

Please cite the Published Version

Mavah, GA, Funk, SM, Child, B, Swisher, ME, Nasi, R and Fa, JE (2018) Food and livelihoods in park-adjacent communities: The case of the Odzala Kokoua National Park. *Biological Conservation*, 222. pp. 44-51. ISSN 0006-3207

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.03.036>

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/621237/>

Usage rights: © In Copyright

Additional Information: The Accepted Version is the author's final submitted typescript version that we accepted for publication before it was edited and typeset.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

Accepted for publication in *Biological Conservation*

Highlights

1. Protected area management plans should pay attention to the provision of food and income to adjacent human communities.
2. In our study bushmeat was the most important component of meals on nearly all study villages.
3. A quarter of households earned cash from hunting wildlife.
4. More bushmeat was consumed closer to the national park.
5. Income from bushmeat sales was greater closer to markets.
6. Wildlife is perceived as declining around all village groups.

Food and livelihoods in park-adjacent communities:
The case of the Odzala Kokoua National Park

Germain A. Mavah ^{a,b}, Stephan M. Funk ^c, Brian Child ^a, Marilyn E. Swisher ^a, Robert Nasi ^d, John E. Fa ^{d,e*}

^a *Center for African Studies, 3141 Turlington Hall, PO Box 117315, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-7315, USA*

^b *Wildlife Conservation Society, 2300 Southern Boulevard, Bronx, New York 10460, USA*

^c *Centro de Excelencia en Medicina Traslacional CEMT, Av. Alemania 0458, Universidad de la Frontera, Temuco, Chile*

^d *Center for International Forestry Research, CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor 16115, Indonesia*

^e *Division of Biology and Conservation Ecology, School of Science and the Environment, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD, UK*

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: jfa949@gmail.com (J.E.Fa)

ABSTRACT

Protected areas (PAs) in Central Africa provide unprecedented opportunities to maintain ecosystem integrity and safeguard the unique wildlife of one of the most biodiverse regions in the world. However, conflicts exist between wildlife protection, and the needs of human populations adjacent to PAs. Although the use of wildlife resources within PAs is nominally regulated, wildlife exploitation in the areas surrounding parks benefit human nutrition and livelihoods of adjacent populations. In 2013-2014, we interviewed 28% of all known households in 37 villages surrounding the Odzala Kokoua National Park (OKNP), Republic of Congo. We gathered information on bushmeat consumption, income, material assets, and hunter perception of the state of wildlife. We show that bushmeat species (mostly duikers, small monkeys and porcupine) were consumed in 38-48% of meals, and 20-30% of households earned cash from hunting wildlife in most villages; more than any other single source of revenue, except cocoa. Although it remains unknown whether the park was a reservoir for wildlife for areas around the studied villages, we showed that more bushmeat was consumed closer to OKNP. By contrast, income from bushmeat sales in villages closer to markets was greater, and as a corollary, market access and household wealth were positively correlated. Overall, total household income, income from bushmeat sales, travel time, and distance to the OKNP were good predictors of household wealth. Wildlife, although considered more abundant around villages closest to the park, was perceived as generally declining around all village groups. Our results highlight the possible importance of PAs and adjacent areas as reservoirs of wildlife and in maintaining wild meat resources used by the surrounding human populations.

60 **Key words:** Buffer zone, bushmeat hunting, Congo, human livelihoods, protected
61 area, local communities.
62

1. Introduction

Carefully managed protected areas (PAs) remain the cornerstone for the conservation of dwindling natural resources (Coad et al., 2015). PAs also play a significant role in providing ecosystem services for adjacent human communities, by benefiting these directly, for example through the consumption of food produced or obtained in or around PAs (Taylor, 2009; Stolton and Dudley, 2010; Ferraro et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2012). Indirect benefits are manifold and include income and employment (Angelsen and Wunder, 2003). However, park-adjacent communities experience costs e.g. no entry into nearby PAs, and their lack of acceptance of these rules can influence support for PAs and subsequent conservation related behaviours (Acquah et al., 2017). If not properly managed and included in management plans, these communities can generate negative impacts on biodiversity, human livelihoods, and human well-being (Ghimire and Pimbert, 1997; West et al., 2006; McElwee, 2010; Barrett et al., 2011; Redpath et al., 2013).

Satisfying basic needs of people living near PAs puts enormous pressure on the environment. One of the key challenges facing such communities in tropical forest areas is how to meet the need for sufficient, safe and nutritious food without exhausting the resources available. Often park-adjacent peoples rely on wild meat as the main source of sustenance and even livelihoods. However, unsustainable hunting of wild animals even within PAs is the most commonly reported threat (Schulze et al., 2018), due to mounting human population pressures, technological advances and the emergence of a booming commercial wild meat trade. Overexploitation of wild meat has direct impacts on the survival of some targeted species, especially large mammals (Dirzo et al 2014, Ripple et al, 2016), and will

88 affect the availability of sufficient foods to meet the dietary needs of those peoples
89 reliant on this resource. Ultimately, rural communities have the option of managing
90 existing wild meat resources more sustainably, turning to alternatives (including the
91 production of cash crops to generate income to buy food), or hunting wildlife to local
92 extinction and then moving to other source areas.

93
94 In the Republic of Congo (ROC), tropical moist forests cover over 200,000
95 km² or around 66% of the country (Mayaux et al., 2013). Significant populations of
96 species of high conservation concern (e.g. elephants, gorillas, chimpanzees, etc.)
97 are found within the 200 PAs (11.7% of the country's area) as well as within
98 unprotected forests. The latter include stretches of forest managed by logging
99 companies that exploit the important economic timber resources are also found
100 within the country's forests (Doumenge et al., 2015). Logging operations allow
101 access to remote areas and encourage more people to settle within concessions in
102 search of jobs, thus increasing hunting pressure for bushmeat (Clark et al., 2009;
103 Poulsen et al., 2009, 2011; Nasi et al., 2012). Increased hunting pressure can be
104 reduced or prevented through partnerships between timber companies and
105 conservation organisations, which can be successful in promoting the sustainable
106 management of wildlife resources within logging areas (Clark et al., 2009).

107
108 Understanding the role that PAs and logging concessions play in supplying
109 wild meat to the adjacent communities is essential to resolve or even prevent conflict
110 between policy-makers, local people, and managers (Oldekop et al., 2015).
111 Ensuring that wild meat is sustainably managed in areas peripheral to PAs will
112 positively contribute to the protection of biodiversity. To determine the level of

dependence on wild meat versus other foods and income sources it is crucial to obtain data from which to establish a causal connection between people's livelihoods and protected area management (Pullin et al., 2014). Foerster et al. (2011) contrasted resource use and livelihoods in communities less influenced by a newly established PA (i.e. further away from the park) and those closest to it. The influence of proximity to the PA was significant. However, similar investigations in which the use of resources and livelihoods in communities at different distances away from a PA are scarce. In this paper, we study the contribution that park resources (wild meat) and cultivation make to the livelihoods and well-being of communities located at different distances from the Odzala-Kokoua National Park (OKNP) and the Ngombé Forest Management Unit (NFMU), in the northern ROC. Thus, by comparing communities that traditionally rely on park resources with those that do not, we can develop future management strategies that balance human welfare and conservation of biodiversity. We employ a cross-sectional design (De Vaus, 2001) to examine how livelihoods and use of wildlife resources vary according to the distance to the park and markets as predictor variables (Salafsky and Wollenberg, 2000; Foerster et al., 2011). We test two main hypotheses: (1) greater market access increases income from bushmeat sales and agriculture (mainly cocoa in this region) and both are linked to higher household wealth, and (2) shorter distances to the park increase the volume of bushmeat consumed and sold, and hence household income.

Methods

2.1. Study area

The study area is located in northern Congo, Central Africa, 1.61361°N, 16.05167°E (Fig. 1). Human population density is around 0.8 inhabitants km²

(unpublished data). The two main ethnic groups found in the area include several Bantu sub-ethnicities (70%) and indigenous Pygmies (30%). The two groups have co-existed for centuries. The main human settlement in the region is the town of Ouessou, with about 30,000 residents. It is rapidly growing because new roads connect it to Brazzaville and logging activities draw immigrants. There is also a logging town, Ngombé, as well as several villages.

The OKNP is a protected area officially proclaimed a national park in 1935, making it one of the oldest national parks in Africa. With 13,546 km² it is part of the TRIDOM Transfrontier Park, which extends from the Congo into Gabon and Cameroon (Kamdem-Toham et al., 2003). A secondary road from Ouessou to Sembé (hereafter the OS road) in the west borders the northern perimeter of the park. The Ouessou to Brazzaville road (N2) is found to the east of the park (Fig. 1).

The OKNP is situated within the catchment area of the Mambili River, which drains the area towards the south. The park is within the savanna-forest boundary of north-central Congo, allowing for a high biodiversity of flora and fauna, with species from forest and savanna. The area is densely wooded in the northwest; towards the south and east the forest becomes more open. In the south of the park an extensive forest-savanna mosaic is found, including gallery forests and dry and swamp savannas. Climate is typically equatorial with two dry and two wet seasons, 1,500 mm annual rainfall and a mean annual humidity of around 80%. Temperatures are moderately high (23-25°C), with a low annual temperature range of 1-2°C (Hecketsweiler et al., 1991).

2.2. *Village selection*

Our study was conducted in villages located on the Ouessou-Sembé, Ouessou-Liouesso, and Ouessou-Pikounda road axes (Fig. 1). Study villages were classified into four comparison groups based primarily on their distance to Ouessou (one group close, two distant groups and one quasi inaccessible), their proximity to OKNP, and their most important economic activity; cocoa cultivation differentiates the two distant groups (Table A1).

2.3. *Household data collection*

From July 2013 until June 2014 we gathered information from a total of 386 households (28% of the 1,382 known households), within 37 study villages in the four village groups. Table A1 details main characteristics of the four village groups as well as the number of villages and households sampled. Households were selected at random within each study village where we conducted semi-structured questionnaires with each household head (Table A2). Each questionnaire took about 45 minutes to administer. They were applied by the principle investigator (PI), a Master's student from Congo's National School of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences and a hired local guide. The PI trained the student and the guide. All three interviewers conducted questionnaires in all villages in order to avoid biased results, which might be introduced by subtle impacts of interview style on interviewees.

We documented household composition (number, age, and sex of all household members), education, income, wealth and food consumption. To determine the overall health status of all household members aged >1 year old, we estimated the average of all household members' individual body mass index (BMI).

Individual household wealth was determined, first, by establishing an inventory of cash reserves, household possessions and stocks of food items for own consumption or sale. We then assigned monetary values to all possessions and food items as declared by the respondents using current trading values in the local currency, FCFA, as a baseline. The total estimated wealth was transformed into \$US using the exchange rate 1 \$US = 500 FCFA. From these we partitioned the distribution of wealth of all households into five quintiles, “poorest”, “poor”, “middle income”, “rich”, and “richest”. Each Individual household was then assigned to its corresponding category or wealth index relative to all surveyed households. A household’s total income and its income from bushmeat was valued as absolute estimates in \$US. Analyses of income from specific items (including bushmeat and cocoa, Table A3) considered absolute values and percentage of the total income (i.e. relative bushmeat income). Community coherence was estimated by the community trust index and the perception of wildlife abundance by the interviewee’s assessment (Table A3).

2.4. *Statistical analyses*

The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used to examine whether the samples come from village groups with equal medians. Boxplots were drawn to visualize the distribution of data for the village groups. The alternative hypothesis is that at least one pair of group villages has unequal medians. We quantified the relationship between livelihood activities indices with the potential mediating factors using the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient r_s and subsequently tested for statistical significance. Because the same data set was used for several tests the sequential Bonferroni correction (Holm, 1979), also known as the Holm-Bonferroni

correction, was applied and the corrected p' -values were report alongside the uncorrected p -values. The sequential Bonferroni correction is increasingly being rejected because it results in a low statistical power (Moran, 2003; Nakagawa, 2004). To account for this problem, we did not decide on significance when $p < \alpha=0.05 < p'$. Significance applied for cases when $p < p' < \alpha=0.05$ and high significance for $p < p' < \alpha=0.01$. Because the regression analysis involving all pairwise comparisons of the selected variables would result in a large number of multiple tests, we made the a *priori* decision to apply statistical tests only to those pairwise correlations where the absolute value of r_s , $|r_s|$, was larger than 0.1. This is a reasonable trade-off between reducing statistical power by a larger number of multiple test and not further evaluating cases where low values of r_s indicate a low explanatory power whether the correlation is significant or not.

We evaluated the interactions between the potential mediating factors and their effect on relative income from bushmeat by using a linear mixed effect model as implemented in the lme4 package for R (Bates et al., 2014). We constructed a series of models aided by the correlation coefficients between relative income from bushmeat versus potential mediating factors and their significance, as calculated by r_s . Altogether five parameters were significantly correlated with relative income from bushmeat. As random effects the intercepts for village and village groups were used. P-values were estimated by likelihood ratio tests for the full model against the model without the specific fixed effect. All analyses were conducted using the R statistical environment (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2016).

3. Results

3.1. Characteristics and market access of surveyed villages

Summary statistics of the socio-economic and livelihood variables across the four village groups, as well as the results of the Kruskal-Wallis tests, are shown in Table 1 (more details in Table A1). For the 37 villages sampled, we surveyed an average (Mean \pm SD) of 12.2 ± 6.6 (group 1), 8.7 ± 5.5 (group 2), 12.2 ± 5.0 (group 3) and 6.0 ± 2.9 (group 4) households per village.

Group 4 villages were the furthest settlements from OKNP (approx. 16 times further away than group 1), about four times further than group 1 from Ouessou market. Group 2 and group 3 villages were closest to OKNP and between three and four times further away from Ouessou market than group 1. Travel times to Ouessou corresponded with the actual distance by road from village groups 1 to 3 but was significantly longer for group 4 villages due to their location away from main roads; this difference was highly significant (Table 1).

3.2. Households, income and expenditure

Across all villages, household size varied between 3 and 5 persons. Median and mean household size were highest for the two village groups closest to OKNP, with differences being highly statistically significant. Age of respondents did not vary significantly among villages, thus questionnaires were unbiased by age and, thus, experience of the respondents.

Education levels were similar among all village groups but the most remote village group (group 4) did not contain any person with a university education. Mean

household BMI was comparable between groups 1, 2 and 3, but slightly lower in group 4, though the differences were not statistically significant. The community trust index for all villages was low overall (median ≤ 2.3) with the exception of village group 4 which was highest (median 2.7); differences were significant.

All households in the four village groups relied heavily on wild food resources (ranging from 65% to 72% amongst village groups, Fig A1), followed by domestic products (22% to 35%), imported meat (less than 8%) and other sources (less than 5%). Only village group 4 did not consume imported meat or other resources, relying more on domestic products.

Differences between village groups in their monthly household income were highly significant; highest values were reported for groups 2 and 3, medium values for group 1 and lowest values for group 4. Income sources were highly diverse (Fig. A2), including bushmeat sales, farming, cocoa, fishing, small commerce, salaries, raphia wine, corn liquor, palm oil, gathering of NTFPs such as eru (*Gnetum africanum*), livestock, and other activities such as handicrafts. However, income was largest from the sale of bushmeat (ranging from 22% to 34% amongst village groups), farming (13% to 28%), and cocoa cultivation (10% to 49%). Absolute and relative incomes from bushmeat differed significantly between village groups (Fig. 2) with the highest absolute incomes from this source reported from group 3 (mean = \$42, median = \$0 and maximum = \$480) and the lowest for group 4 (mean = \$11, median = \$0 and maximum = \$190). The statistical comparison yielded, however, an undecided result. Income from cocoa was similarly distributed with highest values in

group 4 and lowest in group 4. In contrast to bushmeat the differences were highly significant.

Total food expenditure was highly significantly different between village groups and was lowest in group 4 (Table 1).

3.3. *Wealth*

According to our wealth index, around 60% of all rural households were extremely poor, with less than 10% considered rich (Table 1). Highest proportions of extremely poor and poor people were found in group 2 (21.17%) and in group 4 (28.33%). Rich households were less common in group 2 (9.68%) and group 3 (8.66%). There were no rich people in group 4. Across village groups, wealth was highly skewed and significantly different (Table 1, Fig. 2). Relative income from bushmeat was more highly skewed across village group than absolute income (Fig. 2). The smallest and largest percentages were in group 4 and 3 villages, respectively.

3.5. *Relationships between bushmeat incomes and expenditures versus potential mediating factors*

Correlations (r_s) between bushmeat and total incomes and expenditures relative to potential mediating factors for all respondents are shown in Table 2.

Travel time to the market in Ouesso and distance to the OKNP were all negatively correlated with expenditures and incomes. Total and relative incomes from bushmeat versus travel time and distance, and the total income versus the

distance to the OKNP had relatively high r_s values, which were significant or highly significant in all cases i.e. incomes and expenditures were highest for both scenarios: nearer to the market and nearer to the OKNP. Bushmeat expenditure contributed a large proportion of total consumption expenditure ($r_s = 0.49$) and was highly significant. Bushmeat expenditure was also highly significantly correlated with total income but to a smaller degree than total consumption expenditure ($r_s = 0.18$). Income from cocoa was positively correlated with total income but negatively with the relative income from bushmeat. Thus, the more cocoa sales the less the relative income from bushmeat or vice versa. Wealth was significantly or highly significantly correlated with all income and expenditure parameters (Fig. 3). Correlation was negative only for absolute and relative bushmeat income, which indicates that reliance on bushmeat income was associated with lower wealth. The data also confirm that body mass indices were positively correlated with total income and expenditures levels; whether total income and expenditure stemmed from bushmeat or not had no effect. People reliant on bushmeat income, whether absolute or relative to the total income, had higher trust in their communities than those that depended less on bushmeat, reflecting a higher social coherence amongst bushmeat hunters.

Linear mixed models for relative income from bushmeat were built using the absolute values of the correlations r_s in Table 2 as guidelines. The null model based of the mean jointly with intercepts for villages and villages groups as random effects was significantly different from the model with wealth as a fixed effect (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 21.35$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.00001$). The latter model was significantly different from the model with wealth and travel time to the market as fixed effects ($\chi^2 = 8.12$, $df = 1$,

$p = 0.0043$). The addition of the distance to the OKNP and cocoa sales were not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.008$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.93$ and $\chi^2 = 0.18$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.67$, respectively). The model with wealth, travel time and the community trust index as fixed effects was significantly different to the model of wealth and travel time only ($\chi^2 = 16.12$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.00006$). As the wealth and community trust indices might be interdependent, we also evaluated the model of wealth, travel time and the community trust index allowing for travel time x community trust interaction and compared with the model without interaction. No significant interaction effects were observed ($\chi^2 = 0.39$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.54$). The final model produced fixed effects of 0.28 ± 0.083 for the intercept, -0.02 ± 0.005 for the time to the market, -0.48 ± 0.127 for wealth and 0.11 ± 0.026 for the community trust index, respectively.

4. Discussion

4.1. Market access, household income and bushmeat sales

The variations of household income and bushmeat sales can be explained by the villages' accessibility to markets in Ouesso (i.e. travel time), and by the ability to sell their products to passengers along the road that connects Ouesso to Brazzaville. The sale of forest products is an important source of household income, and part of an income diversification strategy (Shackleton et al., 2011).

Market access is critical in generating income from bushmeat, farming, and cocoa. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that Village group 4, the remotest group of settlements (travel to Ouesso only along the Sangha River, since there are no roads) relied on subsistence uses rather than market sales. Thus, poor market access results in lower household incomes. In this group of villages, forest product

prices are lower than prices in the other three village groups where there are local weekly markets because of the easy access to Ouessou. Moreover, consumers travel regularly from Ouessou to buy rural products, particularly bushmeat, an important commodity sold by rural households (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). This possibility improves household incomes. The high income of group 3 from cocoa cultivation also emphasizes the importance of markets for household incomes. These villages are on the Cameroon border, and since the cocoa crisis in the early 1990s, traders from Cameroon buy cocoa in this area (Russell et al., 2011) but neglect plantations elsewhere in the Congo.

Group 3, with the highest average household income from cocoa cultivation has important implications for the discussion on alternative livelihoods and poaching. The assumption is often made that cocoa can be an important alternative income source that as a consequence will reduce the need for people to obtain cash and therefore reduces hunting pressure. However, these villages also have the highest average income from bushmeat (\$41.8). This is because most cocoa plantation owners were older, whereas most young people (who neither own nor inherit cocoa plantations) were active in bushmeat hunting. Russell et al. (2011) argue that young people turn to illegal hunting activities in the absence of access to land. Another contributing factor is that group 3 is closer to the park, and although they are further from markets than other village groups the status of the road is better. Group 1 (\$26.7 as income from bushmeat sales) is far from the park but near to Ouessou while group 2 (\$30.5 as income from bushmeat sales), the group 1 is closest to Ouessou but further from the park.

4.2. *Household daily food expenditure*

Household expenditure on daily meals differed among village groups. The three groups with easy access to Ouessou spent more money in comparison to group 4, demonstrating that income is affected by market access. In village group 4, with no access to markets, people hunt more for subsistence rather than for trade, and each family tries to produce what they need (e.g. cassava, raphia wine, palm oil, maize). In rural areas, bushmeat consumption may be associated with people's preferences or their culture, but the scarcity of bushmeat can push consumers to change their preferences. In the largest towns in the country (i.e. Brazzaville and Pointe Noire), bushmeat is a luxury good consumed by rich people (Mbete et al., 2011). Although many people living in these cities originate from rural areas with bushmeat-eating habits, they cannot afford bushmeat and are forced to consume other sources of animal protein (Wilkie et al., 2005; Mbete et al., 2011). So rich people in cities diversify animal protein intake to include bushmeat, whereas poor people consume only the cheapest protein such as domestic meat (Auzel and Wilkie, 2000; Wilkie et al., 2005).

4.3. *Wealth*

People are poorest in the remote villages with few markets (group 4) and also in the villages nearer Ouessou (group 1) where forest products and wildlife, which constitute the main source of income, are severely depleted because of human pressure. Villages close to the park but further from Ouessou (groups 2 and 3) presumably benefit from wildlife dispersing out of the park where hunting is still productive, supporting a weekly bushmeat market. As noted, cocoa cultivation is a

major source of income contributing about 49% of income in group 3, but aside from this localized group, cocoa farming is underdeveloped in the study area.

4.5. General findings and conclusions

Overall, we show that household income is negatively associated with distance to the park, with household consumption expenditures, income from cocoa sales, and wealth index, but is not related to travel time. These associations suggest that people with better access to markets and the park tended to be richer because of their income primarily from bushmeat sales, whereas those further away from the park obtained less revenue from bushmeat and were overall poorer. Foerster et al. (2011) report similar findings for Gabon, in which the authors suggest that because richer hunting zones are found closer to the park, people in these localities are able to hunt more and to sell. Greater access to wildlife also had an effect in permitting beneficiaries to spend more money on bushmeat than poorer people, but also to sell more bushmeat. However, wealthier people depended less on selling bushmeat, but those who sold bushmeat were generally poor. Other studies suggest this (Scherl, 2004; Shackleton et al. 2011).

Dependence of rural peoples on forest resources is marked, as shown in our study. Wildlife is an important source of both cash and food, similar to other locations around the Congo basin (Wilkie and Carpenter, 1999; Wilkie et al., 2006; Van Vliet and Nasi, 2008; Foerster et al., 2011) and in some African drylands (Von Richter and Butynski, 1973). In our study, hunters are pushed to sell much of the bushmeat they harvest for markets in Ouessou and even beyond (Brazzaville), where bushmeat is a popular delicacy and usually sell at much higher prices. Such increase in commercial

436 hunting and trade to secondary towns and large cities in the country places
437 unprecedented pressures on wildlife populations in the region. This situation may be
438 reflected in the responses given by interviewed hunters who suggest that in all
439 villages, except those furthest away, wildlife is perceived to be decreasing. As shown
440 in other studies in the region (Noss, 1998; Muchaal and Gandjui, 1999; Poulsen et
441 al., 2009) current harvest rates around the OKNP could be much higher than
442 sustainable levels.

443
444 With growing human populations, urban areas, roads, and markets the
445 demand for bushmeat increasingly threatens its sustainability. More importantly, the
446 demand for bushmeat is growing in the absence of local regulations to protect
447 wildlife resources. Scarcity should drive up both the price and the production of
448 wildlife, but in the absence of clear property rights wildlife is exploited rather than
449 produced sustainably. Legally, wildlife is owned by the central government which is
450 unable to exert its “rights of exclusion” and the richest wildlife habitats are rarely
451 visited by most governmental agencies which in any case lack the human and
452 financial resources to effectively enforce laws even in even easy to reach areas
453 (Rowcliffe et al., 2004) - the government officials’ “authoritative reach exceeds their
454 implementational grasp” (Murphree, 2000:4). The result is a humanly constructed
455 stalemate and an economically incoherent wildlife economy, where local people
456 deplete the resource over which their livelihood depends, while the state lacks
457 strategies and the human and financial resources to enforce laws at the village level.
458 In public meetings, people regularly stated “wildlife is for the state” and asked “how
459 can we take care of something that doesn’t belong to us?” Thus, central control of
460 wildlife management disenfranchises local people, causing them to shirk any

responsibility for a resource that is “owned” by an outside entity. The seeming lack of local conservation action despite the key contribution of wild resources to local livelihoods is a paradox. The likely cause is weak local property rights (Schlager and Ostrom, 1992; Hanna et al., 1996) and disempowerment of local people with respect to their wildlife.

Given the high dependence of human livelihoods on forest resources in our study area, as in other similar localities, the future of wildlife and PAs may lie in the sustainable use of wild resources rather than non-use to strengthen the resilience of the poor (Roe and Elliott, 2004; Sanderson and Redford, 2003). Livestock is not an effective alternative activity to bushmeat hunting for forest dwellers in central Africa (Russell et al., 2011) but, even if it were, the result of encouraging people to use livestock rather than wildlife is simply for domestic species to replace wild ones. The ecological reality is that forests (and drylands) often cannot produce more raw commodities. In southern Africa, therefore, wildlife replaced livestock commodity production once proprietorship was devolved to landholders, and because wildlife could be converted into much higher values through trophy hunting and, in a few places, through tourism. Reversing these trends may well require approaches like those implemented in Namibia (NACSO, 2015).

Though this study does identify significant associations, its cross-sectional rather than experimental design does not confirm causality (Bryman, 2008; Agresti and Finlay, 2009). Therefore, further research is needed to investigate the relationship among variables in terms of the causes and effects. In addition, we ask what will motivate local people to take action to conserve wildlife. Despite this, our

results have generated a new hypothesis. Thus, the distance to the town did not provide strong clarification on rural livelihood activities' variation. However, the travel time from Ouessou to village that characterizes market access and offers a clearer explanation regarding the associations among variables (i.e. this is an effective predictor of livelihoods variation and-or association). Surrounding this study area, it is argued, "the impacts of conservation-related displacement need to be understood in the context of the other major land-use changes occurring in the region" (Curran et al., 2009, Ridell, 2013). The recognition of the starting point for interventions will facilitate the task when setting biodiversity conservation and poverty elimination goals (Adams et al., 2004). In other words, for the future evaluation of park management effects, these variables can be used to assess trends, comparing villages with the park effects to control villages (i.e. without the park effects). Child (2014) argues that we should establish a relationship between the economic value of the PAs and their benefit to local people, and then this can enable PAs to undertake conservation actions in their buffer zones.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the funding received from USAID through the Center for International Forestry Research Bushmeat Research Initiative, part of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry, and the Rufford Small Grants Foundation. We also appreciate the support of Wildlife Conservation Society - Congo national program who hosted GAM during this study.

References

- Acquah, E., Rollins, R., Dearden, P. & Murray, G. (2017). Concerns and benefits of park-adjacent communities in Northern Ghana: the case of Mole National Park. *Int. J. Sust. Dev. World* 24, 316-327.
- Adams, W.M., Aveling, R., Brockington, D., Dickson, B., Elliott, J., Hutton, J., Roe, D., Vira, B., Wolmer, W., 2004. Biodiversity conservation and the eradication of poverty. *Science* 306, 1146-1149.
- Agresti, A., Finlay, B., 2009. *Statistical methods for the social sciences*, 4th Ed. Prentice-Hall.
- Angelsen, A., Wunder, S., 2003. Exploring the forest–poverty link: key concepts, issues and research implications (No. CIFOR Occasional Paper no. 40, pp. viii-58p). CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Auzel, P., Wilkie, D., 2000. Wildlife use in northern Congo: Hunting in a commercial logging concession. In: Robinson J.G., Bennett E.L. (Eds.), *Hunting for Sustainability in Tropical Forests*. Columbia University Press New York, pp. 413–426.
- Barrett, C.B., Travis, A.J., Dasgupta, P., 2011. On biodiversity conservation and poverty traps. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108, 13907-13912.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2014. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *ArXiv Prepr. ArXiv14065823*.
- Bennett, E.L., Robinson, J.G., 2000. *Hunting for Sustainability in Tropical Forests*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Bryman, A., 2008. *Social research methods*. 3rd Ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

535 Child, B.A., 2014. Parks in transition: adapting to a changing world. *Oryx* 48, 469-
536 470.

537 Clark, C.J., Poulsen, J.R., Malonga, R., Elkan, Jr. P.W., 2009. Logging concessions
538 can extend the conservation estate for Central African tropical forests.
539 *Conserv. Biol.* 23, 1281–1293.

540 Coad, L., Leverington, F., Knights, K., Geldmann, J., Eassom, A., Kapos, V.,
541 Kingston, N., de Lima, M., Zamora, C., Cuadros, I., Nolte, C., Burgess, N.D.,
542 Hockings, M., 2015. Measuring impact of protected area management
543 interventions: current and future use of the Global Database of Protected Area
544 Management Effectiveness. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 370: 20140281. [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0281)
545 [dx.doi.org/10.1098-rstb.2014.0281](http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0281)

546 Curran, B., Sunderland, T., Maisels, F., Oates, J., Asaha, S., Balinga, M., Defo, L.,
547 Dunn, A., Telfer, P., Usongo, L., Von Loebenstein, K., Roth, P., 2009. Are
548 Central Africa's protected areas displacing hundreds of thousands of rural
549 poor? *Conserv. Soc.* 7, 30–45.

550 De Vaus, D., 2001. Research design in social research. London, Sage Publications.

551 Dirzo, R., Young, H.S., Galetti, M., Ceballos, G., Isaac, N.J.B., Collen, B., 2014.
552 Defaunation in the Anthropocene. *Science* 345, 401-406.

553 Doumenge C., Palla F., Scholte P., Hiol Hiol F., Larzillière A., 2015. Aires pro-
554 tégées d'Afrique centrale – État 2015. Kinshasa and Yaoundé, OFAC.

555 Ferraro, J.P., Hanauera, M., Sims, R.E.K., 2011. Conditions associated with
556 protected area success in conservation and poverty reduction. *Proc. Natl.*
557 *Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108, 13913-13918.

558 Foerster, S., Wilkie, D.S., Morelli, G. A., Demmer, J., Starkey, M., Telfer, P., Steil,
 559 M., 2011. Human livelihoods and protected areas in Gabon: a cross-sectional
 560 comparison of welfare and consumption patterns. *Oryx* 45, 347-356.

561 Ghimire, K.B., Pimbert, M.P., 1997. Social change and conservation: environmental
 562 politics and impacts of national parks and protected areas. Earthscan,
 563 London.

564 Hanna, S.S., Folke, C., Maler, K.-G., 1996. Rights to nature: Ecological, economic,
 565 cultural, and political principles of institutions for the environment. Island
 566 Press, Washington DC.

567 Hegetsweiler, P., Doumenge, C., Mokoko Ikonga, J., 1991. Le parc national
 568 d'Odzala, Congo. IUCN. Gland, Switzerland.

569 Holm, S., 1979. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scand. J.*
 570 *Stat.* 65–70.

571 Mayaux, P., Pekel, J.-F., Desclée, B., Donnay, F., Lupi, A., Achard, F., Clerici, M.,
 572 Bodart, C., Brink, A., Nasi, R., Belward, A., 2013. State and evolution of the
 573 African rainforests between 1990 and 2010. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 368,
 574 20120300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0300>

575 Mbete, A.R., Mboko, B.H., Racey, P., Ntsakala, M.A., Nganga, I., Doucet, L.J., 2011.
 576 Household bushmeat consumption in Brazzaville (Congo). *Biol. Sciences*, 4,
 577 187-202.

578 McElwee, P.D., 2010. Resource use among rural agricultural households near
 579 protected areas in Vietnam: the social costs of conservation and implications
 580 for enforcement. *Environ. Manage.* 45, 113–131.

581 Moran, M.D., 2003. Arguments for rejecting the sequential Bonferroni in ecological
 582 studies. *Oikos* 403–405.

583 Muchaal, P.K., Ngandjui, G., 1999. Impact of village hunting on wildlife populations in
584 the western Dja Reserve, Cameroon. *Conserv. Biol.* 13, 385-396.

585 Murphree, M.W., 2000. Boundaries and borders: The question of scale in the theory
586 and practice of common property management. Paper presented at the Eighth
587 Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common
588 Property, Bloomington, Indiana.

589 NASCO: Namibia Association of Community Based Natural Resource Management
590 Support Organization, 2015. What is CBNRM? (NACSO: CBNRM in Namibia
591 http://www.nacso.org.na-what_is_cbnrm.php

592 Nakagawa, S., 2004. A farewell to Bonferroni: the problems of low statistical power
593 and publication bias. *Behav. Ecol.* 15, 1044–1045.

594 Nasi, R., Billand, A., van Vliet, N., 2012. Managing for timber and biodiversity in the
595 Congo Basin. *Forest Ecol. Manag.* 268, 103–111.

596 Noss, A.J., 1998. The impact of cable snare hunting on wildlife populations in the
597 forest of the Central African Republic. *Conserv. Biol.* 12, 390-398.

598 Oldekop, J.A., Holmes, G., Harris, W.E., Evans, K.L. 2016. A global assessment of
599 the social and conservation outcomes of protected areas. *Conserv. Biol.* 30,
600 133–141.

601 Poulsen, R.J., Clark, J.C., Mavah, G.A., Elkan, P., 2009. Bushmeat supply and
602 consumption in a tropical logging concession in northern Congo. *Conserv.*
603 *Biol.* 23, 1597–1608.

604 Poulsen, J.R., Clark, C.J., Bolker, B.M., 2011. Decoupling the effects of logging and
605 hunting on an Afrotropical animal community. *Ecol. Appl.* 21, 1819–1836.

606 Pullin, A.S., Bangpan, M., Dalrymple S., Dickson, K., Haddaway, N.R., Healey J.R.,
607 Hauari, H., Hockley, N., Jones, J.P.G., Knight, T., Vigurs, C., Oliver S., 2014.

608 Assessing the effects of terrestrial protected areas on human well-being: A
 609 STAP Advisory Document. Global Environment Facility, Washington, D.C.
 610 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2016. R
 611 Redpath, S.M., Young, J., Evely, A., Adams, W.M., Sutherland, W.J., Whitehouse,
 612 A., Amar, A., Lambert, R.A., Linnell, J.D.C., Watt, A., Gutierrez, R.J., 2013.
 613 Understanding and managing conservation conflicts. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 28,
 614 100-109.
 615 Ripple, W.J., Abernethy, K., Betts, M.G., Chapron, G., Dirzo, R., Galetti, M., Levi, T.,
 616 Lindsey, P.A., Macdonald, D.W., Machovina, B., Newsome, T.M., Peres, C.A.,
 617 Wallach, A.D., Wolf, C., Young, H., 2016. Bushmeat hunting and extinction
 618 risk to the world's mammals. *R. Soc. open sci.* 3, 160498.
 619 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160498>
 620 Roe, D., Elliott, J., 2004. Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation: rebuilding
 621 the bridges. *Oryx*, 38, 137-139.
 622 Rowcliffe, J.M., De Merode, E., Cowlshaw, G., 2004. Do wildlife laws work? Species
 623 protection and the application of a prey choice model to poaching decisions.
 624 *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B. Biol. Sci.*, 271, 2631-2636.
 625 Russell, D., Mbile, P., Tchamou, N., 2011. Farm and forest in Central Africa:
 626 Towards an integrated rural development strategy. *J. Sustainable For.* 30,
 627 111-132.
 628 Salafsky, N., Wollenberg, E., 2000. Linking livelihoods and conservation: A
 629 conceptual framework and scale for assessing the integration of human needs
 630 and biodiversity. *World Dev.* 28, 1421-1438.
 631 Sanderson, S.E., Redford, K.H., 2003. Contested relationships between biodiversity
 632 conservation and poverty alleviation. *Oryx*, 37, 389-390.

633 Schulze, K., Knights, K., Coad, L., Geldmann, J., Leverington, F., Eassom, A., Marr,
 634 M., Butchart, S.H.M., Hockings, M., Burgess, N. 2018. An assessment of
 635 threats to terrestrial protected areas. *Conserv. Lett.*
 636 e12435.wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/conl1of10https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.1
 637 2435

638 Scherl, L.M., 2004. Can protected areas contribute to poverty reduction?
 639 Opportunities and limitations. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

640 Schlager, E., Ostrom, E., 1992. Property-rights regimes and natural resources: a
 641 conceptual analysis. *Land Econ.* 68, 249–262.

642 Schulze, K., Knights, K., Coad, L., Geldmann, J., Leverington, F., Eassom, A., Marr,
 643 M., Butchart, S.H.M., Hockings, M., Burgess, Neil D., 2018. An assessment of
 644 threats to terrestrial protected areas. *Conserv. Lett.* 2018;e12435.
 645 <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12435>

646 Shackleton, S., Delang, C.O., Angelsen, A., 2011. From subsistence to safety nets
 647 and cash income: exploring the diverse values of non-timber forest products
 648 for livelihoods and poverty alleviation, in Shackleton, S., Shackleton, C.,
 649 Shanley, P. (Eds.) *Non-Timber Forest Products in the Global Context.*
 650 Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 55-81

651 Stolton, S., Dudley, N., 2010. Vital sites: The contribution of protected areas to
 652 human health. WWF and Equilibrium, Gland, Switzerland.

653 Taylor, R., 2009. Community based natural resource management in Zimbabwe: the
 654 experience of CAMPFIRE. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 18, 2563–2583.

655 Turner, W.R., Brandon, K., Brooks, T.M., Gascon, C., Gibbs, H.K., Lawrence, K.S.,
 656 Mittermeier, R.A., Selig, E.R., 2012. Global biodiversity conservation and the
 657 alleviation of poverty. *BioScience* 62, 85-92.

658 Van Vliet, N., Nasi, R., 2008. Hunting for livelihood in northeast Gabon: patterns,
 659 evolution, and sustainability. *Ecol. Soc.* 13(2), 33. [http:--](http://www.ecologyandsociety.org-vol13-iss2-art33-)
 660 www.ecologyandsociety.org-vol13-iss2-art33-.
 661 Von Richter, W., Butynski, T., 1973. Hunting in Botswana. *Botsw. Notes Rec.* 5, 191-
 662 208.
 663 West, P., Igoe, J., Brockington, D., 2006. Parks and peoples: the social impact of
 664 protected areas. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 35, 251-277.
 665 Wilkie, D.S., Carpenter, J.F., 1999. Bushmeat hunting in the Congo Basin: an
 666 assessment of impacts and options for mitigation. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 8, 927-
 667 955.
 668 Wilkie, D., Starkey, M., Abernethy, K., Effa, N.E., Telfer, P., Godoy, R., 2005. Role of
 669 prices and wealth in consumer demand for bushmeat in Gabon, central Africa.
 670 *Conserv. Biol.* 19, 268-274.
 671 Wilkie, S.D., Morelli, A.G., Demmer, J., Starkey, M., Telfer, P., Steil M., 2006. Parks
 672 and people: Assessing the human welfare effects of establishing protected
 673 areas for biodiversity conservation. *Conserv. Biol.* 20, 247–249.
 674
 675
 676

FIGURE LEGENDS


Figure 1. Location of the study area, villages and the Odzala Kokoua National Park OKNP (Northern Congo).

Figure 2. Distribution of bushmeat related livelihood variables across the four village groups GP1 to GP4. Each box covers 50% of the respective data (i.e. first to third quartile). Bold lines indicate medians, whiskers indicate 1.5 the interquartile ranges and dots suspected outliers.

Figure 3. Association between potential mediating factors and incomes and expenditures from bushmeat. Those associations are shown which were significant or highly significant (Table 2).


693 Fig. 1

694



695

696






Table 1. Socio-economic and livelihood variables across the four village groups surrounding the Odzala-Kokoua National Park. Shown are number of interviewed respondents n , mean μ , median Mdn and range, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 and p (df = 3 in all cases) and adjusted p' for multiple testing by Holm-Bonferroni sequential correction. Means and medians are shown because of the skewed data distributions. Significance is indicated as $*$ = $p < p' < 0.05$, $**$ = $p < p' < 0.01$ and “?” = $p < 0.05 < p'$. The descriptive distances were not statistically evaluated.

| Parameter | group 1 | | group 2 | | group 3 | | group 4 | | Kruskal-Wallis test | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|---------|--|---------|---|-----------|---------------------|-------|-------|----|
| | n _{min} =133, n _{max} =136 | | n _{min} =59, n _{max} =63 | | n _{min} =115, n _{max} =127 | | n _{min} = n _{max} =60 | | | | | |
| | 11 villages | | 8 villages | | 9 villages | | 9 villages | | χ ² | p | p' | Σ |
| | μ Mdn | range | μ Mdn | range | μ Mdn | range | μ Mdn | range | | | | |
| Survey villages and market access | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance to OKNP | 30.4 20 | 20-79 | 14.5 15 | 10-20 | 10.0 10 | 10-10 | 316 328 | 239-360 | - | - | - | - |
| Distance to Ouessou | 53.1 48 | 25-85 | 176.8 200 | 100-215 | 138.8 143 | 69-190 | 212.0 224 | 135-256 | - | - | - | - |
| Travel time to Ouessou market | 1.4 1 | 0.5-3 | 4.8 5 | 3.3-5.5 | 4.1 4 | 2.5-6 | 15.6 17.3 | 7-20 | 309 | <.001 | <.001 | ** |
| Household size | 4.4 4 | 1-13 | 4.4 5 | 1-9 | 5.3 5 | 1-17 | 3.3 3 | 1-9 | 31.6 | <.001 | <.001 | ** |
| Respondent age | 47.3 46 | 20-86 | 45.0 42 | 20-80 | 47.9 46.5 | 24-79 | 50.0 44 | 24-82 | 2.8 | .417 | .818 | |
| Respondent education level | 1.3 1 | 0-4 | 1.7 2 | 0-4 | 1.3 1 | 0-4 | 1.1 1 | 0-3 | 12.3 | .006 | .038 | * |
| Respondent BMI | 23.9 23.6 | 17.7-42.6 | 23.6 22 | 18-37.6 | 23.2 23.2 | 14.7-31 | 22.3 22.3 | 16.8-29.5 | 8.9 | .031 | .154 | ? |
| Community trust index | 2.3 2.3 | 2-4.7 | 2.3 2 | 0-4 | 2.4 2.3 | 0-4 | 2.9 2.7 | 0-4.3 | 30.6 | <.001 | <.001 | ** |
| Household income, food consumption & wealth | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total income \$US | 81.2 66 | 0-355 | 96.3 60 | 0-600 | 170.7 105 | 0-1170 | 55.0 33.3 | 0-320.8 | 38.2 | <.001 | <.001 | ** |
| Income from bushmeat \$US | 26.9 0 | 0-230 | 30.5 0 | 0-600 | 41.5 0 | 0-480 | 10.5 0 | 0-190 | 8.1 | .045 | .179 | ? |
| Income from cocoa \$US | 0.1 0 | 0-16.7 | 0 0 | 0-133 | 90.2 0 | 0-1320 | 4.7 0 | 0-35 | 90.4 | <.001 | <.001 | ** |
| Expenditure bushmeat \$US | 1.1 0 | 0-10 | 1.1 0 | 0-10 | 1.5 0.8 | 0-16 | 1.0 0.3 | 0-8.4 | 6.9 | .076 | .228 | no |
| Expenditure consumption \$US | 3.9 2.4 | 0-10 | 4.5 4.1 | 0-13.7 | 2.9 2.4 | 0-0 | 2.3 2.2 | 0-7 | 27.7 | <.001 | <.001 | ** |
| Wealth index | 0.3 0.2 | 0-0.7 | 0.3 0.4 | 0-0.9 | 0.3 0.3 | 0-0.9 | 0.2 0.3 | 0-0.6 | 17.4 | .001 | .004 | ** |
| Perception of abundance | 3 | 0-4 | 3 | 0-4 | 3 | 0-4 | 3 | 0-4 | 2.9 | .41 | .818 | |

706 **Table 2.** Association between potential mediating factors and incomes and expenditures from bushmeat. Spearman's rank
707 correlation r_s , sample sizes n and outcomes from the test statistics are presented. Tests were only performed when r_s explains at
708 least 10% of the observed variance. Observed p and the p' -values adjusted with the Holm-Bonferroni sequential correction
709 approach are shown. Significance as in Table 1.

| Potential mediating factors | n | Bushmeat consumption expenditure (\$US) | | Total consumption expenditure (\$US) | | Income from bushmeat (\$US) | | Total income (\$US) | | Relative income from bushmeat | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| | | n=386 | | n=383 | | n=386 | | n=386 | | n=359 | |
| | | r_s | p p' | r_s | p p' | r_s | p p' | r_s | p p' | r_s | p p' |
| Travel time to Queso market | 386 | -0.03 | - | -0.01 | - | -0.15 * | 0.004 0.022 | -0.02 | - | -0.17 ** | <0.001 0.007 |
| Distance to OKNP | 386 | -0.02 | - | -0.09 | - - | -0.13 * | 0.011 0.033 | -0.30 ** | <0.001 <0.001 | -0.12 * | 0.018 0.037 |
| Total consumption expenditure (\$US) | 383 | 0.49 ** | <0.001 <0.001 | N/A | N/A | 0.09 | - | 0.18 ** | <0.001 0.003 | 0.04 | - |
| Income from cocoa sale (\$US) | 386 | 0.06 | - | -0.08 | - | -0.08 | - | 0.32 ** | <0.001 <0.001 | -0.17 ** | <0.001 0.007 |
| Wealth index | 386 | 0.16 * | 0.002 0.015 | 0.28 ** | <0.001 <0.001 | -0.13 * | 0.008 0.032 | 0.21 ** | <0.001 <0.001 | -0.22 ** | <0.001 <0.001 |
| BMI | 367 | -0.06 | - | 0.11 * | 0.018 0.037 | -0.02 | - | 0.15 * | 0.003 0.022 | 0.04 | - |
| Community Trust Index | 386 | 0.08 | - | 0.01 | - | 0.19 ** | <0.001 0.002 | 0.08 | - | 0.17 ** | <0.001 <0.001 |

710

711

712

713

Supplementary Information

Table A1. Summary of the four surveyed village groups surrounding the Odzala-Kokoua National Park northern Congo (Figure 1).

| | Village group | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Villages sampled (n) | 11 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| Households sampled (n) | 136 | 62 | 128 | 60 |
| Average distance to OKNP (km) | 30 | 14 | 10 | 316 |
| Road access | On main north-south and east-west roads, good road conditions, high levels of traffic | On main north-south road, good road conditions, high levels of traffic | On main east-west road, good road conditions, high levels of traffic | No road access, access by boat only |
| Access to OKNP | Via both the main north-south and east-west roads | Via the main north-south roads, which straddles part of the eastern park border | Via the main east-west road, which straddles most of the northern park border | No access |
| Access to local bushmeat markets | Weekly market in some villages e.g. Liouesso and Attention | Weekly bushmeat market in some villages e.g. Mokouagonda and Moyoye | Weekly market in some villages e.g. Kokoua and Seka | No markets |
| Cacao cultivation | None | High | High | Low |
| Hunting pressure extended on OKNP | High | High | High | Low |


Table A2. Heads of Households' Questionnaire

Village: Date: Investigator: Questionnaire #:

Name of household head (HH):

1. Demographic information

Please, how many individuals do you have in your household? :

| Name | Relationship -HH | M-F | Age | Ethnicity | Education level | Weight | Height | Mid upper arm  |
|------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------|--------------------|--------|--------|---|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

2. Wealth assessment (basket of assets): Please, do you have these goods?

| Items | # Unit | Cost per unit | Total Cost |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------|------------|
| Shotgun (i.e. for hunting) | | | |
| Wood bed | | | |
| Mattress | | | |
| Watch-Clock | | | |
| Stereo | | | |
| Radio | | | |
| DVD player | | | |
| Scooter | | | |
| Bicycle | | | |
| Livestock # | | | |
| Poultry # | | | |
| House sheet metal roof | | | |
| Power Generator | | | |
| TV | | | |
| Other | | | |

3. How important is wildlife for your household?

Very little: Little: Some: A lot of: Great deal:

3. Household consumption: Please fill out the following table regarding your expenditure for food in the last 48h

| Products | Source | | | | | |
|----------|--------|------|----------|------|--------------|------|
| | Wild | | Domestic | | Manufactured | |
| | Unit | Cost | Unit | Cost | Unit | Cost |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

4. Transitory income of household heads: What are the quantity and the values of your forest products and crops for both use and sale over past month or season?

| Products | Quantity collected | Unity | Own use | Sold | Price per unit | Type of Market | Income |
|----------|--------------------|-------|---------|------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

5. Importance of hunting in household income compared with other activities

| Designation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Farming | | | | | |
| Cacao | | | | | |
| Fishing | | | | | |
| Hunting | | | | | |
| NTFPs (specify) | | | | | |
| Livestock | | | | | |
| Job | | | | | |
| Pensions | | | | | |
| Traditional practitioners | | | | | |
| Money from town | | | | | |
| Other (specify) | | | | | |

749
750
751

6. Please, what are your hunting motivations

To increase household income: Traditional activity: Good product to sell: Other (specify):

752
753
754
755

7. Community trust: Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements

| Items | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Would you trust a neighbor to look after your house when you had to leave the village | | | | | |
| Would you trust a neighbor to look after your money | | | | | |
| Whether a machete left outside overnight would still be there in the morning | | | | | |

756
757
758
759
760
761

8. Disease vulnerability

Please, in the past year, have any of you suffered from the following diseases?

Diarrhea: Kwashiorkor: Malaria: Other(specify):

762
763
764
765

9. Food security

How many times in the past five years has your family not been able to get enough food? Number of months without enough food?

20012: 2011: 2010: 2009: 2008: 2007:

Why:

769
770
771
772
773

10. Compared to 10 years ago, are your forest resources more or less abundant today and explain why?

| Wild resources | Don't know (1) | No change (2) | Decrease (3) | Increase (4) |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Wildlife | | | | |
| Fish | | | | |
| Caterpillar | | | | |
| Irvingia sp | | | | |
| Nkoko | | | | |
| Other (specify) | | | | |

774

775
776 **11. How far can we find the following wildlife species? Please specify how**
777 **many walk time to find these species**
778

Gorillas: Chimpanzees Small monkey: Brush-tailed porcupine:

Bleu duiker: Peter's duiker: Bush pig: Other (specify):

779 **12. What major events have affected your livelihood in the past 5 years?**
780

1: 2: 3:

What caused?

How did you respond?

781
782 **13. What are the three biggest challenges to your livelihood that you are**
783 **worried about and explain?**
784

1: 2: 3:

785
786 **14. Compared to 5 years ago, is your household more or less prosperous**
787 **today and explain why?**
788

More abundant Less prosperous No change Don' t know

789
790
791 **15. Participation in community actions**
792

793 Are you member of any associations in the village?
794

Yes: No:

Named them:

Social-Economic objective:

Do they interact with other villages?

A. Focus Group

Village: GPS X: Y: Distance to Ouessou:

Travel time: Distance to park: Population estimate:

1. What are your principle activities in the village? For men, for women?
2. What is the most important hindrance in community projects in your village?
Why? How do you can overcome it?
3. What types of associations do you have in your community?
4. Do you any informal rules or regulations of access to your forest? If so, how strong are they comparing to formal?
5. What factor influence the most pressure on wildlife in your village?
6. Please sort your most important hunting motivations
Increase household Income: Traditional activity (culture): Bushmeat has high benefit:
7. What can we do to use wildlife for long term?
8. Can you report any poaching event in the village to village's authorities?
9. What do you know about wildlife?
Measures of control wildlife:
Benefits:
Trends (increase or decrease):
10. What are the consequences of wildlife extinction?
11. What actions should you take according to you?
12. Why are you not taking these actions?

849 **Table A3.** Human livelihood variables assessed through questionnaires.

850
851

| Study variable | Measurements | Measurement units |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Access to the main town Ouesso | Reported travel time village - Ouesso | minutes |
| Distance to Ouesso and OKNP | Distances from village according administrative records | km |
| Gender | Gender of household head | male / female |
| Age | Age of household head | years |
| Ethnicity | Self-assignment of ethnic group | Bantu, indigenous Pygmy groups |
| Level of the education | Level of the education of each household member | Index: no school (0), primary school (1), secondary school (2), high school (3), university (4) |
| Body mass index BMI | Weight and height of all household members aged 1 year or above | averaged BMI over all household members |
| Household size | all household members | n |
| Household food composition | Bushmeat, fish, domestic animals, vegetables from farm, vegetables from forest, imported protein, others | Composition of last main household meal in percent |
| Household expenditure for all food | Monetary value of all food items bought for last main household meal | Monetary value in the local currency FCFA, translated into \$US using the exchange rate \$US 1 = 500 FCFA |
| Household expenditure for bushmeat | As above but for bushmeat only | As above |
| Sources of income | Bushmeat trade, farming, cocoa, small commerce, salary, corn liquor, fishing, raffia wine, gathering, livestock, palm oil, handcrafts, and other items sold during the last season or this year | As above |

852

| Study variable | Measurements | Measurement units |
|---|--|---|
| Household income from any sold food items | Estimated value of any food items sold during the last season or this year including | As above |
| Income from cocoa sale | As above for cocoa only | As above |
| Income from bushmeat sale | As above for bushmeat only | As above |
| Community Trust index | How are neighbours trusted to look after one's house | Strongly mistrust (1), mistrust (2), neutral (3), trust (4), strongly trust (5) |
| Wildlife abundance perception | Perception of wildlife abundance | Index: don't know or not specified (0), no change (1), decrease (2), increase (3) |
| Household wealth | Sum of monetary value of itemized household possessions | Monetary value in the local currency FCFA, translated into \$US using the exchange rate \$US 1 = 500 FCFA |
| Household wealth index | Household wealth in relation to all other surveyed households | Partition of the distribution of wealth of all households into five quintiles, which were categorized as "poorest", "poor", "middle income", "rich", and "richest". Each Individual household was then assigned to the adequate category, |

854 **Table A4.** Average prices of principal products sold surrounding Odzala-Kokoua
855 National Park OKNP (northern Congo). Prices in \$US are converted from the local
856 currency FCFA (see Table A3).

| Rural products | Village Groups | | | | Ouessou |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------|------|------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Red duikers (\$-Kg) | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.30 | 0.70 | 3.30 |
| Blue duikers (\$-Kg) | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.20 | 2.40 |
| Small monkeys (\$-Kg) | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Porcupine (\$-Kg) | 2.00 | 2.00 | 20 | 1.30 | 4.00 |
| Raffia wine (\$-liter) | 0.30 | -- | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.60 |
| Palm oil (\$liter) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 2.00 |
| <i>Gnetum africanum</i> (\$-Unit) | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 1.00 |
| Local chicken (\$-unit) | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 8.00 |
| Corn (\$-3 ears of corn) | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.10 | 0.60 |


857
858

Table A5. Potential explanation of associations between assessed livelihoods.

| | Possible associations among variables | Direction of significant association | Explanation |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Market access and bushmeat income | - | It is harder to sell bushmeat to distant markets. As market accessibility declines (i.e. travel times increase), bushmeat becomes more difficult to transport and sell, or transport costs exceed the price in the market |
| 2 | Market access and community wealth | + | Communities with access to markets are wealthier. People successfully use markets to increase their household wealth |
| 3 | Distance to park and expenditure, income, wealth | - | The further from the park people are, the poorer they are, because there are fewer forest products (and village group 4 is both far from the park and far from markets) |
| 4 | Distance to the park and bushmeat sales | - | Local people far away from the park have less wildlife resources to hunt and sell |
| 5 | HH expenditure and bushmeat purchases | + | Wealthier people choose to spend money on bushmeat, and-or poor people have no money to spend on bushmeat. Richer households buy more bushmeat |
| 6 | Household expenditure and bushmeat sales | + | The more wealthy people are, the less they depend on selling bushmeat, or people who depend mainly on selling bushmeat remain poor |
| 7 | HH expenditure and HH income-community wealth | + | Richer households spend more money |
| 8 | Cocoa sales and household income, wealth | + | Cocoa production is a key component of household income in some villages (group 3) in the region and allows people to purchase more goods |
| 9 | Bushmeat sales and wealth index | - | This is opposite to 5 and 6 because results show a very low negative correlation between wealth index and income from bushmeat sales. This means richer people sell less bushmeat. |

863 Figure A1. Main food sources

864




865

866

867

868 Figure A2. Income sources
869



870
871