

## **BUSHMEAT, FORESTRY AND LIVELIHOODS: EXPLORING THE COVERAGE IN PRSPS**

**Chris Dickson and Neil Bird**  
*Overseas Development Institute, London*

<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Acronyms used in this report.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 Background on the PRSP process and its relevance to forests and bushmeat.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 Coverage of Forestry and Bushmeat in PRSPs - methodology.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Selection of countries .....	6
2.2 Search methodology .....	6
2.3 Results.....	7
<b>3 Type of coverage: where does bushmeat appear and how is it treated?.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Quantitative overview .....	11
3.2 Preservation or exploitation? .....	11
3.3 Comparison with forestry content: asset or constraint? .....	13
3.4 Process over outcome .....	14
3.5 Effect of legality on wildlife hunting and policy .....	15
3.6 Effect of language group affinity .....	16
3.7 The implications of value accumulation along the bushmeat supply chain...	17
<b>4 Potentially relevant aspects <i>not</i> covered in PRSPs.....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1 Management and measurement.....	19
4.2 Conflicts .....	19
4.3 Undeveloped linkages .....	21
<b>5. Possible causes of low coverage.....</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1 Low visibility .....	22
5.2 Low impact.....	23
5.3 Low measurability .....	23
5.4 A controversial issue.....	23
5.5 Bushmeat as a forestry anomaly.....	24
5.6 Institutional weaknesses.....	24
<b>6. A closer look at the Participatory Process.....</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1. Participatory Poverty Assessments .....	25
6.2. Method for this part of the research.....	25
6.3. Results - forestry and bushmeat in the PPAs.....	26
6.4. Disconnect between PPA and PRSP .....	27
<b>7 Conclusions .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>8 References.....</b>	<b>30</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

This project was made possible through support from the Forestry Research Programme of the Department for International Development, the Zoological Society of London, and the MacArthur Foundation.

Other areas of forestry and their treatment in PRSPs are further dealt with in a paper submitted to DFID's Forestry Research Programme, entitled *Forestry, bushmeat and livelihoods: exploring the coverage in PRSPs*, by the same authors.

This publication is an output from a research project partly funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID. ZF0201 Forestry Research Programme.

### **Acronyms used in this report**

<b>CAS</b>	Country Assistance Strategy (of the World Bank)
<b>EFI</b>	European Forestry Institute
<b>HIPC</b>	Heavily-Indebted Poor Country
<b>IMF</b>	International Monetary Fund
<b>I-PRSP</b>	Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
<b>JSA</b>	Joint Staff Assessment (of the World Bank and the IMF)
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>MTEF</b>	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
<b>NEEDS</b>	National Economic Empowerment & Development Strategy (of Nigeria)
<b>NEPAD</b>	The New Partnership for Africa's Development
<b>nfp</b>	National Forestry Programme
<b>NTFP</b>	Non-Timber Forest Product
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>ODI</b>	Overseas Development Institute
<b>PPA</b>	Participatory Poverty Assessment
<b>PRGF</b>	Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility
<b>PRS</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy
<b>PRSP</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
<b>PSIA</b>	Poverty and Social Impact Assessment
<b>SME</b>	Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises
<b>SWAp</b>	Sector-Wide Approach
<b>ZSL</b>	Zoological Society of London

## **Summary**

The treatment of forestry and bushmeat issues within the **Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers** of 16 countries was reviewed. The countries selected are known range states where consumption of bushmeat is significant. Countries from West and Central Africa, the neotropics and South-East Asia were included.

The **method used** was to carry out word searches based on keywords associated with forestry and bushmeat and then to categorise the extracted phrases according to the context in which they appeared.

This yielded the following **results**:

- i) Both forestry and bushmeat were marginal issues within most of the PRSPs reviewed, although forestry coverage was more extensive.
- ii) It is noteworthy that the trends in coverage are similar for both bushmeat and forestry issues:
  - a. PRSPs described policy responses more frequently than they discussed or assessed the extent of the underlying problems.
  - b. Very few of the Papers examined the links between poverty and the use of forest resources (including bushmeat) in any detail.
  - c. There was little exploration of the links between poverty reduction processes and national sectoral processes, e.g. national forest programmes
- iii) Responses concerning bushmeat tended to be more process- rather than outcome-orientated, relative to forestry responses. While bushmeat policy recommendations are usually limited to increasing participation or supporting community management initiatives, forestry policy recommendations often include more concrete targets such as revenue goals, institutional reforms, or areas of forest to protect.
- iv) Timber products are frequently considered a productive resource with the potential to support poverty reduction. In contrast, the consumptive use of bushmeat is seldom discussed as a productive resource in PRSPs.

Possible **causes** of low coverage include:

- The low visibility of those who rely on bushmeat and forest goods and services for their livelihoods
- The fact that the poor themselves do not list natural resources as a main concern during participatory poverty assessments. (This may be due to their reticence to talk about illegal activities, or other discursive obstacles inherent in the consultation methodologies.)
- The low impact of these activities on national-level poverty levels; and, the inherent difficulty in measuring sustainable off-take levels
- The fact that the utilisation of wild resources has rarely figured in national statistics even before PRSPs, despite longstanding calls to this effect<sup>1</sup>
- In addition, the utilization of bushmeat (and to a lesser degree natural forests) continues to be seen by some as not being a legitimate productive activity. This may account for the general unwillingness to highlight the commodity in documents that aim to leverage donor support.

An important **consequence** of the low coverage of these issues is that they will not appear high on the national political agenda, which is much influenced by the poverty reduction debate at present. As a result of this, there is reduced scope to secure public funds and the much needed cross-sectoral coordination across government that the management of natural resources desperately need.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eg. Asibey, 1977

## **1 Background on the PRSP process and its relevance to forests and bushmeat**

Since 1999, Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS), as documented in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), have become the national development framework in many countries. This World Bank and IMF initiative has now been endorsed by other multi-lateral and bilateral donors, and forms the framework for much international development assistance. PRSPs are intended to be country-owned documents, implying the leadership of national governments and the involvement of civil society, the private sector and other national stakeholders. They are designed to improve the comprehensiveness of poverty reduction measures over past efforts, in an effort to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

Over fifty developing countries have prepared PRSPs. Originally set as a requirement for debt relief under the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative, many non-HIPC countries have also invested in preparing these plans. Additionally, access to PRGF<sup>2</sup> resources is now conditional on a nationally-owned PRSP. Key policy measures and structural reforms aimed at poverty reduction and growth are identified and prioritised during the PRSP process, and if feasible, their budgetary costs are assessed. Countries' budgets under PRGF-supported programmes then reflect this analysis.

The PRSP is thus a formal representation of a nation's development policies, and helps determine the attitude of the international community towards national efforts. Although not in itself a guarantee of funding, inclusion in the PRSP is a necessary platform to gain political prominence. Whether an issue is included in these documents consequently has a bearing on the likelihood of implementation and success of any given initiative. The treatment of bushmeat within PRSPs is therefore important.

Degradation of natural resources is now recognised in almost all PRSPs. Within the broad coverage of environmental issues, sustainable management of forests has been the subject of considerable analysis over the last decade. By adapting the volume and method of off-take of timber and other non-timber forest resources, it is hoped that the interests of poverty reduction and resource conservation can be reconciled. These efforts have benefited from progress in environmental economics, including methods for the valuation of non-market goods, and the increasing recognition of social and environmental benefits relative to economic ones.

The issue of bushmeat shows discrete socio-economic and ecological characteristics, and merits attention separately from more general forestry issues. In particular, the mobility of the resource and its fugitive nature (in the sense of not being owned until the point of capture and death) leads to difficulties in measurement and regulation of the 'stock'. Equally, the informal nature of much of the trade and the relatively short supply chain make it difficult to assess or formalise trading activities. Yet such an analysis is important, as much of this economic activity is believed to be carried out by members of poorer communities. Within these groups, the financial benefits often constitute a large proportion of household income, as well as being an important source of protein. Under these conditions, bushmeat resources are an indispensable safety-net for those most vulnerable to environmental or seasonal fluctuations in resource availability<sup>3</sup>. There is therefore a clear link between bushmeat activities and poverty.

This paper explores the presentation of bushmeat issues within PRSPs, including relevant references to biodiversity conservation or more general forest policies, in an effort to see what prominence these issues are currently given.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility of the IMF

<sup>3</sup> de Merode et al., 2003

## **2 Coverage of Forestry and Bushmeat in PRSPs - methodology**

### **2.1 Selection of countries**

The countries chosen for this study are known range states where bushmeat is a significant economic activity. Although frequently seen as essentially a West and Central African phenomenon, similar activities are common throughout the world, albeit often under different names<sup>4</sup>. In an effort to understand the wider picture of how bushmeat issues have been treated in PRSPs, this report has included a number of Central and South American and South-East Asian countries, in addition to the West and Central African states. In all these countries the forest sector is a significant part of the economy. The sample therefore allows for a comparison in the treatment between bushmeat and other forest resources that may contribute to improved livelihoods of the poor.

The following 16 countries were reviewed:

#### **Africa (11):**

Benin; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Cote D'Ivoire; Democratic Republic of Congo; Ghana; Nigeria; Sierra Leone; Zambia; Tanzania; and Uganda

#### **Central & South America (3):**

Bolivia; Honduras; Nicaragua

#### **SE Asia (2):**

Indonesia; Vietnam

### **2.2 Search methodology**

#### **2.2.1 Bushmeat and forestry coverage**

The method used in this assessment was adapted from two similar studies that have examined the inclusion of environmental issues<sup>5</sup> and forest issues in PRSPs<sup>6</sup>. For eleven countries within the sample, both the interim and final PRSP were reviewed. For the remaining five countries the final PRSP document has yet to be published, in which case the country analysis depended on a review of the interim PRSP. Automatic word searches were carried out on each PRSP (or I-PRSP) for a number of bushmeat- and forestry-related terms.

The terms used were as follows:

##### **Forestry:**

- Forestry
- Forest Resources
- Forest Management
- Tree Products
- Non-timber forest products
- Management of renewable natural resources

##### **Bushmeat:**

- Bushmeat / wild meat / game meat
- Wildlife trade
- Wildlife products
- Hunting/trapping/trophy hunting
- (Community) wildlife / fauna management

---

<sup>4</sup> For the purposes of this report, the term 'bushmeat' is used to refer to any meat killed for sale or consumption that was not raised domestically.

<sup>5</sup> Bojö and Reddy, 2002

<sup>6</sup> Oksanen and Mersmann, 2003

Instances of these phrases in each of the documents were extracted and compiled in two tables, 'forestry' and 'bushmeat'. Each mention was then evaluated according to the following criteria in order to assess the degree to which the issues described had been incorporated in the PRS process:

- i) "Issue assessed": forest or bushmeat issues are mentioned in the poverty assessment/analysis
- ii) "Linked to poverty": causal linkages between forest or bushmeat-related issues and poverty related issues are discussed in the documents
- iii) "Responses discussed": forest or bushmeat-related responses and actions are defined in the documents
- iv) "Processes discussed": process links between the PRSP process and forest or bushmeat-related policy and planning processes are described in the documents

Within each of these categories, the treatment of the issue was given a score out of three, where:

- 0 = not mentioned
- 1 = mentioned but not elaborated
- 2 = elaborated
- 3 = best practice

This yielded the results shown in Table 1 below.

## 2.2.2 Asset or constraint – comparison of bushmeat and forestry contexts

The selected quotations were further examined to determine the context in which bushmeat or forestry resources were mentioned. In particular, whether the presence of these resources is considered a 'constraint' to be overcome and worked around, or an 'asset' to be used and on which to build<sup>7</sup>. Relevant points and phrases were extracted and compiled into another two tables – one for bushmeat and one for forestry resources. These extended tables were then condensed into a quantitative summary, yielding the results shown in Tables 2 and 3 below.

Only PRSPs, I-PRSPs or equivalent documents were researched. PSIAs are so focussed on individual project areas that their coverage of bushmeat issues cannot legitimately be compared to that of forestry issues. Additionally, none of the PSIAs for the countries considered actually addressed the themes of forestry or bushmeat within the PRS. The Joint Staff Assessments (JSAs) were slightly more vocal on the subject, and this is discussed in the section on the participatory process below.

## 2.3 Results

### 2.3.1 Bushmeat and forestry coverage

See table overleaf.

---

<sup>7</sup> NB these two attitudes were not found to be mutually exclusive

**Table 1 – Scoring of bushmeat and forestry issues according to the Bojö and Reddy method. Scores in italics indicate those allocated by Oksanen and Mersmann (2003).**

		Forestry				Bushmeat			
		Issues assessed	Linked to poverty	Responses mentioned	Processes discussed	Issues assessed	Linked to poverty	Responses mentioned	Processes discussed
Country	Document	0=not mentioned; 1=mentioned but not elaborated; 2=elaborated; 3=best practice							
Benin	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2003	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0
Cameroon	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2003	2	1	2	2	0	0	1	1
Central African Republic	I-PRSP 2000	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	0
Cote D'Ivoire	I-PRSP 2002	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
D. R. of Congo	I-PRSP 2002	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
Ghana	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2003	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	0
Nigeria	CAS 2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NEEDS 2004	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sierra Leone	I-PRSP 2001	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Zambia	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2002	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1
Tanzania	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	draft PRSP 2004	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uganda	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP APR 2003	2	2	1	0	1	0	1	0
Bolivia	I-PRSP 2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2001	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0
Indonesia	I-PRSP 2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnam	I-PRSP 2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2003	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Honduras	I-PRSP 2000	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2001	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0
Nicaragua	I-PRSP 2000	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	PRSP 2001	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>

*PRSP = Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*

*I-PRSP = Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*

*CAS = Country Assistance Strategy (precursory document to the PRSP, essentially similar)*

*NEEDS = National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (effectively the Nigerian PRSP)*

*NB although JSAs (Joint Staff Assessments) and PSIAs (Poverty and Social Impact Assessments) were read for a selection of these countries, these documents offered no coverage of bushmeat-specific issues*



## 2.3.2 Asset or constraint – comparison of bushmeat and forestry contexts

**Table 2 – Assessment of the treatment of bushmeat as asset or constraint in PRSPs**

						Bushmeat resources considered...						
		Constraint	Process or outcome?	Asset	Process or outcome?	...independently	...together with other forestry resources	...as part of rural development	...as part of agriculture and/or fisheries	...as part of manufacturing and export resources	...for tourism potential	Clash of agricultural and forestry interests
Benin	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2003	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Cameroon	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2003	Yes	Both	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Central African Republic	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	Yes	Process	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Cote D'Ivoire	I-PRSP 2002	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Democratic Republic of Congo	I-PRSP 2002	Yes	Neither	Yes	Neither	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Ghana	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	Yes	Process	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	PRSP 2003	Yes	Process	Yes	Process	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Nigeria	CAS 2002	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	NEEDS 2004	No	-	Yes	Neither	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Sierra Leone	I-PRSP 2001	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Zambia	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2002	No	-	Yes	Both	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Tanzania	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Draft PRSP 2004	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Uganda	PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP APR 2003	No	-	Yes	Both	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Bolivia	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2001	Yes	Both	Yes	Both	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Indonesia	I-PRSP 2003	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Vietnam	I-PRSP 2001	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2003	Yes	Both	No	-	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Honduras	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2001	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Nicaragua	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	PRSP 2001	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

**Table 3 – Assessment of the treatment of forestry resources as asset or constraint in PRSPs**

						Forest resources considered...							
		Constraint	Process or outcome?	Asset	Process or outcome?	...independently	... together with bushmeat	...as part of rural development	...as part of agriculture and/or fisheries	... as part of manufacturing and export resources	... for tourism potential	Clash of agricultural and forestry interests	
Benin	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	PRSP 2003	No	-	Yes	Both	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Cameroon	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	Yes	Both	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	
	PRSP 2003	Yes	Both	Yes	Both	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Central African Republic	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	Yes	Outcome	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Cote D'Ivoire	I-PRSP 2002	Yes	Process	Yes	Both	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Democratic Republic of Congo	I-PRSP 2002	Yes	Neither	Yes	Neither	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Ghana	I-PRSP 2000	Yes	Outcome	Yes	Both	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
	PRSP 2003	Yes	Process	Yes	Both	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Nigeria	CAS 2002	No	-	Yes	Process	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
	NEEDS 2004	Yes	Neither	Yes	Neither	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Sierra Leone	I-PRSP 2001	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Zambia	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	PRSP 2002	Yes	Outcome	Yes	Process	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tanzania	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Draft PRSP 2004	No	-	Yes	Both	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Uganda	PRSP 2000	Yes	Process	Yes	Process	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	
	PRSP APR 2003	No	-	Yes	Process	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
Bolivia	I-PRSP 2000	No	-	No	-	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	PRSP 2001	Yes	Both	Yes	both	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Indonesia	I-PRSP 2003	No	-	Yes	Neither	No	No	No	No	Yes	no	No	
Vietnam	I-PRSP 2001	No	-	Yes	Both	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
	PRSP 2003	No	-	Yes	both	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Honduras	I-PRSP 2000	Yes	Process	Yes	both	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
	PRSP 2001	No	-	Yes	Both	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Nicaragua	I-PRSP 2000	Yes	Both	Yes	Process	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	PRSP 2001	Yes	Both	Yes	Process	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

### 3 Type of coverage: where does bushmeat appear and how is it treated?

#### 3.1 Quantitative overview

Forestry issues are mentioned in 21 out of the 28 documents reviewed, and in all of the full PRSPs (Table 1). In contrast, bushmeat is only mentioned in seven of the documents, and never scores at a level higher than 'Level One' (*'mentioned but not elaborated'*). Although some of the documents (e.g. Bolivia, Zambia, Uganda) mention policies and initiatives to maximise sustainable exploitation of wildlife (ecotourism, ranching, restricted hunting for export), they do not show how these initiatives might relate to current bushmeat off-take.

This reflects a more general pattern in the coverage of forestry and bushmeat. There are many suggested policy responses, but fewer references to assessment or analyses of the problems. For example, the Zambian PRSP (2002) lists deforestation as the fifth of five problems imposing the greatest social costs upon the Zambian people, but does not explain what the consequences are and how these impact on welfare or poverty. However, the suggested response includes extensive details of how to substitute charcoal fuel use and stimulate ecotourism.

In addition, both policy initiatives and contextual assessments appear far more often than the two other aspects covered, namely the causal links with poverty and with sector policy and planning processes.

It is difficult to compare I-PRSPs with each other or any other document, as they vary hugely, ranging from a short summary of development priorities, possibly to comply with HIPC requirements (Tanzania, DRC), to a full 200+ page draft of the final PRSP (Honduras, Vietnam). However, the results obtained from the full PRSPs are considered to be sufficiently robust to provide an indication of the nature of present bushmeat coverage.

***It is noteworthy that the relative trends described above (i.e. with most attention paid to policy responses) are similar for bushmeat and forestry issues, although bushmeat receives consistently less treatment than forestry. Given this similarity, the discussion on bushmeat and livelihoods may be able to gain from the more extensive debate on the relationship between forests and poverty reduction.***

In particular, there has been a considerable amount of work analysing the contribution of forest extraction to GDP, best practice for sustainable forest management (including indicators), and the impact of non-monetary benefits on poverty reduction. Some of the methodology established in the course of this research may apply to the evaluation of the bushmeat trade. This evaluation could in turn make it easier for the PRSPs to include a more quantitative assessment of the trade, and develop more concrete policy recommendations and indicators.

#### 3.2 Preservation or exploitation?<sup>8</sup>

##### 3.2.1 Preservationism

Many of the PRSPs advocate a combination of conservation and exploitation, with a few at either end of that spectrum.

Several countries plan some kind of reserves (Vietnam, Zambia) to **conserve** forest and wildlife resources. Cameroon's PRSP is unusually **preservationist**, as it presents the bushmeat trade as an outright threat to wildlife conservation.

---

<sup>8</sup> The following section is based on the method described in 2.2.2. Tables 2 and 3 provide a quantitative overview of these findings.

*“213. The demand for nontraditional stock farming products remains very high in domestic and regional markets. Game ranching would decrease the capture of wild animals, contributing to the conservation of ecosystems” (Cameroon PRSP 2003) (Also see p. 34, *ibid*, for a catalogue of protected forest areas)*

This point is not, however, elaborated further, and it is worth noting that Cameroon’s Forestry Reform Program explicitly supports forest-based income generation for poor forest-dwelling people later in the document (see point 36 quoted below).

### 3.2.2 The middle ground

Quite a few countries (Bolivia, Benin, Cameroon, Ghana and Vietnam) hold a **middle ground**, recognising the importance for local/ethnic/rural economic development of somehow stabilising bushmeat practices within sustainable off-take levels. However, the policy recommendations seldom address the bushmeat issue explicitly and independently, often grouping all forestry resources together or grouping them with agricultural interests:

*“512. The appropriate utilization of the potential of biodiversity will also have significant positive effects on disadvantaged and vulnerable segments of the rural population (native peoples and peasant communities). In the short term, incomes of the communities of the east and high plateau will be increased through projects of sustainable use of wild animal species such as vicuna, lizard and peccary, whose economic value has already been recognized.” (Bolivia PRSP 2001)*

*“88. Forestry. Forestry resources [...] provide an important source of food and income.” (Benin PRSP 2003)*

*“36. The forestry reform program is to enhance forest-based income opportunities for village communities, and thus improve the livelihood of the rural population living in the forest zones” (Cameroon PRSP 2003)*

*“7.2. Pay attention to biodiversity in poor regions, sandy, arid, and marsh areas, ensuring the availability of renewable resources for production by people, especially by the poor. [...]” (Vietnam PRSP 2003)*

*“65. 1994 Forest and Wildlife Policy and the Forestry Development Master Plan (1996-2020) includes [...] (iii) stimulate community involvement in the management of the resources and enhance the economic well-being of rural residents.” (Ghana I-PRSP 2000)*

### 3.2.3 Utilitarianism

A small number take a more **utilitarian** view, where the aim is to exploit the economic potential of their wildlife for the whole country. This approach is focused more on the longer-term benefits of wildlife conservation, including ecotourism initiatives, the export of all non-timber forest products and the growth of agro-forestry and sustainable (often community-based) forestry management. However, there is little focussed attention on specific mechanisms to incorporate wildlife into future local livelihoods.

*“511. [...] Preliminary studies indicate that within a period of approximately 15 years the contribution of biodiversity could represent an increase of about 10 percent in GDP, if activities are developed in ethnic and ecotourism, mitigation of climate change and biodiversity services relating to biotechnology, ecological products, and others.” (Bolivia PRSP 2001)*

*“3.1.3.2 In the areas of subsistence agriculture, livestock, water, and hunting and fishing, the policy directions will be based on the agriculture master plan (1999-2006) and will focus on the establishment of an efficient institutional and economic environment, as well as regional or sector support programs to ensure coverage of national needs and food self-sufficiency.” (CAR I-PRSP 2003)*

Frequently, PRSPs express potentially conflicting positions on livelihood concerns and preservationist priorities (e.g. Cameroon), sometimes even within one paragraph (e.g. Vietnam). It is further worth noting that the exploitation of wildlife for national economic growth does not seem to consider consumptive use, despite estimates of the traded volume

as high as US\$200M across the range states (Table 4)<sup>9</sup>. Some evaluations calculate the production of bushmeat in the five central African states (Cameroon, Gabon, the Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic, and Rwanda) to exceed five million tonnes per annum, which would imply a value of upwards of USD\$10 billion.<sup>10</sup>

**Table 4 – Estimated bushmeat trade for selected countries<sup>11</sup>**

COUNTRY	Value of bushmeat trade (annual)	Year
Central African Republic	\$23 million	1999
Cote d'Ivoire	\$105 million	1996
Ghana	\$205 million	1996/7

### 3.3 Comparison with forestry content: asset or constraint?

Tables 2 and 3 clearly show that forestry receives considerably more attention across the PRSP process than bushmeat. Furthermore, in the case of forestry attention is focussed on its positive value as an asset, whereas the position of bushmeat is ambiguous. Twenty two documents consider forestry resources a productive resource, whilst in only six documents can bushmeat-related activity be seen in this way. On the other hand, 12 documents cite forestry concerns as a constraint, as against five who hold the same view on bushmeat.

It is worth noting that the underlying situation and requirements are very different in each of the countries, and the options differ accordingly in the various regions. West Africa is on the whole characterised by high human population, long-standing agricultural activities and associated bushmeat trade. The Congo basin is still a forest frontier, with a sparser human population and a high density of wild game. This game includes many rare and forest dependent species. The woodland habitat is different again, with an abundance of terrestrial mammals. Differences in the treatment of bushmeat/wildlife in PRSPs partially reflect these obstacles and opportunities in determining sensible and specific steps forward on the bushmeat issue.

**Forestry as asset:** "33. ...And despite a rapid pace of exploitation in the recent past, Cameroon's forests still cover more than 22 million hectares, making it the second largest producer of forestry products in Africa behind the DRC and the first exporter of wood products from Africa." (Cameroon PRSP 2003)

**Bushmeat as asset:** 224. "Environmental management is a policy [...] to develop mechanisms and instruments for appropriate management of biodiversity, and to promote the sustainable and equitable use of forest resources." (Bolivia PRSP 2001)

**Forestry as constraint:** "For protection and conservation of forest resources, US\$68.9 million is being invested [by the National Forestry Programme], with particular emphasis in the departments of El Paraíso, Olancho, Copán, Santa Bárbara, and Islas de la Bahía." (Honduras I-PRSP 2000)

**Bushmeat as constraint:** "7.2 Implement projects on environmental recovery and protection, protect watershed forests, build national parks and protected forest areas, construct national gardens, plant trees, preserve and protect bio-diversity. Develop and improve the quality of animal-botanic garden research centers and national parks in order to maintain and preserve precious and rare genetic sources." (Vietnam PRSP 2003)

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/bushmeat\\_crisis\\_livelihoods.htm](http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/bushmeat_crisis_livelihoods.htm)

<sup>10</sup> Wilkie and Carpenter 1998

<sup>11</sup> From Davies 2002

### 3.4 Process over outcome

We have already noted that policy recommendations for forestry, whilst not extensive, are nonetheless more frequent than suggested initiatives concerning bushmeat. However, both policies relating to forestry and bushmeat resources tend to focus on inputs and process rather than outcome objectives. These include research and evaluation, the establishment of consultative committees, or the adoption of certain principles. If we compare these areas with, for example, agriculture, we can see that agriculture benefits from the most outcome-driven policies. Examples are provided in Table 5 for illustration.

**Table 5 – Comparison of process versus outcome recommendations**

Country/document	Rural development & agriculture	Forestry	Bushmeat
	<div> <div>OUTCOME EMPHASIS</div> <div>←</div> <div>→</div> <div>PROCESS EMPHASIS</div> </div>		
Zambia PRSP 2002	<p><i>Output 4: [agricultural] Technology Development and Dissemination Improved</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a Technology Development and Transfer Fund.</li> <li>• Improve livestock disease monitoring and eradication.</li> <li>• Improve the enactment and enforcement of legislation and regulations.</li> <li>• Improve technical skills for farmers, farmer groups, extension staff, and NGOs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Fruit/forest tree establishment/agro-forestry</b></p> <p>Conduct PRA WNB</p> <p>Train the local people in basic fruit/forest tree techniques \$30,000</p> <p>Procure nursery inputs \$20,000</p> <p>Establish community fruit/forest tree nurseries \$5,000</p> <p>Establish fruit/forest tree orchards/woodlots \$2,000</p>	<p><b>Environment and Natural Resource Management</b></p> <p>Sensitise the private sector, NGOs, and local communities on the benefits of environment and natural resources \$25,000</p> <p>Provide incentives to stakeholders \$WNB</p>
Cameroon PRSP 2003	<p>“The policy includes rural infrastructure development activities (building village-level warehouses, markets, rural and feeder roads, access to safe drinking water and electricity, etc.) and community development.”</p> <p>“200. <i>Rural sector financing</i> includes two subcomponents. The first (the National Microfinance Program) aims at improving the rural population's access to microfinance institutions and at strengthening the capacity of these institutions. The second plans to implement mechanisms relating to medium and long-term financing for farmers and agriculture-based business investments.”</p>	<p>“220. The 1994 Forest Law and subsequent forest sector reforms have improved the welfare of the forest population, which now receives part of the annual forestry tax (RFA). This group also benefits from the social welfare activities undertaken by the logging companies (in the case of large multiyear logging concessions). The goal of these reforms is to have forestry become: (i) a key sector in poverty reduction; and (ii) a major area for Cameroon's industrialization and exports. “</p>	<p>213. Non-traditional stock farming. "The demand for non-traditional stock farming products remains very high in domestic and regional markets. Game ranching would decrease the capture of wild animals, contributing to the conservation of ecosystems. Activities will include improving domestication techniques for a better and more sustainable management of species"</p>
Tanzania PRS II (draft) 2004	<p>Agriculture – “Increase food crops production from 9 Millions in 2003/04 tons to 10 Millions in 2010. (MAFS)”</p> <p>Rural development – “Construct more water charcos; improve access and quality of veterinary services; and promote diary and leather industries (SMEs).”</p>	<p>Promote schemes to add value to primary agricultural, fishing, forest products, wildlife, and livestock products</p>	-

Without some outcome indicators the impact on the poor at a national-level of aggregation is often difficult to see. Some likely reasons for this relative lack of such indicators include the international political sensitivity of natural resources, the informal nature of these resources,

and the perceived limited potential for economic growth based on these resources<sup>12</sup>. This may put forestry, and in particular bushmeat, at a comparative disadvantage in PRSPs compared to those sectors where outcome indicators can be easily measured and hence their impact on poverty reduction clearly demonstrated. Those allocating funds, such as donors or government officials, may prioritise the latter, partly to meet their own standards of accountability and transparency.

### 3.5 Effect of legality on wildlife hunting and policy

#### 3.5.1 Bushmeat legality in the PRSPs

The PRSPs do not contain much discussion of the legality of the bushmeat trade. However, it is widely acknowledged that such regulations as do exist are often a legacy of colonial jurisdictions, which were not designed to stimulate entrepreneurial, sustainable, decentralised economic activity of any kind. Furthermore, even in those cases where there are regulations in place which might promote sustainable off-take levels and harness the bushmeat trade for local poverty reduction, enforcement capacities are weak.

#### 3.5.2 Correlation of legality, PRSP significance, and off-take levels

It is difficult to form an overview of the legality of bushmeat hunting and trading in the different countries. To be done properly, this would need to acknowledge the restrictions on different species (protected, endangered), on same species in different circumstances (close-season, size restrictions), different types of hunting (safari hunting, pest control, subsistence hunting), and different categories of protected area (logging concessions, national parks, game reserves). All of these overlap in each territory, subject of course to the enforcement abilities in each instance. It would not do this complex theme justice to attempt to cover it in the context of the current research. However it is interesting to look briefly at two examples, in order to observe any correlation between the legality of bushmeat hunting, the volume of trade, and the prominence of the topic in the PRSPs.

**Table 6 – Comparison of bushmeat issues in the PRSPs of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire**

Country	Regulations	Bushmeat prominence in PRSPs	Bushmeat trade <sup>13</sup>	Country population	Country surface area
Ghana	Allowed, but some restrictions according to certain species and seasons	PRSP 2003: The problem of consumptive wildlife use is not explicitly mentioned. However, there is a relevant response suggested: Point 6.2.4 explicitly recommends, as part of a 10-year programme, "Improved management of wildlife while increasing their contribution to local livelihoods and economic development." Regarding forestry more widely, there is some mention of the problems, and the links to poverty are cursorily discussed. General forestry responses are described in detail, as well as the processes necessary to implement these.	\$205 million	20.5 million	239,460 sq km
Côte d'Ivoire	Hunting for meat illegal	I-PRSP 2002: The issue of bushmeat receives no mention. Forestry resources are extensively discussed (as are related responses), but there is no link made to poverty reduction. NB only an I-PRSP.	\$105 million	17 million	322,460 sq km

<sup>12</sup> See also IDA and IMF 2002 for discussion of the overall evolution of PRSPs from process- to outcome-oriented policies

<sup>13</sup> From Davies, referring to 1996/7 data

In Ghana, where bushmeat hunting is allowed, this activity is acknowledged within the PRSP, whereas there is no mention of it in the Côte d'Ivoire's PRSP, where such hunting is banned (Table 6). This is not surprising, as it would be very difficult for a country to make bushmeat hunting illegal on one hand, but also explicitly support its use for the purposes of poverty reduction. However, hunting of bushmeat species still occurs. The total figures involved estimate that the country with the stricter regulations - Côte d'Ivoire - produces half the amount of bushmeat than Ghana, which has at least some tolerance of game hunting.

This effect of stricter regulation is still apparent if we factor in the different populations and surface areas of the countries, as Côte d'Ivoire has only a slightly smaller population, and a larger surface area. This comparison should ideally incorporate factors such as forest cover, game density and other statistics. However, we should exercise caution in comparing the estimated scales of the bushmeat trade, as the recorded levels in Côte d'Ivoire probably does not include the considerable proportion of the trade that is driven underground by its illegal status. Another caveat is that the Ivoirien Poverty Reduction Strategy is here examined through its *Interim* PRSP, even if this is a relatively extensive one, running to over a hundred pages and, more importantly, incorporating feedback from grassroots consultations. These limitations notwithstanding, the information to hand is enough for us to conclude that the different levels of bushmeat trade are probably not due to endemic characteristics of the country, and more likely reflects the effectiveness of the hunting restrictions in Côte d'Ivoire.

From a conservation perspective, if stricter regulations lead to less wildlife hunting, it might imply that one should advocate a more comprehensive ban on the practice. However, this brief comparison also suggests that a ban on hunting makes it more difficult for bushmeat issues to be legitimately included in the PRS. This in turn deprives wildlife management programmes of the political capital and donor funding that inclusion in the PRSPs may facilitate<sup>14</sup>. The questions that remain are therefore:

- what are the conservation implications of “declassifying” game hunting, from a comprehensive ban to more of a “controlled use” status?
- what are the conservation benefits, if wildlife use consequently becomes more prominent within the PRSP framework?

### 3.6 Effect of language group affinity

The demand for bushmeat is heavily affected by culture, as indicated by the taboo surrounding the consumption of primates in some regions, or the status of bushmeat as a delicacy in many urban areas. To explore this aspect further we considered how different language groups consider game hunting. At the risk of oversimplification, the consideration of bushmeat (as “constraint or asset”) was assessed for English, French and Spanish speaking countries<sup>15</sup>, as per table 7.

**Table 7 – Language group against the perception of bushmeat as a constraint or asset**

Language	Number of countries considering bushmeat a conservation constraint	Number of countries considering bushmeat a poverty reduction asset	Total number of countries
French	2 (=40%)	2 (=40%)	5
English	2 (=29%)	4 (=57%)	7
Spanish	1 (=33%)	1 (=33%)	3

<sup>14</sup> Although the link between PRSP-inclusion, funding, and implementation, are not completely clear and warrant further analysis.

<sup>15</sup> Cameroon was double-counted, once for each of the French and English speaking groups.



English-speaking countries seem to be the most prepared to consider bushmeat an asset that may have a role to play in the alleviation of poverty, whereas the French-speaking countries appear most likely to feel that the problem of game-hunting requires conservationist measures.

The Spanish-speaking group is not very representative, as there is no significant mention of these issues in the Nicaragua or Honduras documents. Bolivia is probably an 'outlier', in that its assessment of wildlife use is unusually detailed. The discrepancy between Bolivia and the other countries, combined with the small size of the neotropical sample, makes it difficult to draw any conclusions linking Hispanic language and culture to bushmeat policy. However, it has been observed that colonial practices implanted a stronger farming tradition in Latin America than they did in Africa<sup>16</sup>. This may in turn have contributed to the rural poor in the former region being less dependent on bushmeat than they are in the latter

### **3.7 The implications of value accumulation along the bushmeat supply chain**

#### **3.7.1 Supply chains and value distribution**

The benefits from some forestry resources are widely distributed along complex production-to-consumption chains. Some of these receive attention in the PRSPs, for example the production of paper and other processed wood in Vietnam, or the revenue opportunities from eco-tourism in Zambia. The discussion on these topics includes the possible contribution to GDP and exports, the infrastructure requirements, and the benefits to local and poor communities through revenue sharing, concession allocation and decentralised management. This section explores the possibility of such an analysis of the bushmeat trade in the context of poverty reduction.

#### **3.7.2 Difficulties of measuring the bushmeat value chain**

The detailed dynamics of the bushmeat supply chain receive little attention, for several reasons. Firstly, there are many cultural factors that probably cause under-representation of the true volume of trade. Its taboo or illegal nature does not encourage those involved to divulge their activities. Equally, its informality means that much of the trade does not involve money and is therefore difficult to quantify in terms of the value chain. Secondly, the supply chain is shorter and more localised. Although one might think that this should make it easier to identify and assess, in fact this means that the data regarding revenue is hard to collect and difficult to extrapolate from one area to the next. If there were more exports and the trade were more formal, then tax revenues and other indicators would provide a better indication of the distribution of the benefits.

However, the short supply chain does mean that the benefits of improved resource management can be directed towards the poor without being diluted or diverted by many different agents. Although data gathering for this is onerous, and such programmes have to be tailored to each (sometimes quite small) community, it does provide a potential for effective intervention.

#### **3.7.3 Treatment of the bushmeat supply chain in PRSPs**

As a consequence of these difficulties, there is little mention of the potential of bushmeat for delivering benefits to targeted local areas, even where fauna are seen as an asset for poverty reduction. An exception is the Bolivian PRSP, which does emphasise the direct benefits of effective profitable wildlife resource management to the rural poor or indigenous groups<sup>17</sup>. This recognises the advantages of using a resource which is local, and which people are already familiar with.

---

<sup>16</sup> Rushton et al 2004

<sup>17</sup> See point 512. in that PRSP

Several other PRSPs mention the distribution of the value of natural resources, such as in the examples above (Vietnam and Zambia). However these do not deal explicitly with the consumptive use of wildlife, and do not explore supply chain details and the implications for interventions intending to reduce poverty.

### 3.7.4 Treatment of the bushmeat supply chain in other research

Although this does not receive any substantial treatment in the PRSPs, there is some relevant research on the topic outside this framework<sup>18</sup>. One study on the bushmeat market of Takoradi in Ghana<sup>19</sup> analysed the supply chain in that locality and made the following observations:

- rural hunters appear to make more profit per transaction than urban traders
- of the various parties, hunters have the lowest cost of entry, and the highest profitability (receiving 74% of the retail price of the meat)
- wholesalers and market traders incur moderate operating costs
- chopbars operators incur the highest running costs (staff, overheads etc)

This leads the authors to conclude that any intervention or management policy should target all these various actors:

*“In markets such as Takoradi, where no one actor group appears to exert overall control, the best entry point for management intervention is not straightforward:*

- *Chopbars make most retail sales (and are therefore the most important retailers);*
- *Wholesalers handle the largest per capita share of the trade (and are therefore the most cost-effective group to work with);*
- *Market traders are gathered together in a single public place (and are thus the easiest group to identify and monitor);*
- *Hunters, in contrast, do not enjoy any of these advantages. Yet management policy cannot afford to overlook them due to the strong incentives that they have to harvest bushmeat (arising from their substantial profits).*

*These observations indicate that a management policy that incorporates all actor groups may be the most effective way of managing the bushmeat trade. Such an approach also has the advantage that any repercussions of management interventions along the commodity chain will be detected more quickly, facilitating a more rapid response.”*

**Figure 1 – breakdown of bushmeat value chain (from Cowlshaw et al., 2004)**

Box Two: Actors in the Takoradi bushmeat commodity chain						
Actor group	Number of actors in chain	Fraction of sales made to public	Fraction of city bushmeat sales handled, by weight		Fraction of sales incurring significant transport costs	Fraction of sold weight smoked
			Per group	Per actor		
Farmer hunter	75	0.00	0.38	0.005	0.59	0.40
Commercial hunter	50	0.00	0.62	0.012	0.78	0.68
Wholesaler	14	0.00	0.58	0.041	0.49	1.00
Market trader	16	0.15	0.41	0.026	0.19	0.95
Chopbar operator	143	0.85	0.85	0.006	0.00	0.83

The “effective way of managing the bushmeat trade” described here, however, has a strongly conservationist agenda. This is no criticism – the research was carried out under the aegis of the Zoological Society of London / Institute of Zoology. Therefore, the interventions

<sup>18</sup> See the ZSL/IOZ’s research programme on bushmeat for different perspectives, <http://www.zoo.cam.ac.uk/ioz/projects/bushmeat.htm>

<sup>19</sup> Cowlshaw et al; 2004

considered aim to prevent harmful extraction of bushmeat without unduly exacerbating local poverty.

### 3.7.5 Relevance to Poverty Reduction Strategy

From a more poverty-centric perspective (such as that of the PRSPs), the potential for economic growth from this kind of initiative is limited. Equally, collecting the data to understand the bushmeat supply chain in one area or community is time-consuming and expensive, relative to gathering other data relevant to poverty reduction. And finally, once produced, the findings from one community would probably not provide “best practice” guidelines, reproducible at a national level. These factors together may legitimately prevent PRSPs from considering the supply chain of the bushmeat trade in any detail.

## 4 Potentially relevant aspects *not* covered in PRSPs

### 4.1 Management and measurement

There is almost no discussion of what might be ‘sustainable’ in the context of bushmeat production. The term, when applied, seems to be used in an abstract way to comply with the guidelines of the World Summit for Sustainable Development or the Millennium Development Goals.

In a narrow sense, ‘sustainable’ off-take can be defined as a rate of depletion that does not exceed the rate of regeneration (natural or assisted). Over the last ten years considerable investment has been made in the forestry / timber sector to define such levels, not only as researchers have been able to determine forests’ rate of regeneration, but also as progress has been made in quantifying environmental and social factors alongside economic ones, allowing a “triple bottom line” analysis of costs and benefits. This principle, of limiting off-take to the rate of regeneration, could perhaps be usefully applied to bushmeat activity. However, there are several problems associated with this. Firstly, the stock of mobile fauna is more difficult to identify, and is not delimited by national geographical boundaries. This makes it difficult both to determine populations and ‘replenishment’ rates, and enforce access and property rights. The validity of ‘substitutions’ is equally difficult – restocking wildlife is harder than reforestation. Substituting with ranched livestock is also problematic due to the unsuitability of species, or the socio-economic changes that this would impose on the affected communities<sup>20</sup>. This imprecision can lead to vague declarations on the subject, as is the case in Vietnam’s PRSP (2003):

*“7.2. Constantly improve the quality of the environment and use natural resources in an appropriate way. Pay attention to biodiversity in poor regions, sandy, arid, and marsh areas, ensuring the availability of renewable resources for production by people, especially by the poor”.*

### 4.2 Conflicts

There are very few concrete policies suggesting how to manage bushmeat resources<sup>21</sup>. Policies that are in place usually involve designating areas where hunting is restricted, presumably to allow for the affected species to live undisturbed. In other sections of the PRSPs however, there are concrete outcome-based recommendations (often relating to infrastructure or industrial development) which potentially clash with such abstract conservationist commitments.

---

<sup>20</sup> Loss of independent incomes by hunters, establishment of ranch-owning classes etc. See Bowen-Jones et al., 2002.

<sup>21</sup> This may in part be due to a lack of consensus between local beneficiaries and international donors regarding the trade-off between environmental and economic benefits

#### 4.2.1 Transport infrastructure

Many PRSPs see a combination of structural reform and economic growth as the twin driving forces of poverty reduction. However, road developments cut across swathes of forest and the improved access to remote areas is likely to stimulate bushmeat trade along with other economic activity. This conflict is not addressed in policy recommendations<sup>22</sup>.

#### 4.2.2. Eco-tourism

There may be potential for local communities to replace some of the 'utility income' they receive from hunting bushmeat by exploiting its existence value as a live resource. Eco-tourism initiatives are therefore suggested by the Zambian PRSP and others. However, no attention is paid to the impact that constructing the necessary infrastructure on the bushmeat species' habitats. Equally, little mention is made of the implications for the local population if they are expected to provide the services and thereby benefit from this activity.

##### **Ghana PRSP 2003**

*"6.2.4.1 [...] d) Private Sector in Rural Natural Resource Enterprises: The private sector can be encouraged to set up enterprises in rural areas in many ways. One of these is providing tax breaks for those that locate in rural communities and are natural resource-based. Eco-tourism, and other cottage industries are examples. The role of government as indicated above will be to promote and create adequate awareness on both potentials and protection requirements."*

#### 4.2.3. Growth of the logging industry

As has been shown, many countries consider their forests an economic asset. Even though rates of deforestation are above regeneration rates, there is at least a political awareness (and an economic evaluation) of the policies needed to achieve a sustainable income from this source. However, none of these calculations or policies takes into account the effects of this industry on potentially productive wildlife resources.

#### 4.2.4. Primacy of other environmental concerns

The fact that consumptive use of wildlife falls under environmental concerns may be to its detriment. Many of these countries face other environmental crises with much more immediate and apparent impact on the poorest people. Soil degradation in Zambia, irrigation problems due to deforestation in Ghana, and oil gas flaring in Nigeria all absorb large amounts of the political capital allocated to environmental issues, leaving little left over for consideration of bushmeat (see Table 8). Forestry manages best to reclaim some attention where it is seen also as a productive sector. This status, and the associated increased political interest, is not attributed to bushmeat by any of the PRSPs, despite the significant contribution made to GDP in countries such as Ghana or Nigeria.

**Table 8 – Main environmental risks in Nigeria by social group, with no mention of bushmeat<sup>23</sup>.**

Sources of Risks	Key Risk Group	Formal Response
NATURAL -Drought, Flood, erosion, rainstorms, and food loses due to pests.	Well-to-do, poor, rural male, rural female, rural male youth, rural female youth	Irrigation, Agric. extension services, aforestation/agro- forestry, Agricultural insurance.
ENVIRONMENTAL - Deforestation, desertification, oil spillage.	Poor, rural male, rural female, rural male youth and rural female youth	Environmental measures to stem pollution, tree-planting campaigns. Agro-forestry, incentives to convert to alternative energy, use, enforcement of standard oil field practices.

<sup>22</sup> Eg. Ghana PRSP 2003, point 4.1, plans to commit to three major new highways but makes no mention of the potential impact on natural resources.

<sup>23</sup> Nigeria NEEDS 2004, table 10.4, p. 108

### 4.3 Undeveloped linkages

Some of the policies explored in other contexts might facilitate the sustainable utilization of bushmeat resources. Potential benefits include protecting those resources from potential extinction, and increasing income security for those dependent on them. However, such linkages remain largely unexploited within the PRSPs reviewed in this study.

#### 4.3.1. Institutional reform

Many PRSPs suggest institutional reforms to improve land tenure conditions, or property rights for the poor. This might increase the sustainability of the bushmeat trade, as formalising the income might assist regulation against the use of poison or automatic weapons in hunting. Furthermore, secure tenure or usufruct rights might encourage hunters to moderate their offtake in the interests of ensuring future stock levels. Equally, legitimisation of this economic activity could help ensure that any reform of the bushmeat market (for example allowing limited export) would benefit the poorest, rather than traders. However, reforms are usually focussed on agricultural and sometimes forest exploitation, and seldom mention hunters' rights. The Bolivian PRSP is a noteworthy exception, providing an example of best practice that is on the whole lacking from these documents:

**Table 9 – Extract from Bolivian I-PRSP showing outcome indicators for wildlife management<sup>24</sup>**

Table 8.11  
Goals for Intermediate Indicators: Environment (1)

Intermediate Indicators	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Determinants of Goal Attainment
Completion of design of National Water Resources Plan, Master Plans for Basins and the National Flood Control Plan	n.a.	50%	100%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Proper administration of IDB project 929
% increase in level of resources allocated to local communities based on SERNAP collections in protected areas	30%	20%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	Proper administration of SERNAP
% increase in income levels due to sustainable wildlife management programs	50%	20%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	Wildlife management programs for commercialization of products, regularization of land tenure

Note. The pertinent annex provides a detailed description of the determinants of goal attainment.  
n.a: not applicable

#### 4.3.2. Formalisation and deregulation

Other countries such as Côte d'Ivoire see potential for harnessing economic potential by formalising small-scale (often informal) activities and encouraging the growth of entrepreneurship and SMEs<sup>25</sup>. The benefits of the bushmeat trade are ideal for this type of initiative, given the low cost of entry and small-scale operations. This could potentially both foster local economic growth and the sustainable management of bushmeat practices<sup>26</sup>.

#### 4.3.3. Logging – the flip side

The links between logging and wildlife extraction are well known. Logging provides an infrastructure that is readily exploited by bushmeat hunters, both for reaching the game and transporting it home or to market. Although this leads to problems in the case of illegal logging, some coordination of bushmeat policies with existing sustainable logging

<sup>24</sup> Bolivia I-PRSP 2001, table 8.11 p. 186

<sup>25</sup> Small and medium enterprises

<sup>26</sup> See Côte d'Ivoire I-PRSP 2002, section I.6.2.7, for resolutions to stimulate entrepreneurialism.

programmes could encourage loggers to adopt a more sustainable approach to the forest (to allow the “regeneration” of bushmeat resources), and might also motivate them to assist in monitoring illicit activity. There is already considerable political will to encourage / enforce a change in logging practices and mitigate the impact on wildlife, as demonstrated by Cameroon:

*“35. The government is also committed to accelerating the implementation of the forestry sector reform agenda, which would ensure sustainable exploitation and increase value added in the sub sector while preserving Cameroon’s national heritage. The forestry reform program is supported by the donors and aims to: (i) promote sustainable exploitation while preserving ecological stability, (ii) support the emergence of a high-value-added wood processing industry, and (iii) foster community participation in conserving and managing this national forestry heritage. Key measures include: (i) a competitive bidding system for awarding concessions; (ii) transparent planning of new concessions; (iii) implementation of a forestry tax revenue mobilization program (PSRF); and (iv) supervision of forestry development plans in close partnership with two international NGOs for more effective control of logging activities and enforcement of forestry sector regulations.” (Cameroon PRSP 2003)*

Although this does not explicitly address the management of wildlife extraction, it does lay the groundwork for future policies in this area. Further initiatives focussing more closely on bushmeat have been implemented in close cooperation with logging companies<sup>27</sup>. Encouraging a wider uptake of these sorts of programmes through the PRSPs could reconcile the interests of wildlife conservation with the commercial requirements of the logging industry.

#### 4.3.4. Participatory assessment

Many PRSPs make use of Participatory Poverty Assessments in determining the “grass-roots” causes and manifestations of poverty. This is a measure to address the possible disconnect between increased nominal income and levels of welfare. When consulted, the rural poor tend to cite irrigation, deforestation, soil degradation etc. as their major environmental concerns. Depletion of bushmeat stocks does not register as a concern through this method of data collection.

##### *Uganda PRSP 2003, box on p. 81*

*“People stressed that declining soil fertility, deforestation, pasture degradation and decreasing fish stocks are impacting directly on their livelihoods by constraining their ability to increase their income and making them more vulnerable. Women in particular were concerned about these changes. They found that they were now walking longer distances to more isolated places to collect resources such as wood, grass and wild fruits. This was increasing their work burden and exposing them to new risks.”*

At the national level of the PRSP therefore, participation does not seem to reveal a concern for sustainable wildlife management. It is possible that these are simply not voiced by affected communities, or else that they are ‘filtered out’ because they are not shared by all the poor across the nation. This is explored in more depth in the closer exploration of the participatory process below.

## 5. Possible causes of low coverage

### 5.1 Low visibility

Consumptive use of wildlife seems to be frequently viewed as only affecting populations within tightly defined geographical or socio-economic categories<sup>28</sup>. As these are often relatively ‘voiceless’ groups, their interests may be under-represented in the PRSPs. This underlines the fact that the contribution of wild meat to local livelihoods is rarely valued in

<sup>27</sup> See for example the work of WCS with the government and the Congolaise Industrielle des Bois in Rep. of Congo.

<sup>28</sup> See the Bolivia PRSP 2001, point 106

these documents, despite the growing evidence that it may contribute significantly to well-being of the poor.

## **5.2 Low impact**

Another problem is the size of the impact that bushmeat management may have on *national-level* poverty. Although the PRSPs are hefty tomes, they are nonetheless finite, and must exercise a degree of selection and focus. There may be legitimate reasons why some forestry resource management issues do not meet the criteria for inclusion as well as other themes.

It is widely recognised that bushmeat is an important source of income or an essential safety net for many of the world's poorest people. However, it is still hard to demonstrate the positive impact on those people of any given policy designed for the sustainable management of wildlife extraction for consumptive use. Furthermore, once those benefits have been quantified, they need to be evaluated in the context of national poverty reduction in order to be relevant to the PRSP. If the benefits of a bushmeat policy are difficult to predict or measure, or if they only accrue to a small proportion of the nation's poor, then that policy will receive correspondingly little attention in the PRSP.

Also, the returns (including non-monetary welfare) from investing in forests and natural resources are seen to be long-term and high-risk, compared to other more mainstream productive sector activities. 'Sustainable management' almost invariably entails lowering the extraction rate relative to existing 'free capture' levels, at least initially. In this sense any policy aimed at conservation of bushmeat or other forestry resources would restrict short-term economic opportunity and therefore meet with some stakeholder opposition.

## **5.3 Low measurability**

It is difficult to measure bushmeat populations, determine appropriate levels for offtake, restrict or even measure current trade levels, especially at a national level. The informality of the market means that many of the transactions are only partially conducted financially, and these are difficult to trace. Also, hunting is often done alone or in small loosely affiliated groups. The illegality of much of this activity adds another incentive for hunters not to divulge the extent of their off-take. Finally, although the trading may take place in urban areas, the hunting itself is mainly carried out in remote places, relatively inaccessible to bureaucracy (to collect data) and law enforcement (to implement restrictions) alike.

## **5.4 A controversial issue**

Over issues such as education or health care, there is usually at least a buildable consensus between the interests of donors, local policy-makers, and their constituents. However, this is much harder in the case of bushmeat and forestry resources. The existence value of certain bushmeat species or forest habitats can mean little to those who depend on those resources for income or food. Conversely, international conservationists can have an incomplete understanding of the local dynamics of forest use, which can lead to inappropriate measures being proposed to achieve the conservation of these resources.

Although PRSPs are intended to be country-owned documents and not subject to such considerations, they are not immune from donor priorities and sensitivities<sup>29</sup>. Within the culture of the international donor community, there are two very different rationales which both resist the inclusion of forestry and bushmeat resource management in PRSPs. Firstly, the conservationist perspective stigmatises the utilitarianism exploitation of wildlife, and

---

<sup>29</sup> Wilks and Lefrançois, 2002

certain natural habitats (e.g. tropical rain forests). In addition to this there is a potentially counterproductive difference in priorities within the international donor community. As the PRS process gains momentum among donor organisations, particular interest groups are anxious to ensure their area of interest is included in the format. This includes organisations keen to improve the sustainability of natural resource management in developing countries. However, the PRS process places a strong emphasis on economic growth and infrastructure development. It is therefore difficult for conservationist initiatives to gain the poverty-reduction credentials necessary to secure a legitimate and effective place within a poverty reduction strategy.

There may be some ways to reconcile these agendas. The first would be a more localised approach to poverty reduction. This would validate some of the bushmeat and livelihood programmes that only deliver benefits very locally, and are hence currently unrecognised by national PRSs. Another approach could be to widen the scope of the PRSs to strengthen the role of poverty alleviation and vulnerability mitigation, as well as economic growth. The groundwork for this is already present in the PRSPs in principle, including community resource management programmes and research into the environment/vulnerability/poverty dynamic. However, there is not much in terms of concrete outcomes and indicators concerning these non-income dimensions of poverty as they relate to forests.

## 5.5 Bushmeat as a forestry anomaly

The institutional reforms that are often advocated to improve the management of other forest resources do not transfer very well to bushmeat issues. The reasons for this include the informal nature of the bushmeat trade, and the fact that bushmeat by definition is more mobile than other forestry resources. The use of land is therefore less intense but requires more forest to be set aside. This also means that bushmeat may roam across borders from one jurisdiction to another, either out of the 'designated' area for controlled hunting, or even into another country with a completely different regime in place. Together, this may in part explain the omission of bushmeat from policies dealing with land tenure, property rights, forestry resources and food security. Although the relevant regulatory frameworks might be well suited to the management of wild game, they seem to apply only to the land itself, not to the animals living on it.

### *Côte D'Ivoire I-PRSP 2002*

*"II.2.1.2. Rural development [...] objectives are: (i) to improve the competitiveness and productivity of rural operations; (ii) to seek self-sufficiency and security with respect to food; (iii) to restore forest resources; and (iv) to improve farmers incomes and reduce local disparities and urban poverty." strategy is "... (vii) provision of land tenure security (application of the new Rural Land Use Code adopted in December 1998, and the new forest policy), preservation of environment and implementation of the new forest policy"*

## 5.6 Institutional weaknesses

In many of the countries examined, the design and implementation of sustainable, pro-poor forestry policy is further hampered by certain characteristics of the institutions currently in place. Firstly, the benefits of conservation do not accrue immediately or directly to those who exercise restraint or comply with prohibition. In other words, the preservation of future stock levels is not in itself reward enough for a hunter to reduce his off-take. This is due to a variety of institutional factors, including culture (the bounty of the forest, the substitutability of different game species<sup>30</sup>) and property rights.

As people do not feel adequately compensated for the loss of potential game meat, incentives exist for the enforcement agencies to adopt more of a "rent-taking" attitude towards their conservationist duties<sup>31</sup>. Furthermore, in many countries the institutions

<sup>30</sup> Glyn Davies, presentation to the ODI/ZSL Bushmeat and Livelihoods conference, 23/24 September 2004, [http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/conference\\_overview.html](http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/conference_overview.html)

<sup>31</sup> Bowen-Jones, E., Brown, D. & Robinson, E. 2002. Assessment of the solution orientated research needed to



underlying natural resource regulation date from colonial times, and are not conducive to the development of sustainable small-scale, decentralised economic activity. This is compounded by the corresponding shortage of skilled and motivated manpower, which not only makes policy formulation difficult, but also impedes the effective collection and analysis of relevant data. These institutional factors make it difficult to establish and enforce sustainable, pro-poor forestry policies, especially in the face of political resistance to measures which may restrict off-take levels in the short term.

## **6. A closer look at the Participatory Process**

### **6.1. Participatory Poverty Assessments**

The Bretton Woods Institutions require PRSPs to focus on poverty reduction, but beyond this stipulation they are intended to be a fully country-owned document. Part of this ownership involves the countries defining poverty and its solutions according to their own criteria. In order to ensure that the priorities of all stakeholders are represented, the Joint Staff Assessments explicitly require evidence of participatory identification of factors of poverty<sup>32</sup>.

A major methodological tool that has been used to ensure this participation is the Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA). PPAs are designed to include poor people's views in the analysis of poverty and the formulation of strategies to reduce it through public policy, such as those laid out in PRSPs. However, there is no blueprint of either the content or the method for PPA, so it remains a loosely defined set of actions. Two categories of research can be recognised: those studies that aim to enrich the knowledge base for designing policies to reduce poverty, and those studies that create new political space for negotiation, empowerment and influence<sup>33</sup>.

### **6.2. Method for this part of the research**

PPA findings that were used for input into the Poverty Reduction Strategies were reviewed. This was only carried out for countries with full PRSPs or equivalent documents<sup>34</sup>. I-PRSPs were not analysed, as PPAs are not required for these.

In addition to the consultation PPAs to *inform* the PRS, several PRSPs also describe decentralisation and participation programmes for *implementation* of the strategies. These were considered from the same perspective where available for comparison.

Each programme was assessed against the following yes/no questions<sup>35</sup>:

- Timing:
  - o Set up prior to PRSP?
  - o Set up expressly for PRS contribution?
  - o Subsequent to PRSP (planned)?
- Function
  - o Participatory assessment (upstream feedback)?
  - o Participatory policy-making?
  - o Participatory administration (downstream management)?

---

promote a more sustainable bushmeat trade in Central and West Africa. Report to the Wildlife & Countryside Directorate, DEFRA, DETR, UK. Quoted at [http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/bushmeat\\_crisis\\_solutions.htm](http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/bushmeat_crisis_solutions.htm)

<sup>32</sup> World Bank (no date). NB the JSA is instructed not to comment on the *method* of consultation.

<sup>33</sup> Norton et al. 2001

<sup>34</sup> Countries covered were: Benin, Cameroon, Ghana, Nigeria, Zambia, Tanzania, Uganda, Bolivia, Vietnam, Honduras, Nicaragua,

<sup>35</sup> See relevant appendix in the accompanying report "Forestry, bushmeat and livelihoods: Exploring the coverage in PRSPs" for table of results.

- Aspects of poverty addressed
  - o Bushmeat?
  - o Forestry?

### 6.3. Results - forestry and bushmeat in the PPAs

The feedback from these consultations did not include very much on forestry resources or bushmeat. Of 17 consultation programmes (across 11 countries) designed expressly for PRSP input, only five address forestry resources explicitly: in Cameroon, Zambia, Tanzania, Vietnam, and Nicaragua. Even when the issue of forestry was raised, it usually received fewer concrete policy suggestions than other public service sectors. The specific issue of wildlife use was not raised, in the context of consumptive or any other use.

Forest management issues, in particular deforestation, irrigation and desertification concerns, were most prominent in the context of agricultural productivity, not for the welfare provided directly by the forest products (Cameroon, Vietnam, Uganda, Honduras).

There are several references to the conservation of environmental resources in general that may apply to forests and wild game, but these are mostly imprecise in identifying either problems or possible solutions, and are often part of a list of miscellaneous secondary concerns (Tanzania, Benin).

The Vietnamese and Ugandan consultations both seem to show a relatively high awareness of the links between forestry and poverty. This includes both direct use of forest products, and the benefits to agriculture of strong forest and watershed management<sup>36</sup>. The Vietnamese PPA in particular explicitly mentions the importance of forestry resources in mitigating the vulnerability of the

#### ***Tanzania PRSP 2003, p.12***

*Participants underscored the need for*

- i) new and strengthened rural credit mechanisms;*
- ii) improved research and extension services, possibly including one extension agent per village;*
- iii) enhanced ability, especially at the community level, to repair and maintain rural roads;*
- iv) the revival of agricultural cooperatives;*
- v) improvement and expansion of irrigated farming; and*
- vi) effective safety-nets, to assist vulnerable groups. “*

#### ***Vietnam Lao Cai PPA 2003, p.5***

*“Resources - Environment*

- Conflict between demand for and actual usage of agricultural land, forestry land, and protection forest in upland area*
- Many people have seen the benefit of forestation (Sa Moc tree)*

*Recommendations:*

- Provide support to forest growers (avoid giving grant), and help them grow nursling by themselves*
- Bring into play community ownership, and conserve “holy forest”*
- Promote the use of ‘forest saving fireplace’ to save firewood”*

poor, an aspect which is not well covered in the PPAs of other countries. However, these two examples are not representative of the PPAs as a whole.

Where forestry resources are explicitly recognised by the poor, this does seem to be picked up by the PPAs. However, notwithstanding the exception of Vietnam, this dimension of poverty receives relatively little attention. Equally, there is some concern over the methodology applied in gathering feedback through PPAs, as there are no guidelines on this, and there is some evidence that the methods applied are conducive to making certain findings. These concerns are focussed around the selection of the consultees, the remit of the interviewers (Indonesia), the phrasing of the questions, or the influence of donor representatives at the consultation level (Cameroon).

<sup>36</sup> Vietnam - PPA in Lao Cai Province 2003; Uganda – PPA quoted in box on p.81 of the PRSP

## 6.4. Disconnect between PPA and PRSP

It has been suggested earlier in this document that dependency on forest resources may be a regional concern, and therefore may be 'filtered out' at the national level. If this were the case, we would have expected to find at least some incidence of forestry or bushmeat concerns in the PPAs for at least some of the countries that then ignore this in their PRSPs. This is not borne out by this close reading of the PPA feedback, as none of the countries whose PRSPs ignore forestry and bushmeat show a significant incidence of these issues in their PPAs. In fact, the five countries which did discover forestry concerns among the poor all go on to deal with forestry resources in their final PRSPs (although Tanzania to a notably lesser extent than the others).

There does, however, seem to be differences between the attitudes towards forestry resources expressed in the PPAs, and the policies dealing with these issues in their Poverty Reduction Strategy. It is therefore worth looking at the various stages after an issue has been identified by a PPA before it is included in the final PRSP.

### 6.4.1. Different levels of consultation

Many of the countries conducted PPA at two levels, one directly consulting those affected by poverty, and another to obtain feedback from government ministries, donor agencies, local government, and other relevant decision-makers. In some cases there is a greater emphasis on natural resources, including forestry, at the second level. The drive to include these issues in the poverty reduction strategy appears to be coming from those responsible for designing and implementing the strategy, not its putative beneficiaries. In this way, not all views expressed in the context of the PPA are necessarily shared by the poor communities.

Equally, the editors of the PRSP are under no obligation from the JSA to include *all* the issues raised by the PPA. Given the breadth and detail of information collected, it is only practical to filter and organise the feedback (as in the Honduran PRSP) rather than collate a comprehensive list of the participants' concerns and use that as a basis for policy (as in the Cameroonian PRSP). It is therefore consistent with the PRS methodology that the findings of the PPAs should not dictate the content of the PRSP.

### 6.4.2. Restrictions of PPA itself

The very nature of participatory consultation also limits its scope. Firstly, consumptive use of forest resources (especially bushmeat, and sometimes other NTFPs) is often taboo or illegal. This could well prevent participants from talking freely about their dependency on these. Secondly, the results from different regions and communities are bound to be different, and often contradictory. Thirdly, the selection of the participants may exclude the most remote communities, which are often those most dependent on forest resources, including bushmeat. And finally, there are concerns about the discourse of the data collection methodology, which may discourage the poor from listing secondary or non-monetary income, and predispose them towards prioritising growth opportunities rather than vulnerability mitigation<sup>37</sup>.

#### *Honduras PRSP 2001, p.5*

*"From the beginning, what was important was to identify the broadest possible accord, taking into account above all the national interest. [...] Likewise, the following types of proposals were not taken into consideration:*

*i) subsidies that do not necessarily benefit the poorest, or that for other reasons result in an inefficient allocation of productive resources, with negative effects on long-term sustainable growth and therefore on poverty reduction;*

*ii) policies, programs and projects for which both national and international experience has clearly demonstrated their inefficacy and inefficiency as poverty-reduction measures, such as massive subsidized-credit programs, price controls and artificial stimuli; and*

*iii) programs and projects specific to local areas. However, these latter will be considered within the framework of regional strategies."*

<sup>37</sup> Brocklesby & Hinshelwood 2001

### 6.4.3. Difference in motivation

The details of Ghana's consultation reveals that, even at the local level, availability of forestry resources (including bushmeat) is not an explicit factor of poverty for the rural poor. Equally, the breakdown of the feedback from the participation in Zambia reveals extensive and detailed requests from all regions on topics such as agriculture, but very little (and only from three regions) on the subject of the environment<sup>38</sup>. It is therefore perhaps surprising that forest resources receive as much attention as they do; despite the apparent lack of interest from Zambia's rural poor, the country's PRSP describes the launch of 12 programmes working on the environment and poverty. Of these, nine explicitly deal with optimising sustainable extraction of forest and wildlife resources by poor communities<sup>39</sup>. In Cameroon there are several forestry measures in the PRSP, despite a lack of explicit concerns voiced through the PPA. Honduras is perhaps the most striking example, where despite very little mention of forestry from the poor<sup>40</sup>, the PRSP includes forestry management policies with extensive discussion of best practice.

The question then arises of where the additional concern for forestry comes from. It appears that treatment of these issues is inserted on the initiative of national-level institutions and NGOs. The Tanzanian PRSP explicitly describes how the national workshop, following a consultative meeting with international donors "concurred with the orientation of the draft and also noted [i.e. *added*] specific concerns, such as unemployment, child labour and environment"<sup>41</sup>. The possible motivations for this input include a commitment to the Millennium Development Goals, a better overview of the causal relationships between degradation of forestry resources and poverty, and/or an awareness of the sensitivities of the international community. A closer examination of these underlying factors is beyond the remit of this report.

## 7 Conclusions

An important consequence of the low coverage of bushmeat in PRSPs is that this issue is unlikely to appear high on the national political agenda, which is much influenced by the poverty reduction debate. As a result, not only is there little incentive for coordination across government – an aspect much needed when dealing with natural resources – but also limited support can be expected to be forthcoming from international donors. This will tend to maintain, or worsen, the existing national funding crisis for conservation.

The issue of bushmeat does not benefit from any concrete, outcome-based policy recommendations in these documents. This is not for lack of quantitative analysis as there has been plenty of work in this area, including that carried out by the Wildlife Conservation Society, the Durrell Institute, and the Institute of Zoology<sup>42</sup>. It may be possible to mainstream this research into the World Bank poverty reduction machinery, for several reasons:

- Firstly, much of it focuses on the socio-economic aspects of the bushmeat trade<sup>43</sup>.
- Secondly, the World Bank processes recognise the importance of localised poverty impacts through Poverty and Social Impact Assessments, and take account of non-monetary aspects of poverty through Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPAs).
- Finally, the guidelines for these mechanisms specify that pre-existing relevant research should be used where possible.

<sup>38</sup> Zambia PRSP 2002, pp 144 and 147, "Summary of provincial consultations on interventions for poverty reduction"

<sup>39</sup> Zambia PRSP 2002, p 117 ff., "Programmes on the Poverty/Environment linkages"

<sup>40</sup> As represented through the consultations – there has been considerable activism by civil society through other channels on the topic of forest management

<sup>41</sup> Tanzania PRSP 2003, p.5, Box 2, "Consultative steps in preparing the PRSP"

<sup>42</sup> See <http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/> and <http://www.zoo.cam.ac.uk/ioz/projects/bushmeat.htm> for details, also DFID 2002.

<sup>43</sup> Eg [http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/download\\_files/wpb7.pdf](http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/download_files/wpb7.pdf)

However, a number of obstacles remain. Lack of clarity over sustainable best practice in bushmeat issues is a major issue. Allied to this, the growth potential of the extraction of bushmeat from wild populations seems limited. Given the growth emphasis of the PRSs, it is unlikely in any event that an initiative to support *sustainable levels* of offtake would be a valued contribution to a PRS. Even if such potential were identified for some species, there remains the stigma of bushmeat as a productive activity in the eyes of some within the international conservation community. These factors combined would make for a lot of work in order to increase the coverage of the issue in PRSPs.

Furthermore, we have seen that nominal inclusion in PRSPs is no guarantee of additional support or funding. This relies on the presence and nature of the indicators, the underlying institutional capacity, and the follow-up mechanisms within government (e.g. the medium-term expenditure framework, MTEF etc). The question remains therefore, whether the interests of sustainable wildlife management would be best served by working towards greater legitimacy within poverty reduction, or by increasing efforts through other national and local conservation programmes.

## 8 **References**

***All PRSPs and related documents were downloaded from***  
[www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies](http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies)

---

Asibey E. O. A., 1977. *Expected effects of land-use patterns on future supplies of bushmeat in Africa south of the Sahara*. Environmental Conservation, 4: 43-50.

Bojö, J., and Reddy, R. C., 2002. *Poverty Reduction Strategies and Environment, A Review of 40 Interim and Full Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers*, World Bank, Washington DC

Bowen-Jones, E., Brown, D. & Robinson, E. 2002. *Assessment of the solution orientated research needed to promote a more sustainable bushmeat trade in Central and West Africa*. Report to the Wildlife & Countryside Directorate, DEFRA, DETR, UK. Available <http://www.ukcites.gov.uk/documents/Bushmeat%20Final%20Report.doc>

Brocklesby, M.A., & Hinshelwood, E. 2001. *Poverty and the Environment: What the Poor Say. An Assessment of Poverty-Environment Linkages in Participatory Poverty Assessments*. Centre for Development Studies University of Wales Swansea

Cowlshaw, G., Mendelson, S., & Rowcliffe, J.M. 2004. *Bushmeat Commodity Chain: patterns of trade and sustainability in a mature urban market in West Africa*. ODI Wildlife Policy Briefing No. 7. Available at <http://www.odi.org.uk/fpeg/publications/policybriefs/wildlifepolicy/downloads/WPB7final.pdf>

Davies, G., 2002. *Bushmeat, poverty and food security*, EAZA. Available at <http://www.eaza.net/download/summgd.PDF>

De Merode, E., Homewood, K., & Cowlshaw, G. 2003. *Wild resources and livelihoods of poor households in Democratic Republic of Congo*. ODI Wildlife Policy Briefing No. 4. Available at <http://www.odi.org.uk/fpeg/publications/policybriefs/wildlifepolicy/downloads/WPB1final.pdf>

DFID, 2002. *Wildlife and Poverty Study* Available at <http://www.ecoagriculturepartners.org/pdfs/ABDPov%20&%20Wildlife%20FINALREPORT%20DFID%2012-02.pdf>

IDA and IMF 2002. *Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Approach: Main Findings* Prepared by the Staffs of the World Bank and IMF. Washington DC . Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/prspgen/review/2002/031502a.pdf>

Norton, A. 2001. *A Rough Guide to PPAs - Participatory Poverty Assessment: An introduction to theory and practice*, ODI, London

ODI *Wild Meat, Livelihoods Security and Conservation in the Tropics* <http://www.odi-bushmeat.org/>

Oksanen, T., and Mersmann, C. 2003. *Forestry in Poverty Reduction Strategies – An assessment of PRSP processes in Sub-Saharan Africa*. In: Oksanen, T., Pajari, B., and Tuomasjukka, T. (eds.) *Forests in Poverty Reduction Strategies: Capturing the Potential*. EFI Proceedings No. 47. 203 pp.

Rushton, J., Viscarra, R., Viscarra, C., Basset, F., Baptista, R., and Huallata, C., 2004. *Key Policy Issues for Wildlife Hunting and Bushmeat Consumption in the humid and sub-humid tropics of South America*. CEVEP, La Paz, Bolivia. Presented at ODI/ZSL Bushmeat and Livelihoods conference, Zoological Society of London, 23<sup>rd</sup>/24<sup>th</sup> September 2004.

Wilkie, D. S., and J. F. Carpenter. *Bushmeat hunting in the Congo Basin: an assessment of impacts and options for mitigation*. Msc submitted for publication in Biodiversity and Conservation. (1998) Available at [http://carpe.umd.edu/products/PDF\\_files/Abstract-Wilkie1998-1.pdf](http://carpe.umd.edu/products/PDF_files/Abstract-Wilkie1998-1.pdf)

Wilks, A., and Lefrançois, F., *Blinding with Science or Encouraging Debate? How World Bank Analysis Determines PRSP Policies* World Vision and Bretton Woods Project (2002). Available at [www.brettonwoodsproject.org/topic/adjustment/blinding/blindful.pdf](http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/topic/adjustment/blinding/blindful.pdf)

World Bank - *Guidelines for Joint Staff Assessment of a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, available at [http://www.worldbank.org/transport/training/arms\\_01/klug\\_gl.pdf](http://www.worldbank.org/transport/training/arms_01/klug_gl.pdf)

Zoological Society of London *Bushmeat Research Projects*  
<http://www.zoo.cam.ac.uk/ioz/projects/bushmeat.htm>