure would be provided under the PAMSU programme.
- There was inadequate housing for rangers. Ranger outposts were being reopened although the infrastructure was poor and rangers were concerned about the lack of parity regarding employment terms and conditions with other parks. UWA management indicated that terms and conditions were being harmonised and that a Human Resources management manual had been developed and issued.

- Staff uniforms were good, but there was a need for specialised mountaineering clothing and equipment. The latter required proper control as this equipment was expensive.
- Transport and communications equipment was poor. UWA management indicated that allocations of vehicles would be accomplished under the PAMSU programme.

It is recommended that:

13. Decisive action be taken to establish the park headquarters in an appropriate location in order to provide a focal point for staff and visitor interaction and management.

4.8 Community Interaction

The Mission noted:

- That resource-use co-management agreements between UWA and neighbouring communities were in effect, but no agreements had actually been officially signed and the activities required better monitoring.
- UWA is in the process of developing CPIs for each sub-county (22) surrounding the RMNP. The process of establishment was slow, and only three had been initiated, but once all the CPIs had been established, they will be a focal point for community sensitisation about the RMWHS. The CPIs will liaise with UWA staff in the demarcation of the RMNP boundary and in the monitoring of the resource use co-management programmes.
- That the use of radio programmes to educate the public about the Site, and the provision of environmental education in the schools, had been strongly supported by District authorities, who had offered support in the distribution of information.
- The interaction between RMNP staff and local communities is friendly. At local and district level there was demonstrated support for the park and the value of the Site was acknowledged.
- The poor tourist volume over recent years has resulted in negligible revenue for distribution in terms of the revenue-sharing policy, but that the situation would improve as tourist numbers had increased.
- Representatives of the Abanyarwenzori Mountaineering Association (AMA) demonstrated a close association with the world heritage values of RMWHS, and were able to express a deep and spiritual connection with the park. These values require to be reinforced and supported by the protected area management team.

It is recommended that:

14. A programme to establish Community Protected Area Institutions be implemented as soon as possible as the major focal point for RMNP and community interaction.
15. Improved communications regarding the Site be developed using radio as well as links with the District Information Officers.

4.9 Communication with District and other authorities

The Mission noted:

- The relationship between the RMNP management and District authorities and Local Councils was generally good. In almost every case, the Resident District Commissioners indicated that they were prepared to assist the park management, and requested a much closer working relationship. This was not so at the LC5 level in the Bundibugyo area, where many unresolved issues were presented to the Mission. However, the RDC at Bundibugyo offered extensive support to RMNP and invited close co-operation.
- That there were long term social and development programmes to improve infrastructure, education, health and agriculture in all Districts. There was recognition of the decline in natural resources, e.g. thatching grass, soil loss, and the need to promote other forms of development that were not dependent on extractive resource use. In particular, mention was made of a rural electrification programme, which in the future might alleviate pressure on the use of wood for fuel.
- There were District Environmental Officers in all districts except Kabarole where the post was vacant at the time of the Mission. Other key contacts were the District Secretaries for Production and the Environment.
- There was a general awareness of the World Heritage status of the Site as well as its importance for the Districts and how it could be exploited for tourism on the boundaries of the Site. The districts were prepared to invest manpower to sensitise communities about the importance of the Site.
- A land-use plan was being prepared for the whole country, in which the special case of National Parks and especially World Heritage Sites, should be highlighted. This would require the active participation of UWA staff nationally and RMNP staff locally.

- | |
|--|
| 16. RMNP staff interact more strongly with the Resident District Commissioners and their staff to ensure a close working relationship and build on the evident trust which has been established. |
|--|

4.10 Tourism

The Mission noted:

- That tourism is underdeveloped in and around the Site. Tourist activities are restricted to mountaineering tourism in the central circuit at present. The Rwenzori Mountaineering Services (RMS), established in 1990, has a 30-year concession agreement with UWA to act as sole tour agent on the Central Circuit within the RMNP. The concession process requires a complete review in order to include other tourism stakeholders, to clarify the position of RMS and to introduce effective business practices and competition.
- That the manner in which climbing was being conducted on the central circuit was creating unnecessary environmental impact, as the structure of parties and the kind of equipment and fuel being carried demanded a high number of guides/rangers/porters per visitor (current 5:1). A careful analysis of these services might enable a higher number of fee-paying visitors accompanied by fewer support staff, resulting in a better quality experience, increased revenue and wages per capita, and lower environmental impact.
- The Ruboni Community Conservation and Development Project (RCCDP) provides limited tourist facilities outside the RMNP in the form of a camp-site and catering.

- That the Abanyarwenzori Mountaineering Association (AMA) who operated from the Kabarole district before 1997 are awaiting security clearance to continue tourism operations and the award of a concession from UWA to operate within the RMNP. Further delays in decision-making were likely to result in frustration on the part of this community.
- The Site requires a tourism strategy, as an integral component of the management plan, which will facilitate equitable use of the resource, ensure sustainability and put in place a system of information provision and marketing. At present communications between UWA headquarters and the Site is poor which results in misunderstandings between tourists and park staff. There is still a perception that there are safety issues on the trail, but care must be taken to ensure that provision of safer routes and infrastructure complement and do not detract from the visitor experience and naturalness of the Site.
- The quality of tourism infrastructure is poor or non-existent. Tariffs are high for the standard of product being offered, this is in part caused by confusion regarding responsibility for infrastructure and this needs to be clarified. An agreed programme for the upgrading of infrastructure and the setting of standards of service should be established between UWA and stakeholders. UWA confirmed that funds received from UNESCO had been used to upgrade essential infrastructure, including the repair of bridges and overnight huts.
- There are opportunities for public / private partnerships in the development of tourism for the Site. District tourism efforts could play a more significant role than at present and there is an opportunity for far more diversification of activities because of the diversity of geography and natural resources in the Site.

It is recommended that:	
17.	UWA embark on an inclusive process to reformulate the tourism strategy including tourism concessions in RMWHS.
18.	An analysis is conducted of the manner in which climbing is undertaken in RMWHS to optimise the visitor numbers, improve the experience, ensure that appropriate equipment is available at overnight shelters, rationalise the requirement for porters based on the type of fuel and equipment which requires portage, and reduce the environmental impact of climbing.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Terms of Reference for this Monitoring Mission required:

- An evaluation of the nature and extent of threats to the site, taking into consideration the values for which the site was inscribed and specific issues outlined by the World Heritage Bureau / Committee;
- An account of measures which the State Party plans to take to protect the outstanding World Heritage values of the site;
- Recommendations for any additional action to be taken by the State Party, including draft recommendations to the World Heritage Bureau / Committee.

5.1 Evaluating the nature and extent of the threats to the Site

The Mission was able to identify the threats to the Site, based on documentation and interviews with key stakeholders. However, it is not possible to objectively verify the nature of impacts as this would require a much more detailed site survey, which was not possible for a Mission of this duration. The Mission gained the impression that there was an honest disclosure of the relevant information that the management authority had at its disposal, and that although there are significant threats, there are earnest attempts to address these using the resources available. The Mission noted that many of these threats operated at the time that the RMNP was listed as a World Heritage Site and appreciate that they require management and mitigation. The ability to achieve this was impeded by the situation of insecurity that prevailed over the period 1997 to 2001.

5.2 Measures that the State Party plans to take to protect the outstanding World Heritage values of the Site

The Mission examined every aspect of the management of the RMWHS, and found that UWA had assessed the threats and had identified appropriate responses to address and/or mitigate threats. Many of these responses are documented above. UWA's response is, however, constrained by the availability of resources, including the financial resources to accomplish the many costly management programmes that must be undertaken, many of which are documented in the recommendations listed throughout Section 4 above.

In some cases, these interventions can be regarded as hurdles which can be overcome through a once-off intervention, e.g. resolving an appropriate management plan, or tourism strategy. Many others, on the other hand, require a systematic application of improved management processes supported by capacity-building over an extended period of time. The former can be supported by requests for support from external funders, e.g. the building of a park headquarters or the development of a management plan. On the other hand, the ongoing costs of patrolling or monitoring resource-use agreements must be included in the routine management costs of the Site, and the ongoing costs of improved tourism management should be offset by the fees which visitors pay.

It is clear at the present time that the State Party should accord greater priority to the level of budget appropriation that will ensure at least a minimum level of effective management of the Site, in accordance with the obligations conferred by the World Heritage Convention and the listing of the Site. It is clear also that the Site is worthy of increased assistance, both financial and technical, from external sources. UWA indicated that approaches had been made to WWF Netherlands to continue with the planned third phase of the RMCDP and to an Italian group to support community conservation efforts. It is important to target this assistance to the highest priority issues, as otherwise further pressure might be placed on the existing thinly-stretched management capacity.

5.3 Recommendations for any additional action to be taken by the State Party, including draft recommendations to the World Heritage Bureau/Committee

It is recommended that:

- (i) The State Party, represented by UWA, should carefully assess the recommendations 1 – 17 made in Section 4 above, and compile a response report which would indicate those recommendations it deems appropriate to implement and the time scale of this implementation. This report could serve as a basis on which to negotiate further support from external funders and to lobby support for enhanced funding for the management of the Site.
- (ii) It is further recommended to IUCN and UNESCO that, on the basis of the response report from UWA, which would indicate the State Party's commitment to address the management measures required to ensure the integrity of the Site, that a recommendation be forwarded to the World Heritage Bureau/Committee that the Site be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Appendix 1: Terms Of Reference

- Undertake the IUCN World Heritage monitoring mission to Rwenzori Mountains World Heritage Site, Uganda, to monitor the state of conservation of the site;
- Liaise with the relevant authorities in Uganda (as advised by IUCN) in relation to organising the above mission;
- While on mission, make contact with relevant stakeholders to discuss the state of conservation of the site, and provide IUCN with the contact details of the most relevant and reliable sources of information for future reactive monitoring of the site;
- While on mission, take photographs which reflect the key threats to the conservation of the site using 35mm slide film and / or digital camera and deliver a selection of slides/JPEG files with a short text describing the contents of each slide/file to IUCN;
- Prepare the IUCN draft Monitoring Mission Report of approximately 10 pages following the format advised by IUCN (to be attached).
- Ensure that the Monitoring Mission Report includes:
 - i) An evaluation of the nature and extent of threats to the site, taking into consideration the values for which the site was inscribed and specific issues outlined by the World Heritage Bureau / Committee;
 - ii) An account of measures which the State Party plans to take to protect the outstanding World Heritage values of the site,
 - iii) Recommendations for any additional action to be taken by the State Party, including draft recommendations to the World Heritage Bureau / Committee;

NOTE: The final decision on IUCN's recommendation to the World Heritage Bureau / Committee will be made by the World Heritage Panel.

- Prepare a brief 'trip report' (2 pages), for internal use within IUCN, outlining positive and negative aspects of the mission which IUCN should be aware of and suggestions for follow-up action by IUCN;
- Update the relevant IUCN / UNEP - WCMC site sheet. Site sheets are available from http://www.unep-wcmc.org/protected_areas/data/wh/ or from IUCN upon request; and
- Deliver to IUCN no later than 8 February, 2003, a hard copy and electronic version of the Monitoring Mission Report, relevant slides / JPEG files and the contact details of individuals or organisations for future monitoring purposes.

Appendix 2.

Detailed Field Programme

DATE & TIME

ACTIVITY

Sunday January 5, 2003

Arrival in Kampala. Overnight at Hotel Equatoria, Kampala.
Picked from Entebbe Airport by UWA.

Monday 6th January 2003

(Morning)
Meetings in Kampala with UWA management, Department of Antiquities and Museum (responsible for World Heritage), Uganda National Commission for UNESCO, IUCN. Round Table meeting at UWA.
(Afternoon)
WWF, Albertine project, Ecotrust, Wildlife Conservation Society, IGCP. Round table meeting at UWA.

Tuesday 7th January

(Morning)
Travel to Kasese accompanied by a UWA officer.
(Evening)
Meet UWA field based (Rwenzori Park staff, wardens and some Rangers) at Hotel Margherita.

8th January 2003

(Morning)
Meeting Resident District Commissioner (RDC), District Chairman (LCV) and District Environment Officer, Kasese.
(Afternoon)
Travel to Nyakalengijjo, and a walk up to Kyoho bridge (Pack Lunch). Night at Margherita Hotel.

9th January 2003

(Morning)
Meet Ruboni community, Rwenzori Mountaineering Services
(Afternoon)
Abanya Rwenzori Tourist Camp. Continue to Fort Portal.
Night in Fort Portal, Rwenzori View Guest House.

10th January 2003

(Morning)
Meeting Resident District Commissioner (RDC) & District Chairman (LCV) and District Environment Officer.
Travel to Bundibugyo. Fort Portal.
(Afternoon)
Meeting Resident District Commissioner, District Chairman (LCV) and District Environment Officer, Bundibugyo.
Reach Park boundary.
Night at Rwenzori View Guest House.

11th January 2003

Depart for Kampala.
(Afternoon)
Wrap up meeting with UWA CEO and staff, Chairman Uganda National Commission for UNESCO

Appendix 3. List of persons consulted during the Mission

Name	Affiliation/Capacity	Address/e-mail
Achoka, Ignatius	UWA, outgoing Senior Warden-in-Charge, RMNP	Ignatius.achoka@uwa.or.ug
Akunda, Barnard	Senior Warden-in-Charge, Toro-Semiliki Wildlife Reserve	
Amanyire, Charles	General Secretary RMS	
Bacwa, Peter	Secretary for Security, Kabarole District	P.O. Box 38, Fort Portal
Bahati, Azoli	Chairman, AMA	Ama@uonline.co.ug; azolibahati@yahoo.com
Balinda, M. Gideon	Vice Chairman, LC5, Bundibugyo	P.O. Box 1166, Bundibugyo
Baluku, Selevano	Tourism Officer, RMS	
Bambalira	Chairman, LC5, Bundibugyo	P.O. Box 1166, Bundibugyo
Bemigisha, Jane	UWA	Jane.bemigisha@uwa.or.ug
Bosco, Nuwe John	Chief Warden QECA, UWA	
Bwabu, K. Jockonaus	RCCDP	Ruboni Village
Bwabu, K. Patrick	RCCDP	Ruboni Village
Byabasajja, R.M.	District Vice Chairman, Kabarole District	P.O. Box 38, Fort Portal
Dhessa, Joseph L.	District Adm. Police Commander, Kabarole	P.O. Box 13, Fort Portal
Dimiano, Thembo	Treasurer, RCCDP	Nyakalengija Village
Erasito, Gubare	RDC, Bundibugyo	
Guladesi, Kabugho	RCCDP	
Isingoma, Wilson	Deputy RDC Kasese District	P.O. Box 250, Kasese
Kabugho, Virinika	RCCDP	
Kagoda, Edwin	Warden Kibale N.P.	knp@uwa.or.ug; P.O. Box 699, Fort Portal
Kamuhangire, Ephraim R.	Commissioner, Museums & Antiquities	dams@infocom.co.ug
Karamagi, Josephat	Extension Worker, AMA	P.O. Box 835, Fort Portal
Kasoma, Panta M.B.	MAB National Committee	muienr@muienr.mak.ac.ug
Kitaliba, Ra-Dezi	Asst Warden Law Enforcement, RMNP	
Kule, Asa	District Environmental Officer, Kasese District	kss-ein@africaonline.co.ug; P.O. Box 250, Kasese
Kule, Joseph	District Vice- Chairperson, Kasese District	

Name	Affiliation/Capacity	Address/e-mail
Kwemara, Cyril	Chief Administrative Officer, Kabarole District	P.O. Box 38, Fort Portal
Kyamanywa, Timothy	Secretary for Technical Services, Works & Construction, LC5	P.O. Box 1166, Bundibugyo
Limbali, Cornelius	Vice Chairperson, RMS	
Maghulesiya, Kyighoma	Ruboni Community Conservation and Development Project	Ruboni Village
Mahaba, Malik	Asst. Chief Admin. Officer, Kabarole District	P.O. Box 38, Fort Portal
Mapesa, Moses	Director: Field Operations UWA	moses.mapesa@uwa.or.ug
Masereka, Barend	Reporter, New Vision	Kasese Office 077 516325
Masereka, Joshua	Asst Warden Community Conserv., RMNP	
Masereka, Selquest	Assistant Warden, Semuliki National Park	
Mubiwabo, Leonida	Chairperson, RCCDP	Ruboni Village
Mubiwabo, Helen	RCCDP	Ruboni Village
Mugasho, Fred	District Bundibugyo	
Mugisha, Arthur	Executive Director, UWA	arthur.mugisha@uwa.or.ug
Muhesi, B. Hezron	AMA	P.O. Box 835, Fort Portal
Nakkazi, Anastasia	Uganda National Commission for UNESCO	ugnesco@africaonline.co.ug
Nanyange, Leontine	Acting RDC, Kabarole District	P.O. Box 226, Fort Portal
Nkabono	Sgt. Arms, DKC	P.O. Box 1166, Bundibugyo
Nkayarwa, Justus	Secretary for Social Services, LC 5	P.O. Box 1166, Bundibugyo
Nyakabwa, Frederick	District Information Officer, Kabarole District	P.O. Box 38, Fort Portal
Okwabe, James	Warden in Charge, RMNP (incoming Warden)	
Olaboro, James	Asst Warden, RMNP	
Onyai, Francis	Chief Administrative Officer, Bundibugyo LC 5	P.O. Box 1166, Bundibugyo
Plumtre, Andrew	Wildlife Conservation Society, Albertine Rift Programme	aplumtre@aol.com
Remigious, Kigongo	Uganda Museums and Monument Agency	m_remigious@yahoo.com
Rossi, Patrizia	UNESCO	percalma@tin.it
Rusubika, M. Joel	Tourism Coordinator, AMA	P.O. Box 835 Fort Portal
Rwabulinga, J.	Chief Finance Officer	P.O. Box 38, Fort Portal
Scully, Fiona	Project Coordinator, RCCDP	Fio@postmaster.co.uk
Serugo, Joseph	Chief Warden, Kibale Conservation Area	P.O. Box 699, Fort Portal
Sunday, Daniel	Accountant, AMA	P.O. Box 835, Fort Portal

Name	Affiliation/Capacity	Address/e-mail
Syamutsangira, Ben	Vice-Secretary RMS	
Thawite, John B.	Reporter, New Vision, Kasese	
Tukahirwa, Joy	The Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (Ecotrust)	jtukahirwa@ecotrust.or.ug
Walaga, Charles	IUCN	charles.walaga@iucn.co.ug
Walimah, Teddy	Chairperson RMS	rms@africaonline.co.ug

Abbreviations

AMA Abanya Rwenzori Mountaineering Association
 IUCN International Union for the Conservation of Nature
 MAB Man and the Biosphere Programme, UNESCO
 QECA Queen Elizabeth Conservation Area
 RCCDP Ruboni Community Conservation and Development Project
 RDC Resident District Commissioner
 RMNP Rwenzori Mountains National Park
 RMS Rwenzori Mountaineering Services
 UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
 UWA Uganda Wildlife Authority

KEY PERSONS WHO CAN PROVIDE INFORMATION ON RMNP

Dr Arthur Mugisha Executive Director Uganda Wildlife Authority P.O. Box 3530 Kampala UGANDA Tel. 256 41 346287/8 Fax. 256 41 346291 Mobile 077 781129 e-mail: arthur.mugisha@uwa.or.ug	Moses Mapesa Director: Field Operations Uganda Wildlife Authority P.O. Box 3530 Kampala UGANDA Tel. 256 41 346287/8 Fax. 256 41 346291 Mobile 077 741495 moses.mapesa@uwa.or.ug	Dr Andrew Plumtre Director Albertine Rift Programme Wildlife Conservation Society P.O. Box 7487 Kampala UGANDA Tel. 256 041 200699 Mobile 077 509754 Aplumtre@aol.com
---	--	---

Appendix 4.

Documents provided to the Mission

Achoka, I. 2003. Programme and status of RMNP for the visit of UNESCO Officials. Unpublished short report.

Bahati, A. 2003. Why community participation in tourism industry in the Rwenzori Mountains National Park is necessary and important. Unpublished short report from Abanya-Rwenzori Mountaineering Association.

Bwabu, K. P. 2003. Report for UNESCO Mission on Ruboni Community Conservation Development Programme. Unpublished short report.

Mapesa, M. 2003. Prioritization for the UNESCO funding support to Rwenzoris. E-mail to W. Wangari & W. Kaboza, UNESCO.

Plumptre, A. 2003. Maps of Human Impacts and animal presence within RMNP. Unpublished data from Wildlife Conservation Society, Albertine Rift Programme.

Robinson, G.A. 2001. Attack on Kasese Town, Murchison Falls and Queen Elizabeth National Parks by unknown gunmen, and its expected impact on Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA).

Ruboni Community. 2003. Ruboni Community Campsite : at the gateway to the Rwenzori Mountains. Tourism brochure.

Uganda Wildlife Authority, Field Operations Department. (December 2002). Report on use of emergency funding from UNESCO. Unpublished short report.

Uganda Wildlife Authority; USAID; WWF. (September 1999). Rwenzori Mountains National Park : Development Alternative Plan / Environmental Impact Assessment. Unpublished Report

Uganda Wildlife Authority. 2003. Rwenzori Mountains National Park Monthly/Annual statistical data for foreign tourists 2001-Jan 3, 2003.

Uganda Wildlife Authority (April 2001). Rwenzori Mountains National Park: Update on Management Challenges. Unpublished short report.

World Heritage Nomination – IUCN Summary: Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda)

World Heritage Nomination – IUCN Technical Evaluation: Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda)

UGANDA WILDLIFE AUTHORITY FIELD OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT

REPORT ON USE OF EMERGENCY FUNDING FROM UNESCO December 2002

Introduction

Rwenzori Mountain National Park was gazetted in 1991 and was inscribed in the list of world heritage sites in 1994. Due to insecurity caused by ADF (Allied Democratic Force) rebels in the region, the Park was closed in June 1997 and subsequently inscribed as a World Heritage Site in danger.

In 2000 Uganda Wildlife Authority applied for Emergency Funding from UNESCO. At the same time security greatly improved in the area as government was able to rout out the ADF rebels. A decision was also made to re-open the park for tourism. But during the time of the closure, a lot of existing infrastructure like trails, bridges, latrines got damaged and therefore needed to be repaired to allow for any meaningful park and tourist activities. July 2001 was set as the target for re-opening for tourism.

Reconstruction Work

In preparation to open the Park, trails were re-opened by local people (porters) hired locally. The bridges and latrines construction and repair was contracted out to a local contractor, COF. **INTERNATIONAL CO. LTD.**, after competitive bidding. Due to the nature of the terrain, mountain, all construction materials including sand and gravel were ferried from the low lands on foot by humans (porters).

In all 4 suspension footbridges re-constructed and repaired and 3 latrines. The bridges have tremendously enhanced management effectiveness and tourism. Before, whenever the rivers flooded tourists and park staff had to wait for days for the water to recede before crossing. It has also made it easy for the park staff to patrol the lower part of the mountain. The sanitation has too been greatly improved and much appreciated by the visitors.

All these construction works were undertaken with full confidence that the Emergency Fund request to UNESCO would be honored and the funds re-imbursed to Uganda Wildlife Authority. Indeed the request was honored and it is now our request that the re-imburement be made to UWA as detailed below:

Detailed Construction Works and Costs

BRIDGES:

1. KYOHO

This bridge existed with dilapidated huge logs, which collapsed on The 2nd July 2002 after a slight earth tremor, and it had served for constructing other bridges further deep in the mountain. This is the first river to reach after leaving park Headquarter. The bridge was constructed using treated

poles of approx. 230mm diameter x 13.6m from Kilembe Mines Limited (KML), concrete, steel weld square mesh, binding wires and other materials.

Cost: Uganda Shillings

(a) Collection of materials and labor	Shs. 2,431,811/=
(b) Transportation of tools equipment & materials worker's social welfare feeding and medical	Shs. 3,000,000/=
(c) 17% VAT	Shs. 923,000/=
Total	Shs. 6,354,811/=

2. MAHOMA

River Mahoma is the next one after Kyoho river located before reaching Nyabithaba Tourist camp. Accessibility to river Mahoma from the Nyakalengijjo Park main gate is via Kyoho newly constructed bridge which takes approximately one and a quarter hour walk before proceeding to the Mahoma river for another walking distance of about one hour forty five minutes. The Mahoma river had no existing bridge across which had posed a formidable impediment for tourists and park staff. The bridge on this river is composed of 2400mm wide timber each constructed of 150mm x 50mm well treated and seasoned timbers on 230mm dia. x13.64 long treated poles placed to span across the river with timber hand guard rails dressed with galvanized chain links for protection against possible fall into the river.

Cost:

(a) Site clearance	Shs.525,000/=
(b) Setting bridge, Excavation planking to foundation Reinforced Concrete foundation	Shs.785,688/=
(d) Curing, treated round poles packing across River chain links Other works and requirement	Shs.1,120,654/=
(e) Transportation of materials and worker's Welfare	Shs. 132,000
	Shs.4,700,000/=
	Shs. 895,630/=
(f) 17% VAT	Shs. 1,522,572/=
Total	Shs. 9,681,544/=

3. KURT SHAFER

A steeply descending trail path leads to the site for the repair of the bridge and distance is not far from Nyabithaba camp about fifteen minutes walk. The bridge was so defective that it needed immediate repairs.

Cost:

(a)	Preliminary activities	Shs. 250,000/=
(b)	Transportation of materials to park headquarter Timber ,painting, Iron mongery	Shs. 2,549,805/=
(c)	Transportation of materials to site, workers welfare	Shs. 3,530,000/=
(d)	With holding Tax	Shs. 253,193/=
(e)	VAT (17%)	Shs.1,076,069/=
Total		Shs. 7,409,317/=

4. KICUCU

From Nyabithaba tourist camp, the muddy and slippery trail path climbs steadily and gently upwards through swampy area a walking distant of about two and a half hours to reach the site of construction of Kicucu suspension bridge over Mubuku river, which had no existing bridge.

Costs:

(a)	Preliminaries	Shs. 330,000/=
(b)	Site clearance and setting of the bridge	Shs. 552,500/=
(c)	Earthworks reinforcement Bars	Shs. 3,123,000/=
(d)	Concrete to footings, concrete to foundation Curving concrete, Anchorage of bridges	Shs. 15,856,603/=
(e)	Steel rails, Timbering, Assorted wire nails Chain links	Shs. 4,552,131/=
(f)	Materials transportation Empty gunny bags, Workers welfare	Shs. 8,880,000/=
Total (I)		Shs. 33,294,234/=
(g)	Addendum to cater extra transportation of materials	Shs. 13,800,000/=
Total (II)		Shs. 56,739,906/=

5. PIT LATRINES**1. NYAKALENGIJO**

The main entrance gate didn't have toilet or urinal facilities to serve the tourists and park employees. It was therefore of paramount importance and necessity to construct one block with two V.I.P stance pit latrines.

Costs

(a)	site clearance setting excavations	Shs 74,310/=
(b)	Foundation, precast concrete Constructing 230mm external wall	Shs 1,342,137/=
(c)	galvanized roofing Precoated Plaster internally Doors Emulsion paint.	Shs 956,760/=
(d)	Transportation	Shs 355,981/=
(e)	17% VAT	Shs 463,967/=
	Total	Shs 3,193,155/=

BUJUKU TOURIST CAMP:

The water table at this camp is quite shallow; therefore pre-fabricated latrines (crestollet) were the best option.

Costs

(a)	Latrines construction Foundation Concrete Walls construction	Shs. 2,447,659/=
(b)	Wall above the Deck Other requirements	Shs. 1,324,073/=
(c)	Collection of materials Labor	Shs. 3,771,732/=
(c)	Transportation Tools, Equipment and materials (Most expensive and difficult task)	Shs. 9,760,000/=
(e)	17 % VAT	Shs. 2,300,394/=

Total: Shs. 19,603,859/=

GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5) U.shs. 93,336,919/=

Approx. US \$ 51,854/=

The bridges were commissioned by Miss Uganda in June/July 2001 and Tourism activities re-opened on the 2nd July 2001.

Transport

A 4 wheel drive Toyota double cabin pickup was received. Having been purchased by UNESCO directly and delivered to Uganda. Unfortunately the vehicle was erroneously delivered to Mbarara

University of Science and Technology where it was used for 4 months before it was traced and handed over to UWA.

Equipment

The equipment requested for has never been delivered. It is proposed that the funds be availed to UWA and procurement done from Uganda.

Other works (outpost)

Please note that some budget re-allocations had to be done in light of the bridge repairs and construction, which are really key and were very urgent.

Reference should be made to our e-mail of August 24, 2001 addressed to E. Wangari and W. Kaboza. On Prioritisation of UNESCO funding support to Rwenzori. The e-mail was a response to a request made by E. Wangari.

UGANDA WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

PROGRAMME AND STATUS OF RMNP FOR THE VISIT OF UNESCO OFFICIALS FEBRUARY 5 – 11, 2002

Rwenzori Mountain National Park (RMNP) was gazetted in 1991 and was inscribed on the list of World Heritage sites in 1994. Due to insecurity caused by ADF (Allied Democratic Force) rebel in the region the park was closed in June 1997.

RMNP is internationally renowned area of outstanding scientific and geological importance, great scenic and immense ecological value.

Due to its closure most of the facilities were in bad shape including lack of patrols by staff. As the security improved in 2000, UWA decided to open the park for various activities like tourism, regular patrols.

The following have been done since then:

1. Repairs and construction of suspension foot bridges
2. Re-opening and maintaining trails in the central circuit
3. Re-opening of closed ranger out post and deploying permanent staff e.g. Katebwa and Bwera outposts.
4. Relocation of Park Headquarters from Kasese town to Nyakelengijo near the boundary of the Park.
5. Securing communication equipment e.g. radios and a vehicle
6. Full time Warden for Community Conservation was posted in the Park
7. Recruitment and Paramilitary training for rangers were conducted. Refresher training was done for the already existing staff.
8. Routine boundary patrols are being carried out to check agricultural encroachment.
9. There is close working relationship between park management and other security and law enforcement agencies, including joint patrols with the army.
10. Uniforms have been provided including warm clothing for field use
11. Plan is underway to re-open Kazingo trail (Kabarole District). Plan and budget has been submitted to UWA H/Q for funding.

MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

(a) Boundary

The boundary is about 150km in length covering very rugged terrain in three districts of Kasese, Kabarole and Bundibugyo. Because of the recent civil unrest communities returning are now claiming ignorance of the boundary and there is a risk of encroachment.

(b) Illegal activities:

It involves pitsawing, encroachment and poaching of small animals. Patrols have been intensified.

(c) Infrastructure:

The park has no infrastructure for Headquarter and outposts. All structures are being rented except in Bundibugyo. There is therefore urgent need for the infrastructure development. A plan for infrastructure development is already in place, "Development Alternative Plan/Environmental Impact Assessment" The urgent needs as extracted from the plan are:

1. Administrative block to house, Warden-in-charge, Wardens, Accounts Section, Armory, Store, Reception and Head Ranger
2. Housing for staff to include latrine, bathing area, kitchen, 7 senior staff housing units, 12 junior staff housing. The Administrative block and staff housing is estimated at Uganda shilling 450,000,000/- as a lump sum.
3. Visitor center for orientation (rules and regulations, maps)

(a) Audio – visual exhibit area

(b) Curio shop and publication sales

The estimated cost is U.shs.80,000,000/-

4. Ranger outpost in: Bwera, Bundibugyo, Kilembe, Katebwa, Kazingo, and Nyabithaba comprising of 6 blocks to house all the estimated staff at each outpost, including one office block. The estimated cost is U. shs.240,000,000/-

As regards networking with areas like Kilimanjaro there is need for study tours in order to exchange experience and improving on our services.

All the above have been planned for and budgeted under the impending World Bank supported project. However, any additional support would be welcome.

Detailed Field Programme – 5th-10th January 2003.

DATE & TIME	ACTIVITY
Sunday January 5, 2003	Arrival in Kampala. Overnight at Hotel Equatoria, Kampala. Picked from Entebbe Airport by UWA.
Monday 6 th January 2003	<i>(Morning)</i> Meetings in Kampala with UWA management, Department of Antiquities and Museum (responsible for World Heritage), Uganda National Commission for UNESCO, IUCN. Round table meeting at UWA. <i>(Afternoon)</i> WWF, Albertine project, Ecotrust, World Conservation Society, IGCP. Round table meeting at UWA.
Tuesday 7 th January 2003	<i>(Morning)</i> Travel to Kasese accompanied by a UWA officer. <i>(Evening)</i> Meet UWA field based (Rwenzori Park staff, wardens and some rangers) at Hotel Margerita. Overnight Hotel Margerita
8 th January 2003	<i>(Morning)</i> Meeting Resident District Commissioner (RDC), District Chairman (LCV) and District Environment Officer, Kasese. <i>(Afternoon)</i> Travel to Nyakalengijjo, and a walk up to Kyoho bridge (Pack Lunch). Night at Margherita Hotel.
9 th January 2003	<i>(Morning)</i> Meet Ruboni community, Rwenzori Mountaineering Services, <i>(Afternoon)</i> Abanya Rwenzori Tourist Camp. Continue to Fort Portal. Night in Fort Portal, Rwenzori View Guest House
10 th January 2003	<i>(Morning)</i> Meeting Resident District Commissioner (RDC) & District Chairman (LCV) and District Environment Officer. Travel to Bundibugyo. Fort Portal. <i>(Afternoon).</i> Meeting Resident District Commissioner, District Chairman (LCV) and District Environment Officer), Bundibugyo, Reach Park boundary. Night at Rwenzori View GuestHouse.
11 th January 2003	Depart for Kampala.

Costs for the Program in Uganda Shillings

Costs the trip will be twofold:

- 1. Accommodation in the Field: Hotel Margerita 2 night's full board for 5 people, including an officer from UWA headquarters. At a rate of U.shs 90,000/= totaling to U.shs 925,000/= . 2 drivers at per diem rate of U.shs 30,000 totaling to U.shs. 120,000/= . Same rates for Rwenzori View GuestHouse. Total U.shs. 1,045,000/= x 2 = U.shs 2,090,000/=**
- 2. Transport for FieldWork. Entebbe – Kampala – Kasese – Fortportal – Bundibugyo – Kampala. Approximately 1400km round trip. 2 vehicles will be necessary from Kampala and an additional vehicle from the field. Fuel costs will be U.shs 884,000/=**
- 3. Car service U.shs 500,000/= is necessary. The roads around the park are quite difficult and the terrain is rough.**

Total Costs 1+2 above = U.shs 3,474,000/= . Exchange rate 1 US \$ = 1820 U. Shs.