Ecological challenges for the buffer zone management of protected areas of forest-savannah mosaic in West Africa

Komina Honam Atsri *, Komla Elikplim Abotsi *, Kouami Kokou *, Daniele Dendi**, Gabriel Hoinsoude Segniagbeto***, John E. Fa****, Luca Luiselli** ***

**Laboratoire de Recherche Forestière Faculté des Sciences, Université de Lomé, Lomé, Togo*

***Department of Applied and Environmental Biology, Rivers State University of Science and Technology, P.M.B. 5080, Port Harcourt (Nigeria) and IDECC – Institute for Development, Ecology, Conservation and Cooperation, via G. Tomasi di Lampedusa 33, I-00144 Rome, Italy*

****Département de Zoologie, Faculté des Sciences, Université de Lomé, Lomé, Togo*

***** Division of Biology and Conservation Ecology, School of Science and the Environment, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD UK, Email jfa949@gmail.com; and Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor 16115, Indonesia*

RUNNING TITLE: FAZAO MALFAKASSA ECOLOGY

Abstract In sub-Saharan Africa, the management of buffer zones around protected areas do not often take into serious account the needs of resource exploitation by the local populations or the conservation needs of these areas. We described the ecological characteristics and management issues affecting the buffer zone around the Fazao-Malfakassa National Park (FMNP); a 192,000-ha protected area in central-western Togo of utmost conservation importance within the Dahomey Gap region. We focussed on the 10-km radius buffer zone around the park. Using 2015 sentinel-2 images we analysed land cover patterns and described existing ecological zones. We complemented these with field surveys and interviews with 300 persons living in 22 villages within the buffer zone to describe the conditions affecting the resident human population. Although over 80% of the total buffer zone area is altered, we identified four areas of high conservation value (total area = 65,594 ha). Interviewees recognized that slash-and-burn was the most common form of land use, followed by agroforestry practices. Agriculture, charcoal and firewood production were the main drivers affecting habitats, and land conflicts were recurrent due to the rise in human population. The decline in agriculture, reported by interviewees in some sectors, was attributable to ravages of crops by elephants. Three independent diversity indices showed that in well-preserved zones, a greater diversity of animals (with similar utilization frequencies) were hunted than in altered sites (where grasscutters were the dominant hunted species). There were also significant differences between altered and well-preserved zones in terms of plants used for charcoal production and for non-timber forest products. We advocate the development of community-controlled hunting areas to enhance the conservation value of the four well-preserved zones. Instead, promoting sustainable agricultural production systems in the degraded areas can help to further stabilize the agricultural front and reduce land pressure on the park.

Keywords Buffer zones management; Human Pressure; Biodiversity; Standardized questionnaires; Fazao-Malfakassa National Park; Togo

INTRODUCTION

Protected areas are an essential component of conservation strategies (Aubertin 2013; Gross et al. 2015). To play their roles fully and sustainably, protected areas should be managed in a way that considers the needs and concerns of local populations, not only within the core

zones, but also in the buffer (=peripheral) zones (e.g. Dudley 2008; Aubertin 2013). Buffer zones (Mathevet et al. 2010), can be defined as "all the territories likely to interfere with the protected area" (Sayer, 1991; Binot et al. 2007).

In theory, buffer zones are used for activities that are compatible with ecologically sustainable practices that support directly or indirectly conservation and research, and importantly serve ecological buffering functions. Thus, inside buffer zones, some restrictions are placed on resource exploitation and land use in support of the protection of the protected area itself (Newmann 1997). Some management activities are undertaken to enhance the conservation values of the area (Sayer, 1991; Wells and Brandon 1993) but also to provide benefits to neighboring rural communities (Wells and Brandon 1992, 1993). In other words, the main goal of buffer zones is still to protect biodiversity, but this protection has to be harmonized with the derivation of benefits to local people (Martino 2001).

Although few studies have investigated the effectiveness of buffer zones in terms of their ecological buffering functions, a number have focused on the socioeconomic aspects (see Heinen and Mehta 2000). Ecological functions of buffer zones include: (i) the enhanced conservation of species with high mobility (Barzetti 1993), (ii) their functioning as physical barriers from human encroachment (Martino 2001), (iii) reduction of the edge effects (Shafer 1999), and (iv) enhancement of the environmental services provided by the reserve (e.g. Martino 2001). Most studies suggest that local people do not receive economic or other benefits from the establishment of buffer zones (for instance, establishment of corridors involving relocation and compensations), Mwalyosi 1991; Heinen and Mehta 2000; Martino 2001; UICN/PACO 2011, 2012).

In sub-Saharan Africa, the management of the buffer zones does not usually consider the needs of resource exploitation by the resident populations (e.g., traditional hunting or

fishing, collecting fallen timber, harvesting fruit; Mwalyosi 1991; Brandon 1997; Gami 2000; Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres 2008), or the conservation needs and values of their natural resources (Hanon *et al.* 2008). The operative definition of buffer zones also varies across countries in terms of: (i) their extension and zone of influence e.g. 3 km radius boundaries in W Regional Park in Benin, 1 km in Burkina Faso (Lungren and Bouché 2008), 10 km in Central African Republic (Gami 2000), no specification in Togo (UICN/PACO 2012) or (ii) the rights of the resident human populations (village dynamics, rights or prohibitions of use) (UICN/PACO 2012). Therefore, many buffer zones are seen by local populations as a mere geographical expansion of state authority beyond the boundaries of protected areas (Martino 2001). Buffer zones should be perceived as areas in which sustainable use of natural resources is promoted to benefit both local communities and wildlife (Wild and Mutebi 1997).

Although much scientific literature is currently available on the functions and problems affecting buffer zones in African protected areas since the 1990s (e.g., Vujakovic 1987; Mwalyosi 1991; Newmann 1997; Wild and Mutebi 1997), almost nothing has been published to date on buffer zones of parks and natural reserves in Togo (UICN/PACO 2008). Despite being one of the smallest African countries with a population of about 7.6 million (DGSCN 2014), this country has an increasingly successful economy (annual GDP growth has averages 5.5% in the last 10 years, higher than most Sub-Saharan economies (World Bank 2017). Being heavily based on agricultural development (accounting for about 40% of GDP; World Bank 2017), the Togolese economy also generates serious problems for the conservation of natural areas and wildlife (UICN/PACO 2008). This means that understanding the functionality and problems affecting buffer zones in the country can be crucial in heightening the management of protected areas (UICN/PACO 2008).

In this paper, we explore the ecological challenges affecting the management of the buffer zones in one of the country's most important protected areas, the Fazao Malfakassa National Park (hereby FMNP). By employing satellite image analysis and an interview-based approach with local communities we investigate ongoing landscape patterns and uncover the most pressing issues. More specifically, we aim to answer the following key questions: (i) Are there any high-conservation value landscape and wildlife areas of importance to consider in the management of the FMNP buffer zone? (ii) What drivers affect these areas? (iii) What are the best options for adding value to these buffer zones in relation to the management objectives of FMNP? To answer these questions, we (i) identify areas with high conservation value (ii) undertake an inventory and analysis resource exploitation practices and (iii) identify the determinants of the agriculture and landscape dynamics in the area.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

FMNP, 292,000 ha surface, is one of the fourteen priority protected areas of Togo's national protected areas system (Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres 2014). It is located in the central part of the Atakora mountains, and extends between the longitudes East 0 ° 36 'and 1 ° 2' and the latitudes North 8 ° 21 'and 9 ° 10' at the boundary between Sudanese and Guinean savannah vegetastion zones (Figure 1). It is drained by the rivers Mô, Anié, Koui and Kpawa, and is characterized by an annual rainfall varying between 1200 and 1500 mm.

In 2010, human population inhabiting the buffer zone of FMNP was estimated at 60,216 (DGSCN 2014), with a density that has increased from 21 inhabitants / km² in 1981 to 47 inhabitants / km² in 2010 (growth rate = 2.81%, DGSCN 2014). There are many villages around the park. These villages are populated by various ethnic groups including Kotokoli,

Agnanga, Bassar and Kabyè. Most of the landscape consists of agricultural fields, with a patchy mosaic of closed-canopy forests (semi-deciduous, dry deciduous and riparian forests) and open forests, as well as wooded savannahs.

Protocol

A standardized questionnaire was distributed amongst 300 persons (local hunters, village chiefs and farmers), i.e. a sampling rate of 0.5% of the FMNP buffer zone population. To ensure independence of the answers, all interviewees were approached individually. The questionnaire survey covered 22 villages bordering the park (see appendix 1). This questionnaire focused on land use practices, forestry and wildlife resources in the buffer zones, as well as on the different types of land-use conflicts and different agricultural practices. More specifically, each questionnaire consisted of the following questions for each interviewee:

(i) what is the most common form of land use in the surroundings of your village (three pre-selected options available for choice: slash-and-burn, fallow, agroforestry);

(ii) what are the most important resource exploitation practices in the surroundings of your village (for instance, agriculture, hunting, etc.)? Interviewees were allowed to freely describe the various practices without any pre-selected option made by the interviewers.

(iii) what are the different types of conflicts related to the use of resources? (three pre-selected options available for choice: human / wildlife conflicts, land conflicts, ranger / farmer conflicts);

(iv) what is the evolution of the agricultural front in the last five years? (three options : growing, stable, decrising);

(v) what are the reasons for the observed agricultural front dynamics? Interviewees were allowed to freely describe the various reasons without any pre-selected option made by the interviewers.

(vi) what are the most hunted animals?;

(vii) what are the most exploited forest species for charcoal, firewood and non-timber forest products?

The questionnaires survey was carried out in three degraded areas (12 villages) and in three well-conserved areas (10 villages) within the FMNP buffer zone (Appendix 1). These areas were selected after being identified using the land use map of the buffer zone (within a 10 km radius around the FMNP), with a visual interpretation of colored images and supervised classification of the 2015 Sentinel-2A MSI of December 21st image (10m resolution) for discriminating different types of land cover using the maximum likelihood algorithm. This method is based on Bayes' theorem, which makes it possible to describe the classes contained in the image based on the probability density concept (Robin 2007). Each area was considered 'altered' if it was characterized by a predominant presence of agricultural fields, agroforestry zones, houses, and areas of clear-cutting of trees (exploitation for charcoal or firewood), whereas it was considered as 'well preserved' if it was characterized by a predominant presence of natural ecosystems (forests and savannahs), and by the absence of agricultural fields, agroforestry zones, and areas exploited for wood.

Field surveys were conducted also in order to observe faunal species of conservation value (primates, elephants, ungulates, reptiles), and eventually determining their apparent status in the various surveyed areas. Details of the field methodology utilized during these surveys are presented elsewhere, but included random visual encounter surveys in suitable

sites, heard calls, and examination of hunted specimens in local bushmeat markets (Segniagbeto 2009; Segniagbeto *et al*., 2017).

Data analysis

Frequencies of different types of answers by interviewees were analyzed by χ^2 test. In order to analyze the differences between altered and well-preserved zones in terms of variety of frequently hunted animals, three distinct measures of community diversity were calculated for each village (Magurran 1988; Hammer 2012):

(a) Dominance index = 1-Simpson index, and ranges from 0 (all taxa are equally present) to 1 (one taxon dominates completely the community of hunted animals);

(b) Simpson's diversity index. This index measures the 'species diversity' of the community of hunted animals, and ranges from 0 to 1.

(c) Evenness, calculated by Pielou's formula:

$$e = H/\log S$$

with H representing Shannon's index, and S the total number of taxa recorded in in each study area (Magurran 1988).

In order to differentiate the two zone types (altered versus well-preserved) in terms of their quantitative hunted animals community composition (as emerged from interviewees' responses), we used a One-Way Analysis of Similarities (ANOSIM). ANOSIM is roughly analogous to an ANOVA in which the univariate response variable is replaced by a dissimilarity matrix, i.e. with distances that were converted to ranks (Clarke 1993). Significance was computed by permutation of group membership, with 9,999 replicates, and Bray-Curtis was used as distance measure. ANOSIM was performed in R-software, using

Vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2010), whereas, for all the other statistical tests, the software PAST 3.0 version (Hammer 2012) was used, with alpha set at 5%.

RESULTS

Biodiversity characterization of the well-preserved and altered buffer zones

Despite strong anthropogenic pressures on the buffer zone of the FMNP, four clearly defined well-preserved areas were identified (zones 1 to 4, see Figure 1), with a total area being estimated at 65,594 hectares. In three of these well preserved areas, we also conducted our interviews (see below). The main ecological characteristics of these areas are summarized in Table 1.

Zone 1 is dominated by woodland savanna with scattered islands of dense semi-deciduous forests. We directly observed several species of conservation concern, including elephants (*Loxodonta africana*), that use these areas as a refuge during periods of heavy rains where they tend to get bogged down in the hydromorphic valleys. Other frequently observed species were baboons (*Papio anubis*), Spot-nosed Monkey (*Cercopithecus petaurista petaurista*), mona monkeys (*Cercopithecus mona*), Buffon's kobs (*Kobus kob*), West African crocodiles (*Crocodylus suchus*), pythons (*Python sebae* and *Python regius*) and tortoises (*Kinixys nogueyi*).

Zone 2 is characterized by tree and woodland savanna on hydromorphic soils scattered by small open forest fragments dominated by *Isoberlinia* trees (Fabaceae). We observed large herds of Buffon's kob, waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsyprimnus*), pata monkeys and baboons in the open forest patches and in the wooded savannahs. Elephants were regularly observed in this zone, and indeed they make incursions into the cultivated fields (particularly of yam) especially in this zone.

Zone 3 is characterized by a mosaic of hills and plains dominated by woodland savanna, with scattered patches of open forests and dry dense forests. Fruit trees (e.g. *Pentadesma butyracea* and *Detarium senegalense*) are widespread and heavily exploited by people. Some primates (*Colobus vellerosus* and *Cercopithecus mona*) were observed during our surveys, while also consuming these fruits.

Zone 4 is also a mosaic of woodland savanna and open forests with large patches of dense forest. There are permanent ponds in this area, where elephants were regularly observed. These areas were also frequented by forest buffalo (*Syncerus caffer nanus*) and hartebeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus*), but also baboons, pata monkeys, tortoises (*Kinixys nogueyi*) and turtles (*Pelomedusa subrufa* and *Pelusios castaneus*) were regularly observed.

In the altered areas, where the agricultural lanscape is dominant (>80% of the total landscape area), the fauna appeared highly depleted, with virtually no species of conservation value. Mammal fauna is dominated by such habitat generalists as *Thryonomys swinderianus*, *Cricetomys gambianus*, and *Hystrix cristata*. Large ungulates were not observed, whereas small duikers (*Philantomba walteri*) were extremely rare. The reptilian fauna of altered areas was dominated by lizards and snakes. Spitting cobras (*Naja nigricollis*) and African puff adder (*Bitis arieens*) were relatively common, and represented a main threat to local farmers.

Exploitation of buffer zone resources: interview-based approach

What is the most common form of land use?

Since there were no statistical differences between answers by interviewees in the altered versus well-preserved zones (χ^2= 5.28, df = 3, P = 0.152), we pooled the data from the two zone types. Overall, slash-and-burn was considered the most common form of land use

by 38.5% of the interviewees, agroforestry by 35.2%, fallow by 21.1%, whereas 5.2% did not have any opinion.

What are the most important resource exploitation practices?

Interviewees' answers on the resource exploitation practices, in relation to the state of conservation of the buffer zones, are given in Figure 2. Although the exploited resource types were identical in altered and well-preserved areas, there were significant differences between the two categories of area (χ^2= 38.15, df = 7, P < 0.0001), with hunting, honey harvest and non-timber forestry products extraction being significantly more frequent in well-preserved areas, and bush fires in altered areas are identical regardless of the state of conservation of the buffer zones (Figure 2). More specifically, in degraded areas agriculture (85%) was the dominant activity followed by choarcal production (60%). Nevertheless, in intact areas, hunting is the second most important activity behind agriculture, according to 55% of respondents.

What are the different types of conflicts related to the use of resources?

Human / wildlife conflicts were identified by 50% of the respondents), land conflicts by 25%, and ranger / farmer conflicts by 10%. 8% of the respondents did not have any opinion, and 1% answered that there is no land-use conflict in the area. Human / wildlife conflicts are linked to ravages or destruction of crops by elephants (yams) and primates (maize). Elephant incursions into yam fields have increased in recent years with significant economic losses for farmers. Interestingly, yam plantations were shown to be the main target of elephant raids also in Burkina Faso (Hema et al., 2018). This situation has resulted in a significant reduction of the areas of yam cultivation in these areas.

What is the evolution of the agricultural front in the last five years?

The majority of respondents (78%) estimated that during the last five years, the agricultural front has decreased in altered buffer zones, whereas, according to 37% of the respondents, the dynamics of the agricultural front are stable in the well-preserved areas compared to 35% which consider it to be progressing.

What are the reasons for the observed agricultural front dynamics?

Based on interviewees' opinion, the drivers of the evolution of the agricultural front differed significantly (χ^2= 43.23, df = 3, P < 0.0001) according to the state of conservation of the buffer zones (Figure 3), with low agricultural yields being behind the origin of the advancement of the agricultural front according to most (58%) interviewees in altered areas (58% of respondents), while soil fertility (33%) and demographic increase (33%) explain the progress of the agricultural front in well-preserved areas (Figure 3). About 20% of people did not have any opinion on this issue (Figure 3). According to the interviewees, the main crops grown are maize (26%), cowpea (20%) and soybean (15%). The cultivation of yam (10%) and cotton (0.4%), which are well known to be devastating for forests and savannahs, was reported to be declining in recent years by the majority of respondents.

According to the interviewees, the explanatory factors of the regressive dynamics of the agricultural front are manifold (Table 2), and differed significantly between altered and well-preserved areas (χ^2= 26.41, df = 5, P < 0.0001). The presence of the mountains has stabilized the agricultural front in well-preserved areas. Thus, in the western part of the park, which is nevertheless highly anthropized, any progress on the agricultural front is naturally limited by the cliffs. On the other hand, the ravages of crops by elephants and primates have pushed the front back into altered areas (Table 2). In addition, the lack of adequate land development facilities (8%) and the availability of cultivable land (possibility of fallowing) (3%) are other factors contributing to the stability of the agricultural front in well-preserved

areas. Interestingly, the activity of rangers was not viewed as a main reason for the decline and/or stability of the agricultural front in the buffer zones of the park (Table 2). The percentage of respondents without opinion was much higher in altered areas than in well-preserved areas (Table 2).

What are the most hunted animals?

Overall, 15 groups of animals (mostly mammals, and especially ungulates) were mentioned by the interviewees (Table 3). The most hunted species differed significantly between altered and well-preserved zones (χ^2= 58.71, df = 14, P < 0.0001). This difference is not surprising, as the very different environmental conditions between altered and well-preserved zones certainly support considerably different animal communities. In particular, grasscutters (*Thryonomys swinderianus*) and hares (*Lepus* spp.) were the dominant prey for hunters in altered zones whereas several animal groups were similarly hunted in well-preserved areas (Table III). Interestingly, the Simpson's diversity index (0.864 in altered zones versus 0.907 in well-preserved zones), the dominance index (0.136 versus 0.093), and the evenness index (0.728 versus 0.818) were significantly different between the two zone types (one-way ANOSIM: (mean rank within zone types = 101.4; mean rank between zone types = 136.6; R = 0.252, P = 0.0066), thus supporting the notion that, in well-preserved zones, hunters utilize a higher variety of animal preys with similar utilization frequencies. This pattern is consistent with the expected higher diversity and evenness, and lower dominance, of the communities of animals in pristine versus degraded areas (e.g., Magurran 1988).

What are the most exploited forest species for charcoal, firewood and non- timber forest products?

The list of the most used plant species for charcoal, firewood and non-timber forest product exploitation, according to the interviewees' responses in both altered and well-preserved zones, is given in Table 4. The differences were statistically significant between zone types both in terms of plants used for charcoal production (χ^2= 40.24, df = 8, P < 0.0001), and for non-timber forest products (χ^2= 44.22, df = 3, P < 0.0001) but not for firewood (χ^2= 8.1, df = 6, P = 0.231).

DISCUSSION

General patterns of the FMNP buffer zone dynamics

Our study identified a remarkable heterogeneity in the quality of the FMNP buffer zones for conservation value, with more than 80% of the territory being largely altered (made almost exclusively of agricultura fields) and of very low conservation value (Figure 2). This is not surprising, given that most of the savannah habitat within the Dahomey Gap is now cultivations, plantations and human settlements (e.g., UICN/PACO 2008, 2012). Nonetheless, because of the presence of four zones of high conservation value inside the FMNP buffer zone, adopting a clear management strategy for the whole buffer zone area, without taking into consideration whether the area is altered or well-preserved, is certainly wrong. Instead, it is important to adopt different management strategies in the different areas of the buffer zones, on the basis of the habitat types, the available resources and the local development dynamics. Therefore, understanding the local environmental development dynamics still stands as the necessary prerequisite for producing a well-working management plan for the FMNP buffer zones. In this regard, our interview data can be valuable for a better understanding of the local environmental development dynamics.

Agriculture and charcoal production are identified by local residents as being the main drivers of the anthropization of the altered buffer zones. These results confirm the

predominant role of agriculture and woodfuel production in the transformation of natural areas in Africa (Hosonuma et al., 2012). Nevertheless, transhumance is becoming a major constraint for the effective management of many protected areas in West Africa, such as the W transboundary park between Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger (Manceron 2011). Unregulated traditional hunting is instead the main driver of habitat alteration in the well-preserved areas of the FMNP buffer zones. This unregulated hunting may induce the gradual depletion of wildlife in protected areas, especially antelopes (Ly 2001; Grande-Vega et al. 2016 ; Hema et al. 2017). Thus, it is necessary that the authorities governing the FMNP should carefully monitor and control the hunting pressure, at least in the four well-preserved areas where remarkable faunal species can still be regularly encountered. In the well-preserved areas, also the extraction of timber and non-timber products were considered to be rampant by our interviewees, and thus may represent considerable threats that should be carefully considered in implementing management plans at the local scale. Previous studies also observed similar issues in other West African protected areas (e.g., UICN/PACO 2008).

Land conflicts have become very recurrent in the region, given the scarcity of land availability and the rampant growth of the human population density. Prior to the 1990s, land acquisition was inherited or donated according to customary rules. Between 1992 and 1994, the massive settlement of landless populations in certain areas of the FMNP as a result of the socio-political unrest increased pressure on land, and caused the introduction of other ways of accessing land, including land purchase and tenant farming. As a result, there are many open and latent conflicts between the legal holders of land rights and the current land users that are heavily affecting the management strategies in the FMNP buffer zones.

Our interviewees also considered that, in the buffer zone, the agricultural front has decreased in recent years in altered areas, particularly on the plains. This decline in the agricultural front is largely attributable, according to the perceived feeling of the

interviewees, to the ravages of crops caused by the incessant incursions of elephants and primates into the cultivated fields. Despite this perception is much exaggerated, nonetheless it indicates that the presence of human/wildlife conflict is considered a very serious theme for the people inhabiting the FMNP buffer zones. Thus, the FMNP governing authorities should put strong effort in trying to minimize the negative interactions occurring between local communities and elephants. The human/elephant conflict is locally enhanced by the growing "insularization" process (sensu Hausser 2013) of the FMNP, with the increasingly degraded buffer zones that offer scarce habitat quality but abundant food (yams and cassava) to the elephants. In fact, elephants whose population increases in the FMNP, tear tuber plants (yams and cassava), graze and trample on cereals (maize and sorghum) (see also Hema et al., 2018 for a similar issue in Burkina Faso). This damage peaks at the phenological stages of heading and fruiting of crops (Danquah and Oppong, 2014). In response to the numerous looting of crops by these animals, populations are intensifying poaching (Binot et al., 2007). In addition, these human-elephant conflicts forced some peasants to desert the area and abandon the yam crop, resulting in a progressive de-population of the southeastern plains of the park. A similar situation was observed on the outskirts of the Forest Management Unit of Kabo in Congo (Nsonsi, 2017).

A considerable portion of interviewees (just less than 20%) did not have any opinion on the issue of agricultural extension, thus showing that it is difficult to explain the evolution of the agricultural front by disentangling the single potential factors contributing to it. Concerning the factors of the regression or stabilization of the agricultural front in the buffer zones, our study revealed that a much higher percentage of respondents did not have any opinion in the altered areas, whereas almost all the interviewees had a clear opinion of the ongoing processes in the well-preserved areas. We suggest that this difference is due to the highly dynamic and fluid environmental condition in the altered areas, where a rapid

succession of bushlands, agricultural lands and human settlements may occur in almost the whole territory within a very short timespan.

Management options

The current state of the FMNP buffer zones offers several management alternatives that are compatible with the conservation of protected area resources. We think that these management alternatives should be very different between altered and well-preserved zones.

Management options in well-preserved buffer zones

Management options in the four well-preserved zones include the development of hunting areas that should be self-managed by the distinct villages, following the model that has already been applied for the Pendjari National Park (Benin) or Arly National Park (Burkina Faso). In fact, the Pendjari National Park is surrounded by three hunting areas (Porga, Batia and Konkombri) with a total area of 176,000 hectares (Brugière et al., 2015) and by self-managed village hunting areas. This model of development and management of the buffer zones has strengthened the protection of the core area and promoted the conservation of resources for the benefit of local populations (Bouché et al., 2011). Promoting the creation of carefully managed hunting zones is a real mechanism for involving local populations in management because they generate substantial benefits (Grazia, 1997). However, the Government still remains the main beneficiary of revenues from the exploitation of these hunting areas through concession fees, management and slaughter fees, guide licenses, management licenses and permits, in addition to taxes and value-added taxes (Bouché et al., 2011). For example, Bouché et al. (2011) showed that the Government of Benin received 37% (i.e. 433,000 Euro) of the financial flow in 12 years against approximately 220,000 Euro for the populations (zone rental fee and guide fees) within the framework of the management of the Konkombri hunting area adjacent to Pendjari Park.

Nevertheless, 30% of hunting revenues from hunting areas in the Pendjari have been allocated to local development apart from the direct benefits derived from tourism activities related to guiding, hospitality and catering (UICN/PACO 2011).

In addition, the four zones of high conservation value, being core sites for wide groups of large mammals including elephants and buffalos, could be used profitably for enhancing ecotourism (Tchamie, 1994; Hausser, 2013) and eventually also 'scientific tourism', for instance by creating a field research station that can attract scientists from outside Togo. Effective and participatory implementation of these management options would significantly reduce pressures on park resources (Binot and Joiris 2007, Manceron 2011).

Management options in altered buffer zones

Promoting sustainable agricultural production systems in the degraded areas can help to further stabilize the agricultural front and reduce land pressure on the FMNP. In fact, the promotion of agroforestry associated with composting techniques can improve soil fertility and increase the agricultural yields of local residents (Hubert et al., 2008). Some local species with high economic value for local populations such as *Vitellaria paradoxa* C.F.Gaertn. *Detarium senegalense* J.F.Gmel*., Pentadesma butyracea* Sabine, *Parkia biglobosa* (Jacq.) G.Don and *Xylopia aethiopica* (Dunal) A.Rich*.* are to be promoted primarily in reforestation and agroforestry activities.

The reduction of human-elephant conflict is also mandatory in these altered zones. This reduction can be achieved by the exclusion of certain crops such as yams and maize in the buffer zones regularly frequented by elephants (Hema et al., 2018) and the promotion of alternative crops such as chili and ginger. This strategy to combat crop damage has already been successfully tested in the fields near Kakum National Park in Ghana (Danquah and

Oppong, 2014). On the other hand, the decommissioning of these areas could increase the human-wildlife conflict and the resentment of the owners of land rights who were dispossessed of their lands when the protected area was classified. The appropriate solution would be to assign the status of areas of sustainable agriculture to these areas as part of a zoning plan to allow the Government to maintain control over the use of these lands (for the case of Pendjari National Park, see Sabi, 2015).

Given the dynamics of the buffer zones of the FMNP and related socio-economic and ecological issues, the implementation of the management and planning provisions of the park could be done effectively through participatory processes, involving land rights holders, land resource users, and local hunters in the decision-making process for development and the definition of resource use rules (Poisson, 2009). This type of participated management should be implemented in four phases: (1) the preparation of the partnership marked by awareness campaigns and the identification of the relevant actors; (2) consultation and capacity building; (3) negotiation of the management plan and specific agreements; and (4) implementation and monitoring of management arrangements (Poisson, 2009).

Acknowledgements This study was funded by the German Cooperation (GIZ/Togo). We are deeply grateful to the project manager, Mr. Udo Lange, for his advice, and the conservator of the Fazao-Malfakassa National Park and his ecoguards for their immense contribution to data collection. We also express our gratitude to the populations inhabiting the FMNP buffer zones for their availability to always answer our questions despite their multiplication of daily occupations.

REFERENCES

Aubertin, C. 2013. Aires protégées, espaces durables? IRD Editions, Paris, France.

Barzetti, V. (Ed.). 1993. Parques y progreso: Areas protegidas y desarrollo económico en America Latina y el Caribe. IUCN, Washington D.C., USA.

Binot, A., Hanon, L., Joiris, D.V. 2007. Aires protégées et processus d'aménagement en Afrique Centrale: le cas du Parc National de Zakouma (Tchad). In: Atelier final du programme GEPAC contribution à l'amélioration du processus de grouvernance envrionnementale et de gestion participative en Afrique Centrale, Yaoundé, Cameroun, 28-30 mars 2007. Editions CIRAD, Paris, France.

Binot, A., Joiris, D.V. 2007. Règles d'accès et gestion des ressources pour les acteurs des périphéries d'aires protégées. VertigO doi: 10.4000/vertigo.759

Bouché, P., Lungren, C., Moumouni, D. 2011. Le secteur privé à la rescousse de la faune sauvage en Afrique de l'Ouest. Évaluation écologique et économique de la Zone de Chasse de Konkombouri au Burkina Faso. Parcs Réserves 66, 12–22.

Brandon, K. 1997. Policy and practical considerations in land-use strategies for biodiversity conservation. In R. A. Kramer, C. van Schaik, and J. Johnson (Eds.), Last stand: Protected areas and the defense of tropical biodiversity (pp. 90-114). New York: Oxford University Press.

Brugière, D., Chardonnet, B., Scholte, P. 2015. Large-scale extinction of large carnivores (lion *Panthera leo*, cheetah *Acinonyx jubatus* and wild dog *Lycaon pictus*) in protected areas of West and Central Africa. Trop. Conserv. Sci. 8: 513–527.

Clarke, K.R. 1993. Non-parametric multivariate analysis of changes in community structure. Austral. J. Ecol. 18: 117-143.

Danquah, E., Oppong, S. 2014. Food plants of forest elephants and their availability in the Kakum Conservation Area, Ghana. Pachyderm 40: 52-56.

DGSCN. 2014. Quatrième Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat au Togo (Togo RGPH4 2010). Imprimerie d'Etat, Lomé, Togo.

Dudley, N. [editor] 2008. Lignes directrices pour l'application des catégories de gestion aux aires protégées. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Dudley, N., Stolton, S., Belokurov, A., Krueger, L., Lopoukhine, N., MacKinnon, K., Sandwith, T., Sekhran, N. [editors] 2010. Natural Solutions: Protected areas helping people cope with climate change, IUCNWCPA, TNC, UNDP, WCS, The World Bank and WWF, Gland, Switzerland, Washington DC and New York, USA.

Gami, N. 2000. Les activités humaines dans les terroirs coutumiers face aux plans d'aménagement des aires protégées: Le cas du Parc National d'Odzala (Congo-Brazzaville). Homme For. Trop. 467–476.

Grande-Vega, M., Farfan, M.A., Ondo, A., Fa, J.E. 2016. Decline in hunter offtake of blue duikers in Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea. African Journal of Ecology, 54, 49–58.

Grazia, B.-F. 1997. Gestion participative des aires protégées: l'adaptation au contexte. Sér. Sur Polit. Soc. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Gross, J., Watson, J., Woodley, S., Welling, L., Harmon, D. 2015. Responding to Climate Change: Guidance for protected area managers and planners. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Hammer, O. 2012. PAST – Paleontological Statistics, version 2.17. Reference Manual 1999-2012. PAST, Oslo.

Hanon, L., De Cannière, C., Lejoly, J. 2008. Potentialités de gestion concertée des espaces de végétation naturelle en périphérie du Parc National de Zakouma (Tchad). Thèse de doctorat, Université Libre de Bruxelles et Cirad. 198 p. + annexes.

Hausser, Y. 2013. Evaluation régionale des besoins et des formations disponibles pour les professionnels des aires protégées d'Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre. UICN/PACO, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

Heinen, J., Mehta, J. 2000. Emerging issues in legal and proceduralaspects of buffer zone management with case studies from Nepal. Journal of Environment and Development, 9, 45-67.

Hema, E.M., Ouattara, V., Parfait, G., Di Vittorio, M., Sirima, D., Dendi, D., Guenda, W., Petrozzi, F., Luiselli, L. 2017. Bushmeat consumption in the West African Sahel of Burkina Faso, and the decline of some consumed species. Oryx doi:10.1017/S0030605316001721.

Hema, E.M., Sirima, D., Niagabaré, B., Nama, N., Petrozzi, F., Di Vittorio, M., Guenda, W., Luiselli, L. 2018. Raiding or not raiding? A study of the ecological correlates of human-elephant conflict at Nazinga Game Ranch (Burkina Faso). Rev. Ecol. (Terre et Vie) 73: 3-11.

Hosonuma, N., Herold, M., De Sy, V., De Fries, R.S., Brockhaus, M., Verchot, L., Angelsen, A., Romijn, E. 2012. An assessment of deforestation and forest degradation drivers in developing countries. Environ. Res. Lett. 7, 044009.

Ly, I. 2001. Tendances d'évolution du droit de la faune et des aires protégées en Afrique occidentale. Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture (FAO), Rome, Italy.

Magurran, A.E. 1988. Ecological diversity and its measurement. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Manceron, S. 2011. Intervenir en périphérie pour la conservation des aires protégées: réexamen d'un postulat. La situation du Parc du W et des éleveurs mobiles. PhD Thesis, Université de Paris 10. Editions CIRAD, Nanterre, Paris.

Martino, D. 2001. Buffer zones around protected areas: A brief literature review. Electronic Green Journal 1(15): https://escholarship.org/uc/item/02n4v17n.

Mathevet, R., Thompson, J., Delanoë, O., Cheylan, M., Gil-Fourrier, C., Bonnin, M., Mathevet, R. et al. 2010. La solidarité écologique: un nouveau concept pour une gestion intégrée des parcs nationaux et des territoires. Nat. Sci. Sociétés 18, 424–433.

Mawdsley, J.R., O'malley, R., Ojima, D.S. 2009. A review of climate-change adaptation strategies for wildlife management and biodiversity conservation. Conserv. Biol. 23, 1080–1089.

Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres. 2008. Loi N°__ 2008 – 009 ____ Portant Code Forestier du Togo. Imprints of the Republique Togolaise, Lomé, Togo.

Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres. 2014. Strategie et plan d'action national pour la biodiversite du Togo SPANB 2011-2020. Imprints of the Republique Togolaise, Lomé, Togo.

Mwalyosi, R. 1991. Ecological evaluation for wildlife corridors and buffer zones for Lake Manyara National Park, Tanzania, and its immediate environment. Biological Conservation, 57, 171-186.

Nsonsi, F. 2017. Analyse de la vulnérabilite socioéconomique des agriculteurs dans les départements du Pool, des plateaux et de la Sangha (République du Congo). TraHs-Trayectorias Humanas Trascontinentales 1: 104-115.

Newmann, R. 1997. Primitive ideas: protected area buffer zones and the politics of land in Africa. Development and Change 28: 559-582.

Oksanen, J., Guillaume Blanchet, F., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G.L., Solymos, P.,, Stevens, M.H.H. and Wagner, H. 2010. ― Vegan: Community ecology package. Available at: http://vegan.r-forge.r-project.org/.

Parry, M., Canziani, O., Palutikof, J., van der Linden, P.J., Hanson, C.E. 2007. Climate change 2007: impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

Poisson, J. 2009. Impact de la gestion participative sur l'efficacité de conservation dans les parcs nationaux des pays sous-développés. Université de Sherbrooke.

Robin, A. 2007. Détection de changements et classification sous-pixelliques en imagerie satellitaire. Application au suivi temporel des surfaces continentales. (PhD Thesis). Université René Descartes-Paris V.

Sabi, B.L.I. 2015. Impact des feux de vegetation sur les services ecosystemiques dans la reserve de biosphere de la Pendjari au nord-Benin. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Abomey, Bénin.

Sayer, J. 1991. Rainforest buffer zones: Guidelines for protected area managers. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN-The World Conservation Union, Forest Conservation Programme.

Segniagbeto, G. H. 2009. *Herpétofaune du Togo: Taxinomie, Biogéographie*. Thèse de doctorat. Univ. Lomé (Togo) and MNHN Paris (France). Tome I : 1-172 and Tome II : 1-192.

Ségniagbeto, G. H., Assou, D., Koda, K. D. Agbessi, E. K. G., Dendi, D., Luiselli, L., Decher, J. and Mittermeier, R. A. 2017. Survey of the status and distribution of primates in Togo (West Africa). Biodiversity doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14888386.2017.1404930.

Shafer, C. 1999. US national park buffer zones: Historical, scientific, social, and legal aspects. Environmental Management, 23, 49-73.

Tchamie, T., K. 1994. Enseignements à tirer de l'hostilité des populations locales à l'égard des aires protégées au Togo. Unasylva 45, 22–27.

UICN/PACO. 2008. Evaluation de l'efficacité de la gestion des aires protégées : aires protégées du Togo. Ouagadougou, BF: UICN/PACO.

UICN/PACO. 2011. Retombées économiques des aires protégées d'Afrique de l'Ouest. Ouagadougou, BF: UICN/PACO.

UICN/PACO. 2012. Acteurs et gouvernance des aires protégées d'Afrique de l'Ouest : quelle contribution à la conservation ? Ouagadougou, BF: UICN/PACO.

Vujakovic, P. 1987. Monitoring extensive 'buffer zones' in Africa: An application for satellite imagery. Biological Conservation, 39, 195-208.

Wells, M., Brandon, K. 1992. People and parks: Linking protected area management with local communities. Washington, DC: World Bank; World Wildlife Fund; U. S. Agency for International Development.

Wells, M., Brandon, K. 1993. The principles and practice of buffer zones and local participation in biodiversity conservation. Ambio 22, 157- 162.

Wild, R., Mutebi, J. 1997. Bwindi impenetrable forest, Uganda: Conservation through collaborative management. Nature and Resources, 33(3-4), 33-51.

World Bank 2017, data available at : http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/togo/overview; last accessed : 30 december 2017).

Table 1 Description of the zones of ecological interest that were identified in the buffer zones of Fazao Malfakassa National Park

Zone	Area (ha)	Vegetation type	Potentiality of development
Zone 1	5 860	Woody savannah with dense forest islets	Elephants and primates (ecotourism)
Zone 2	20 034	Woody savannah with open forests	Elephants, Buffon's Kob, salt pans, permanent ponds and marshlands
Zone 3	19 400	Woody savanna with both open and dry dense forests	Forest patches with high potential for the production of non-timber forestry products, and ecotourism for primate observations
Zone 4	20 300	Wooded savannah with open forest and with islands of dense forest	Elephants, Buffon's Kob, salt pans, permanent ponds and marshlands

Table 2 Factors of the regression or stabilization of the agricultural front in the buffer zones of Fazao Malfakassa National Park, according to the local population answers. Numbers would indicate the percentage of respondents

	altered area	well-preserved area
Presence of mountains	35	49
culture destruction	33	30
repression by rangers	20	6
without opinion	12	3
lack of equipment	0	8
land availability	0	3

Table 3 List of the most hunted animals according to the interviewees' responses in both altered and well-preserved zones of the FMNP buffer zones. Numbers would indicate the number of citations received by each species.

Species	Altered zone	Well-preserved zone
Kobus kob	8	18
Tragelaphus scriptus	1	5
Syncerus caffer nanus	0	2
Philantomba walteri	4	12
Phacochoerus africanus	0	3
Mongooses	7	9
Genetta spp.	6	17
Phacochoerus africanus	0	3
Primates	26	20
Thryonomys swinderianus	62	32
Squirrels	29	8
Lepus spp	36	11
Francolins	25	14
Guinea fowls	22	16
Varanus niloticus	25	12

Table 4 List of the most used plant species for charcoal, firewood and non-timber forest product exploitation, according to the interviewees' responses in both altered and well-preserved zones of the FMNP buffer zones. Numbers would indicate the number of citations received by each species.

Species	Altered zone	Well-preserved zone
Charcoal		
Burkea africana	96	102
Lophira lanceolata	83	65
Detarium microcarpum	66	34
Erythrophleum suaveolens	26	53
Prosopis africana	25	38
Pterocarpus erinaceus	26	53
Vitellaria paradoxa	28	46
Terminalia spp	55	42
Without opinion	25	36
firewood		
Lophira lanceolata	67	59
Detarium microcarpum	52	37
Pterocarpus erinaceus	27	38
Terminalia spp	39	42
Combretum spp	29	27
Crossopteryx febrifuga	29	36
Without opinion	13	22
Non-timber forest products		
Parkia biglobossa	77	29
Vitellaria paradoxa	88	34
Pentadesma butyracea	4	28
Detarium senegalense	36	24

Figure 1 Map of the study area, the buffer zone of the Fazao-Malfakassa National Park (Togo, West Africa)



Figure 2 Resource exploitation practices, in relation to the state of conservation of the buffer zones of Fazao Malfakassa National Park, according to the local population answers (%).

Symbols : NTFP = non-timber forestry products



Figure 3 Factors of the evolution of the agricultural dynamics of the peripheral areas of Fazao Malfakassa National Park, according to the local population answers (%).



Appendix 1 List of the villages where the questionnaire surveys were carried out, including details of their geographic coordinates, their zone type (altered or well-preserved), and number of interviewed persons in each village

Village name	Longitude	Latitude	Zone type	No. of interviewees
Agbamassomou	0°36'34,3''E	8°37'53,86''N	Altered	12
Tassi	0°38'24,5''E	8°41'0,34''N	Altered	12
Gnabana	0°54'53,97''E	8°44'50,38''N	Altered	14
Melamboua	0°54'19,34''E	8°41'20,93''N	Altered	12
Fazao	0°46'14,05''E	8°41'37,88''N	Altered	22
Kagningbara	0°38'47,5''E	8°52'21,21''N	Altered	8
Kpawa	0°49'29,47''E	8°16'55,05''N	Altered	10
Tchatchakou	0°36'8,26''E	8°34'11,34''N	Altered	10
Mewedè	0°54'3,00''E	8°24'33,71''N	Altered	15
Hèzoudè	0°53'36,51''E	8°26'12,1''N	Altered	10
Kpeyi Solingo	0°52'12,95''E	8°32'10,55''N	Altered	10
Boulohou	0°40'13,03''E	8°46'30,94''N	Altered	15
Tchawari	0°59'7,07''E	8°49'15,58''N	Well-preserved	20
Folo	0°39'59,71''E	8°56'17,65''N	Well-preserved	12
Baghan	0°41'42,64''E	9°4'13,56''N	Well-preserved	22
Koui	0°43'24,36''E	8°15'38,16''N	Well-preserved	28
Elavagnon_todji	0°45'58,62''E	8°16'26,36''N	Well-preserved	10
Kpalou	0°44'40,65''E	9°10'2,32''N	Well-preserved	14
M'poti	0°46'39,33''E	8°14'17,02''N	Well-preserved	12
kalaré	1°2'43,26''E	8°52'1,53''N	Well-preserved	12
Lama Tessi	1°4'12,87''E	8°50'5,89''N	Well-preserved	12
Sakalaoudè	1°0'30,05''E	8°50'50,09''N	Well-preserved	8