

BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS
EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF LIVELIHOODS OPPORTUNITIES FOR
SUSTAINABILITY OF ECOSYSTEM INTEGRITY
A CASE OF RUSHEBEYA-KANYABAHA WETLAND IN RUKIGA DISTRICT

BYONANEBYE INNOCENT

BU/UG/2019/0012

RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE
DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCES IN NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS OF
BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY

2023

DECLARATION

I BYONANEBYE INNOCENT hereby declare that unless otherwise references quoted, the work embodied in this research dissertation is entirely a result of my own efforts and has never been submitted to any other institution of higher learning for the award of bachelor's degree.

SIGNATURE..... DATE.....

BYONANEBYE INNOCENT

(Candidate)

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this research has been submitted with my approval as supervisor.

SIGNATURE..... DATE.....

Mr. KIFUMBA DAVID NSAJJU

(Supervisor)

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved dad Mr. BYAMUKAMA DICKSON and my beloved mum Mrs. TWIKIRIZE JACKLINE for their endless love, financial and moral support and encouragement throughout my pursuit for education. I hope this achievement will fulfill the dream you envisioned for me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special thanks go to my dad and mum Mr. Byamukama Dickson and Mrs. Twikirize Jackline for their words of encouragement throughout my education career.

My gratitude also goes to my brother Atwine Drake and Atwijuka Darius, Tukesiga Joshua for their material support.

The dream of completing this project would not have been easy without the encouragement and support received from the following persons, Agaba Julius, Kungoza Robert, Lule Moses, Joseph T, Boonabaana Phionah, Asiimwe Karungi, Namakula G, Ayesiga Micheal and the entire NRE fraternity 2019.

Special acknowledgement goes to Ssaka Denis, Kabandize Eliphaz Andinda Daisy and Anakakunda Desire for your motivational messages.

My gratitude goes to Busiterma University Faculty of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences academic staff for their great academic contribution during the entire period of study. May God bless you abundantly!

Particular thanks go to my supervisor Mr. KIFUMBA DAVID NSAJJU for your patience, guidance and support. I benefited greatly from your wealth of knowledge and meticulous editing. I am extremely grateful that you took me on as a student and continued to have faith in me over the years. Thank you for your tolerance in reading through the manuscript and your guidance has made this project what it is today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
APPROVAL	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ACRONYMS	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.1.1 Wetlands.....	1
1.1.2 Wetlands as a source of livelihood.....	1
1.1.3 Wetlands ecosystem services.....	3
1.2 Problem statement of the study.....	4
1.4. Research questions.....	5
1.7 Conceptual framework.....	6
1.8 Ethical considerations.....	8
S.....	8
1.9 Research limitations.....	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Benefits of wetlands.....	9
2.1.1 Economic benefits of wetlands.....	9
2.1.2 Global water cycle and regulation of local water availability and quality.....	9
2.1.3 Recreation.....	10
2.1.4 Food and material.....	10

2.1.5	Flood control.....	11
2.1.6	Coastal protection.....	12
2.1.7	Water purification.....	12
2.1.8	Ground water recharge.....	12
2.1.9	Carbon sequestration values.....	13
2.2.	Threats to Wetland Resources.....	13
2.2.1.	Main threats to wetland resources.....	13
2.2.2	Land use system change.....	14
2.2.3	Over exploitation of wetland resources.....	15
2.2.4	Introduction and invasion of alien species.....	15
2.2.5	Persistent and prolonged drought.....	16
2.2.6	Discharge of Hazardous Wastes.....	17
2.2.7	Unsustainable Ecotourism.....	18
2.2.8	Wetland drainage and conversion for various land uses.....	18
2.3	Community Participation in Wetland Resource Conservation.....	19
2.3.1	Role of community in wetland conservation.....	19
2.3.2	Approaches used to involve the local people in wetland conservation.....	20
CHAPTER THREE.....		27
3.0 METHODS OF STUDY.....		27
3.1	The Study Area.....	27
3.1.1	Location.....	27
3.1.2	Altitude.....	27
3.1.3	Climate.....	27
3.1.4	Biodiversity.....	28
3.2	Research design.....	29
3.4	Data collection methods and instruments.....	31
3.4.1	Data collection method.....	31
3.4.2	Sample Size.....	31
3.5	Data validity and Reliability.....	32
3.6	Data Presentation.....	32
3.7	Data Analysis.....	32

CHAPTER FOUR	34
4.0 RESULTS.....	34
4.1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents.....	34
4.1.1 Gender distribution.....	34
4.1.2 Educational Level.....	34
4.1.3 Age composition of respondents.....	35
4.1.4 Occupation of the respondents.....	36
4.1.5 Size and number of dwelling.....	36
4.2 Contribution of wetland ecosystem services towards community livelihoods.....	37
4.2.1 Wetland benefits and community livelihoods.....	37
4.2.2 Wetland utilization.....	38
4.2.3 Sustainable use of the wetland resource.....	39
4.2.4 Distribution of wetland benefits in terms of location and social economic status.....	40
4.3 Threats to the services provided by the wetland.....	41
4.3.1 Major threats to the service provided by the wetland.....	41
4.3.2 Drivers of the threats to services provided by the wetland.....	42
4.3.3 Actions to threats of services provided by the wetland.....	43
4.5 Community participation in wetland resources conservation.....	44
4.5.1 Respondent’s view on wetland resource conservation benefits.....	44
4.5.2 Community participation in conservation activities.....	44
4.5.3 Reasons for Community participation in decision making.....	47
4.6 Economic contribution of Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland to the local community.....	48
4.6.1 Economic activities carried out in the wetland.....	48
4.6.1 Incomes generated from wetland related activities.....	49
CHAPTER FIVE	51
5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
5.1 Discussion of Results.....	51
5.1.1 Contribution of the wetland towards community livelihoods.....	51
5.1.2 Benefit obtained from the wetlands according to distance and social classes.....	52
5.1.3 Threats to services provided by the wetland resources.....	52
5.1.4 Drivers to threats to service provided by the wetland.....	53

5.1.5	Actions to control threats to services provided by the wetland.....	54
5.1.6	Community participation in wetland conservation activities.....	55
5.1.7	Reasons for community participation in wetland conservation activities.....	55
5.1.8	Effectiveness of community wetland conservation activities.....	55
5.1.9	Reasons for community participation in decision making.....	56
5.1.10	Economic contribution of Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland resource.....	56
5.2	Conclusion and Recommendations.....	56
5.2.1	Conclusion.....	56
5.2.2	Recommendations.....	58
REFERENCES.....		60
APPENDICE 1.....		66

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 conceptual framework

Figure 3.1 Map showing Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland

Figure 4.1 Percentage gender distributions of respondents

Figure 4.2 Percentage compositions of respondents according to level of education

Figure 4.3 Comparison of composition of respondents by age group

Figure 4.4 Percentage comparisons of respondents by occupation

Figure 4.5 Household size and number of dwellers in percentages

Figure 4.6 Comparison of wetland resource contribution to community livelihoods

Figure 4.7 Comparison of wetland resource utilization as percentages

Figure 4.8 Comparison of ways of wise use of Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland by the local people

Figure 4.9 Distribution of wetland resource benefits according to distance from the wetland

Figure 4.10 Distribution of wetland resource benefits among different social classes

Figure 4.11 Major threats to services provided by Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland

Figure 4.12 Comparison of drivers of threats to services provided by the wetland as percentages

Figure 4.13 Percentage comparisons of actions to control threats to the wetland resource

Figure 4.14 Comparison of respondent's view on wetland resource conservation benefit

Figure 4.15 Comparison of Reasons for participation in wetland conservation activities

Figure 4.16 Participation of community participation in wetland conservation activities

Figure 4.17 Effectiveness of community wetland conservation activities

Figure 4.18 Comparison of reasons for consulting the local community during decision making process

Figure 4.19 Comparison of economic activities carried out in the wetland

Figure 4.20 Comparison of incomes earned from wetland related economic activities

LIST OF ACRONYMS

SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
GOU	Government of Uganda
TC	Town Council
WHO	World Health Organization
IPLCs	Indigenous People and Local Communities
FOA	Food and Agriculture Organization
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
IPLC's	Indigenous People and Local Communities

ABSTRACT

Wetlands ecosystem are essential to human well-being and form an integral part of the productive ecosystems capable of supporting the 2030 UN Agenda on sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) particularly SDG1 which is about ending poverty in all its form everywhere on planet earth. Thus well managed wetlands can support this agenda because of their contribution to livelihood opportunities of vulnerable communities regardless of the size and location.

The study was reference to Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland located in MuhangT. C. and Kyerero parish in Rukiga district during the month of December to march 2023. The general objective was to evaluate the effectiveness of livelihood opportunities for sustainability of ecosystem integrity. The specific objectives were to ascertain ways Rushebeya-kanyabaha wetland resource contributed towards community livelihoods, investigate the threats to services provided by this wetland resource to the community, assess different activities conducted by communities towards its conservation, and determine the economic contribution of wetland resource to the livelihoods of the local community. A pilot study was done to ensure validity and clarity of the questionnaire. A descriptive cross sectional research design involved qualitative and quantitative data gathering and analysis techniques. A total of 50 respondents were randomly sampled and data collected using questionnaires, interview guides and observation. The study revealed that respondents depended on the wetland to improve their livelihood through harvesting of craft making material, water collection, harvesting construction materials, food crop growing and fish for food or sold to earn income. Threats to the services provided by the wetland included excessive and unsustainable harvesting of wetland vegetation, dredging and drainage, burning, agricultural activities and over fishing. However, community members participated in conservation activities including restoration, demarcations, alternative livelihood activities and sensitization and awareness creation campaigns. It was revealed that Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland generated on average 135,000ug shillings monthly income to the respondents participating in economic activities such as craft making, fishing, food crop growing and selling construction materials.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Background.

1.1.1 Wetlands.

The Ramsar Convention (1987, Article 1.1) defines wetlands as areas of marsh, fen, peat land or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six meters.

Wetlands may incorporate riparian and coastal zones adjacent to the wetlands and islands or bodes of marine water deeper than six meters at low tide lying within the wetlands (Ramsar Convention`1987, article 2.1).

Paul Keddy (2010, pp 2) emphasizes that a wetland is an ecosystem that arises when inundation by water produces soils dominated by anaerobic processes, which, in turn, forces the biota, particularly rooted plants to adapt to flooding.

Wetlands vary depending on the intensity and timing of flooding, salinity, nutrients available in the soil, disturbances, competition and the presence of herbivore animals. Thus the main factors influencing the formation of a particular wetland are the hydrological regime, land topography, vegetation and anthropogenic impact (Siuta & Nedelelcui, 2016).

Wetlands are globally described as a type of ecological structure epitomized by temporary or permanently water logged grasslands, swamps, marsh, bogs, papyrus, grassy fens, and fertile floodplains. Recent description adds that such bio network is located in upland valleys and water bodies (Glockce, 2018).

1.1.2 Wetlands as a source of livelihood.

Wetlands ecosystem are essential to human well-being, (Russi et.al, (2013). Wetlands form an

REFERENCES

- Andrade, G. S. M., and J. R. Rhodes. 2012. Protected areas and local communities: an inevitable partnership toward successful conservation strategies? *Ecology and Society* 17(4): 14.
[http://dx. doi.org/10.5751/ES-05216-170414](http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-05216-170414).
- Bano, H., Lone, F. A., Bhat, J. I. A., Rather, R. A., Malik, S., and Bhat, M. A. (2018). Hokersar Wet Land of Kashmir: its utility and factors responsible for its degradation. *Plant Arch.* 18, 1905–1910
- Anon. 2010. Safety against flooding. Indicators for the Scheldt estuary. Commissioned by the Maritime Access Division, project group EcoWaMorSe, Flemish-Dutch Scheldt Commission. VLIZ Information Sheets, 219. Vlaams Instituut voor de Zee (VLIZ): Oostende. 12 pp
- Bajracharya, S. B., P. A. Furley, and A. C. Newton. 2006. Impacts of community-based conservation on local communities in the Annapurna Conservation Area, Nepal. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 15(8):2765-2786. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10531-005-1343-x>
- Barakagira A., de Wit A. 2017. Community livelihood activities as key determinants for Community based conservation of wetlands in Uganda. *Environmental and Socio-economic Studies*, 5, 1: 11–24.
- Barakagira, A., & de Wit, A. H. (2019). The role of wetland management agencies within the local Community in the conservation of wetlands in Uganda. *Environmental & Socio-economic Studies*, 7(1), 59-74.
- Bassie, N., Kumar, M. D., Sharma, A., & Pardha-Saradhi, P. (2014). Status of wetlands in India:

A review of extent, ecosystem benefits, threats and management strategies. Elsevier. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 2, 1–19. doi:10.1016/j.ejrh.2014.07.00

Bhat, M. Y., Ahmad, L., Sofi, A. A., & Kumar, R. Valuation and Effective Management of the Dal

Lake's Diverse Ecosystem using Choice Experiment Method. *Ecohydrology*, 2502.

Bhat, S. A., Meraj, G., Yaseen, S., Bhat, A. R., and Pandit, A. K. (2013). Assessing the impact of

Anthropogenic activities on spatio-temporal variation of water quality in Anchar lake, Kashmir Himalayas. *Int. J. Environ. Sci.* 3, 1625–1640. doi: 10.6088/ijes.2013030500032

Bridgham, S.D., Megonigal, J.P., Keller, J.K., Bliss, N.B., Trettin, C. 2006. The carbon balance of

North American wetlands. *Wetlands* 26(4): 889-916

Gokce, D., 2018. Introductory Chapter: Wetland importance and management, in Gokce,

D., (Ed.), *Wetlands management: Assessing risk and sustainable solutions*
Doi:10.5772/intechopen.82456.

Hashimet, A. M., & Catherine, S. M. P. (2013). A Laboratory Study on Wave Reduction by

Mangrove Forests. Elsevier. *APCBEE Procedia*, 5, 27–32.
doi:10.1016/j.apcbee.2013.05.006

Institute for Global Environmental Strategies. 2015. Groundwater and climate change: no longer

The hidden resource

Islam, K. M. B. 2011. Community based water resource management - some regional experiences.

Pages 3-12 in C. K. Jain, K. M. B. Islam, and S. K. Sharma, editors. *Community based*

water resources management in North East India: lessons from a global context. Allied, New Delhi, India.

IUCN (1999). Wetlands, Water and the Law; Using law to advance wetland conservation and wise

use. Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 38. IUCN Environmental Law Centre.

Keddy, P.A. 2010. Wetland Ecology: Principles and Conservation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kotios, et al, “The Impact of Tourism on Water Demand and Wetlands: Searching for a Sustainable Coexistence”, Department of Planning and Regional Development, School of Engineering, University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece, January 2009, p8

Lamsal, P., K. P. Pant, L. Kumar, and K. Atreya. 2015. Sustainable livelihoods through conservation of wetland resources: a case of economic benefits from Ghodaghodi Lake, western Nepal. *Ecology and Society* 20(1): 10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-07172-200110>.

Lamsal, P., Pant, P.K., Kumar, L., Atreya, K., 2015. Sustainable livelihoods through conservation

of wetland resources: a case of economic benefits from Ghodaghodi Lake, Western Nepal. *Ecol. Soc.* 20, 1.

Lliso, B., U. Pascual, S. Engel, and P. Mariel. 2020. Payments for ecosystem services or collective

stewardship of Mother Earth? Applying deliberative valuation in an indigenous community in Colombia. *Ecological Economics* 169:106499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106499>

Masese F.O., Raburu P.O and kwena F. (2012). Threats to the Nyando wetland. Kenya disaster

concern and VIRED international and UNDP. Pages 69-80.

Millar, J., Robinson, W., Baumgartner, L., Homsombath, K., Chittavong, M., Phommavong, T.

and Singhanouvong, D., (In press). Local perceptions of changes in the use and management of floodplain fisheries commons: the case of Pak Peung wetland in Lao PDR. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1-18.

Morrison E.H.J., Upton C, Odhiambo-K'oyoo K and Harper D. M. (2012). Managing the natural

capital of papyrus within riparian zones of Lake Victoria, Kenya. *Hydrobiologia*. 692 (1): 5-17, DOI 10.1007/s10750-011-0839-5.

Nabahungu, N.S., 2012. Problems and Opportunities of Wetland Management in Rwanda.

Wageningen University Doctoral Dissertation.

Omagor, J.G., Barasa, B., 2018. Effects of human wetland encroachment on the degradation of L
[11:30 AM, 11/21/2022]

Parker, P. and Thapa, B., 2011. Distribution of benefits based on household participation roles in

decentralized conservation within Kanchenjunga Conservation Area Project, Nepal. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 13(5), 879-899

Pramod, A., Kumara, V., and Gowda, R. (2011). A Study on physicochemical characteristics of

water in Wetlands of hebbe range in Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary, Mid-Western ghat Region, India. *J. Exp. Sci.* 2, 9-15

Rahman, M. M., and A. Begum. 2011. Implication of livelihood diversification on wetland

resources conservation: a case from government policy. Pages 81-88 in M. Gawler, editor. *Strategies for wise use of wetlands: best practices in participatory management*.

Ramsar, 2017. Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/24632wetlands.pdf>.

Ramsar. 2015a. Facsheet 1. Wetlands: Why should I care? Accessed

http://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/library/factsheet1_why_should_i_care_0.pdf
f 16 June 2015

Ramsar. 2015g. Facsheet 2. Wetland Ecosystem Services. Groundwater Replenishment Rather, M. I., Rashid, I., Shahi, N., Murtaza, K. O., Hassan, K., Yousuf, A., et al. (2016). Massive

land system changes impact water quality of the Jhelum river in Kashmir Himalaya. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 188:185. doi: 10.1007/s10661-016-5190-x

Rebelo, L.M., McCartney, M., Finlayson, M., 2010. Wetlands of sub-Saharan Africa: distribution

and contribution of agriculture to livelihoods. *Wet. Ecol. Manag.* 18, 557–572.
doi:10.1007/s11273-009-9142-x

Seifollahi-Aghmiuni, S., Nockrach, M., Kalantari, Z., 2019. The potential of wetlands in achieving

the sustainable development goals of the 2030 agenda. *Water (Basel)* 11(609), 1–14.
doi:10.3390/w11030609

Shrestha, U. (2011). Community participation in wetland conservation in Nepal. *Journal of*

Agriculture and Environment, 12, 140-147.

Siuta, M. and Nedelciu, C.E. 2016. Report on Socio-Economic Benefits of Wetland Restoration

in Central and Eastern Europe. A publication by CEEweb for Biodiversity, Budapest, Hungary.

Sudipto Bhowmik 2020. Ecological and economic importance of wetlands and their vulnerability;

A review. Pages 95-111.

Valizadeh, N., Esfandiyari Bayat, S., Bijani, M., Hayati, D., Viira, A. H., Tanaskovik, V.,

&Azadi, H. (2021). Understanding Farmers' Intention towards the Management and Conservation of Wetlands. *Land*, 10(8), 860.

Wetlands International. 2015. Carbon emissions from peat lands. URL:

<http://www.wetlands.org/Whatarewetlands/Peatlands/Carbonemissionsfrompeatlands/tabid/2738/Default.aspx>

Wilkinson, C. 2008. Status of coral reefs of the world: 2008 Global Coral Reef Monitoring

Network and Reef and Rainforest Research Centre, Townsville, Australia

Williams, W. D. 2002. Community participation in conserving and managing inland waters.

Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 12(3):315-326.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aqc.510>

Xu, T., Weng, B., Yan, D., Wang, K., Li, X., Bi, W., ... & Liu, Y. (2019). Wetlands of international

importance: Status, threats, and future protection. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(10), 1818.