

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Harold Goodwin & Rosa Santilli

gtz



Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Acknowledgments

This paper is based on research undertaken by Rosa Santilli¹ for her MSc in Responsible Tourism Management awarded by the University of Greenwich.

The support of the German Development Agency (GTZ) in part funding² this research and publication is gratefully acknowledged.

We are grateful to those who took the time to respond to our two surveys, without their contribution this report would not have been possible. When collecting the data reported here we undertook to publish only summarised results in the report and to maintain the anonymity of respondents.

This report has been published along with a confidential appendix which has been provided to the funder.

A copy of this report has been sent prior to publication to all the organisations reported here. There have been no amendments suggested or requested.

Acronyms

CBT Community-Based Tourism

¹ Santilli R (2008) Community-Based Tourism: an Assessment of the Factors for Success University of Greenwich unpublished.

² GTZ -4411/Lef Sector Project "Tourism and Sustainable Development" January 2007 Project No.: 03.2230.5-001.00

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Contents

1. Introduction.....	9
The importance of determining net benefits.....	10
What is community-based tourism?	11
This research.....	13
Research Objectives	14
2. Perceptions of success in CBT initiatives.....	16
Methodology	16
Results	16
Conclusions	21
3. Characteristics of projects identified by experts as “successful” examples of CBT.....	22
Methodology	22
Results: Relative Importance of “Success” Criteria	22
Conclusions	23
4. The Case Studies.....	24
Community-Based Tourism	24
Community Benefits.....	27
Collective Benefits	28
Local Economic Development Impacts.....	30
Sustainability: Commercial Viability	31
Social Capital and Empowerment	33
Conservation & Environment.....	35
Conclusion.....	36
Recommendations	36

TABLES

Table 1 Respondent Type	17
Table 2 Success Factor Clusters	18
Table 3 Frequency of Clusters by Category	19
Table 4 Category of Clusters by Frequency	19
Table 5 Ranked Success Categories	20
Table 6 Success Categories mentioned 1 st and 2 nd	20
Table 7 Success Categories mentioned 1 st , 2 nd and 3 rd	20
Table 8 Relative Importance of Criteria for Project Respondents.....	22
Table 9 Ranked Importance of Criteria for Project Respondents.....	22
Table 10 Ranked Importance of Criteria for Managers and Experts	23
Table 11 Descriptions of the 28 successful CBT projects identified by experts	24
Table 12 CBT Initiatives	27
Table 13 CBT projects: proportion of earnings going to the community as a whole.....	28
Table 14 Collective Benefits	28
Table 15 Local Economic Linkages of CBT Projects	30
Table 16 CBT Initiatives: Success and Viability.....	32
Table 17 Social Capital and Empowerment	33
Table 18 Conservation and Environment	35

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Executive Summary

Introduction

Community-based tourism has, for over three decades, been promoted as a means of development whereby the social, environmental and economic needs of local communities are met through the offering of a tourism product. However, whilst many projects have been funded in developing countries, their success (or otherwise) has not been widely monitored and, therefore, the actual benefits to local communities remain largely unquantified.

As alternatives to mainstream tourism ecotourism and CBT have such appeal that they are rarely subjected to critical review. There are very few studies of the actual contribution of either ecotourism or CBT to either conservation or community livelihood. However, despite very little demonstrable benefit the ideas remain attractive, largely because little effort has been made to record, measure or report the benefits accruing to conservation or local communities. This research was designed to address this question not by undertaking a study of failed initiatives but rather to seek to identify CBT successes and then to report the results.

Communities incur costs when they engage in CBT projects, they too have an interest in knowing how successful such initiatives are before engaging with NGOs and others to realise the aspiration of CBT. Will their engagement bring them net benefits? Will what they get from the initiative be larger than what they have to contribute? This report does not seek to answer that question on a case-by-case basis but it is an important question to be addressed by funders and communities considering engaging in CBT.

The community contributes time and labour – it's investment in the initiative. The time and labour of the community has value, these are often significant opportunity costs. For the poorest communities, engagement is prohibitive; they cannot afford to be distracted from subsistence activities. Without measuring the net benefits of the CBT initiative, income less the capital and recurrent costs, it is not possible to determine whether the community and individual households have benefited or been impoverished by the intervention.

There is evidence that the large majority of CBT initiatives enjoy very little success. Mitchell and Muckosy reported research by the Rainforest Alliance and Conservation International which reviewed 200 CBT projects across the Americas and which showed that many accommodation providers had only 5% occupancy. They concluded from their review that “the most likely outcome for a CBT initiative is collapse after funding dries up.” They reported that the main causes of collapse were poor market access and poor governance. In 2006 a survey of 150 CBT organisations by ResponsibleTravel.com and Conservation International revealed that 25 (16.6%) had a non-functioning email address of those 53 (35.3%) that did return a questionnaire only 27 (18%) qualified as CBT organisations. Again average bed occupancy was close to 5%.

There is insufficient rigour in the use of the concept of community-based tourism. The concept is used very flexibly. From a review of the academic literature it is clear that CBT is defined as tourism owned and/or managed by communities and intended to deliver wider community benefit, benefiting a wider group than those employed in the initiative. The large majority of community-based tourism initiatives are based on the development of community-owned and managed lodges or homestays, and that is reflected in the results of this survey.

The Research

Our approach was to ask practitioners how they would identify a successful CBT initiative, what criteria they would use; and then to approach those initiatives which had been defined as successful by funders, conservationists and development workers in order to identify their main characteristics and, so far as possible, to determine what had been achieved.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

This research project has identified and analysed examples of community-based tourism projects which were identified by funders, conservationists and development workers as successful, allowing them to define “successful” as they wished; and then to approach the “successful” initiatives to seek data on that success.

In the first stage of this research, practitioners were asked to nominate projects which they considered to be successful and to identify their criteria for success. These criteria were then analysed to establish (a) the most frequently mentioned criteria and (b) the relative importance of each criteria. Results revealed the most mentioned criteria for the success of CBT initiatives fell in the category of social capital and empowerment.

Expert Criteria for Success

There were 116 responses from the experts we asked to identify successful CBT projects and to tell us what criteria that had used. Social capital and empowerment was the most frequently cited criteria, mentioned by nearly 70% of respondents, only 40% of respondents mentioned anything which might be interpreted as referring to the importance of commercial viability, similar to the number mentioning conservation or environmental benefits. Given the prominence of collective benefits in the literature it was surprising that only 12% of respondents mentioned collective benefits as a reason for a CBT initiative being regarded as a success.

These results demonstrate that amongst informed respondents there is a very broad range of criteria which they use to identify an initiative as CBT. The two most significant criteria used in the academic definition are community ownership/management and community benefit. Only a quarter of respondents mentioned first social capital and empowerment and community ownership/management; although it was the most frequently first mentioned criteria. Only one respondent mentioned collective benefits first. There is a major gap between the academic definition of the concept and the way it is used by practitioners.

It is evident from the surveys that there is no agreement about the meaning of CBT and that whenever the words are used the meaning needs to be made clear. In the surveys undertaken for this research the concept of CBT has been used to describe projects and initiatives which have one of these characteristics:

- benefits going to individuals or households in the community
- collective benefits – creation of assets which are used by the community as a whole, roads, schools, clinics etc
- community benefits where there is a distribution of benefit to all households in the community
- conservation initiatives with community and collective benefits
- joint ventures with community and/or collective benefits, including an anticipated transfer of management.
- community owned and managed enterprises
- private sector enterprises with community benefits
- product networks developed for marketing tourism in a local area
- community enterprise within a broader co-operative
- private sector development within a community owned reserve

If in describing successful CBT projects and initiatives knowledgeable practitioners are not using the criteria used by academics (collective or community ownership/management and benefits) to define the concept where does that leave the definition? Clearly it has little utility in defining that class of initiatives which are regarded by practitioners as CBT successes.

There is a very marked disparity between the views of the experts nominating successful CBT projects and those managing the projects identified by the experts as successful. Neither the experts nor the managers place any importance on collective benefits, ranked 9th and 8th respectively. The experts place more importance on social capital (1st) and local economic development (2nd) than do the managers who rate them 4th and 9th respectively. It is not

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

surprising perhaps that the managers place considerably more emphasis on livelihood impacts (1st) than the more general local economic development (9th).

The CBT Initiatives

Survey data was received from 28 managers of projects identified by the experts as CBT projects. Of these only 15 can be categorised as CBT initiatives in the traditional meaning of the word, being community owned/managed and with some element of collective benefits. Five of the CBT case studies are from Asia, six are from Africa and four are from the Americas. Most of the CBT case studies provide accommodation and activities, although two provide only activities.

The data on community (collective benefits) demonstrates that this ranges between 5% and 100% of earnings; the quantity is a function of scale and success. It is important to note that very significant community (collective) earnings are generated by non-CBT projects, for example the Baltit Fort 60%, Manda Wilderness Lodge 30% and Yachana Lodge 60%. It is not the case that only CBT initiatives provide community benefits. The community benefits may be distributed in cash or more commonly as investments in community assets.

Only 5, one third of the initiatives, distribute a cash dividend to households. All but one of the initiatives has resulted in an improvement in community assets ranging from road improvements to classical music lessons.

There is a very wide range of different linkages between the projects and the local economy, these linkages are extremely difficult to quantify and to do so was beyond the resources of this research project. It has not been possible to determine whether or not CBT initiatives contribute more than the others, but this is very unlikely as the major determinant of impact is scale and economic sustainability.

Of the 15 CBT enterprises identified six can be considered, on the basis of the survey form completed, to be economically sustainable. Two of these are joint ventures: Ban Nong Khao in Thailand which provides activities and a volunteer programme, working very closely with a local tour operator; and Posada Amazonas in Peru, a joint venture between the local community and Rain Forest Expeditions.

The remaining four successful CBT projects are:

- Buhoma Village Walk, Uganda, provides an activity in a period of the day when visitors to the gorillas are otherwise at leisure - a complementary product.
- Kahawa Shamba, Tanzania - a very successful coffee farm visit, with lunch and an option of overnight accommodation for groups, partners closely with one overseas tour operators and supported by the Coffee Co-operative structure within which it sits
- Meket Community Tourism Project, Ethiopia - three community owned lodges and trekking between them, good links with tour operators
- Nambwa Campsite, Namibia - owned by a conservancy it provides pitches and some activities

Participation is crucial to the formation of CBT initiatives as defined in the literature and whilst it is encouraging that communities participated in the majority of the projects surveyed, there was little to suggest that this was in fact the level of participation that allows for community management, without which the basic premise of CBT is undermined. It was beyond the scope of the current study to enquire further into the forms of organisation and the extent to which there is effective community management. The responses to the survey are reported here to demonstrate their diversity.³

³ See Table 17 below

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Surprisingly, only 34% of the manager respondents mentioned conservation or positive environmental impacts as a factor leading to the success of their projects. There is no apparent correlation between successful CBT initiatives and particularly significant conservation or positive environmental impacts

Conclusion

This research identified and analysed examples of community-based tourism projects which were identified by funders, conservationists and development workers (the experts) as successful. The experts were allowed to define “successful” as they wished in order to ensure that as many initiatives as possible were identified. 116 successful initiatives were identified. It is clear from this part of the research that there is little consensus amongst the experts about the meaning of the concept, the concept should not be used undefined. Only 40% of respondents mentioned anything which might be interpreted as referring to the importance of commercial viability in assessing success.

In the next stage of the research the 116 “successful” initiatives were surveyed to seek data on that success. Of the 28 responses secured, 15 could be considered to be CBT in that they met the academic definition. Of these 6 CBT initiatives could be considered economically sustainable and two of these are joint ventures. It is disappointing that only 28 out of 116 “success stories” were able and willing to share those stories.

It is important to remember that this research purposefully used a very broad approach to identify CBT successes. Other evidence suggests that average bed occupancy achieved by CBT initiatives is around 5% and that this is unsustainable. The research has demonstrated that there are a number of initiatives which are not CBT which have demonstrated very considerable employment, local economic development and collective community benefits, for example Manda Wilderness (Mozambique), Aga Khan Development Network in Pakistan (Baltit and Shigar Forts) and Chumbe Island (Tanzania).

Recommendations:

1. Funders should expect managers to report on the outcomes of the initiatives and in particular on employment, local economic linkages, community economic benefits and economic sustainability. Where the initiative is claimed to be a CBT initiative detailed reports of the community’s engagement in the management should be required.
2. Initiatives need to be judged on their outcomes in creating local economic development and reducing poverty.
3. Funders should assure themselves that the initiative will find an adequate market to ensure economic sustainability before committing resources; it is clear from the figures on average occupancy that this is the major issue. Initiatives are being funded which do not find a market adequate to ensure their sustainability, strong market linkages are essential. Joint ventures are one of the ways of ensuring this. Private sector investments can also deliver significant employment and broader conservation and community benefits.
4. Donor dependency is common in CBT – nine of the 15 CBT projects identified in this research were still dependent upon, or seeking, donor funding. Some argue that five years is not long enough to secure sustainability and that it can take longer for a CBT project to prove itself. It seems more likely that these initiatives were ill-conceived from the outset.
5. There would be considerable value in a funder reviewing its CBT investments using a comparative approach to determine the degree of success and, with a more complete set of returns, to assess the preconditions for success.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

6. There are only two differences between CBT projects and conventional investments:
 - community level, collective benefits; increasing numbers of private sector investments have these benefits, they need to be measured and reported too. Data collected for this research suggests that private sector initiatives perform at least as well as, and in some instances better than, CBT initiatives. They should be assessed on the outcomes and donor funding considered against the outcomes;
 - there is a clear case for CBT being different from a private sector initiative in the empowerment of the community. The Bum Hill Community Campsite clearly demonstrates the way in which a CBT initiative can build social capital and empower a community – although this initiative is still not economically sustainable. The claims made for community empowerment by CBT initiatives cannot be taken at face value, the gains can be important and significant for communities but they need to be demonstrated and subject to critical review.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

1. Introduction

Community-based tourism projects (CBT) have, along with other integrated conservation and development schemes, gained popularity over the last three decades. These relatively recent methods of development are based on a participatory approach and ultimately emerged as a result of the failure of “top-down” approaches to both conservation and development which had been widely practised by both conservation and development organisations. Although such community-based projects varied in their methodologies, the common thread between them was in their linking environmental conservation and socio-economic development, most notably in and around protected areas. They work on the premise that in order for conservation and development projects to succeed local communities must be active participants and direct beneficiaries⁴.

Whilst such community-based tourism schemes have been widely adopted, many under the guise of ecotourism, their success (or otherwise) is something which has not been greatly researched. Indeed, there has been limited research into the effectiveness of using tourism to deliver economic development and conservation objectives. Moreover, there does not appear to be any data available on what criteria, factors or indicators are, or can be, used to determine the success of such projects or, indeed, what characteristics such projects share which could be used to inform decision makers in establishing future projects.

Recognising that the conservation of protected areas could not be achieved without the support of local communities conservation organisations have seen Community-Based Natural Resource Management as a significant part of conservation strategies since the 1970's. Zebu & Bush in 1990 produced clear survey evidence that national parks included engagement with local communities in their management strategies. Their survey revealed that tourism formed part of the management strategies in 75% of those national parks which returned data.⁵

Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) were the predominant form of the early initiatives. The ICDPs sought to use nature tourism to provide funds for protected area management and to generate income gains for local communities. In 1992 Wells & Brandon reviewed ICDPs and reported that the results had been disappointing, it was unusual for any additional revenues from tourism to be made available to local management, revenues were remitted to national treasuries; that it was “extremely rare for a revenue share to go to local communities”; and that local employment opportunities linked to tourism were “insufficient to attract much local popular support for the parks.”⁶ The lack of evidence of beneficial impacts did not dent the enthusiasm of funders and practitioners.

This period of optimism about the contribution of tourism to conservation and community development saw the rise of two forms of alternative tourism: ecotourism and community-based tourism (CBT) which were seen as superior alternatives to mainstream mass tourism. Wheeler put it most eloquently:

“The traveller is preferred to the tourist, the individual to the group, specialist operators rather than large firms, indigenous accommodation to multinational hotel chains, small not large – essentially good versus bad ... Perhaps the true situation is best expressed as the good guise versus the bad guys...”⁷

⁴ Mogelgaard, K, 2003, Helping People, Saving Biodiversity – An Overview of Integrated Approaches to Conservation and Development, Population Action International, USA:2

⁵ Zebu EH & Bush M L (1990) Park-People relationships: an international review in **Landscape and Urban Planning** 19 117-31

⁶ Wells M & Brandon K (1992) **People and Parks – Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities** World Bank Washington DC

⁷ Wheeler B (1992) Is progressive tourism appropriate? **Tourism Management** 13 104-5

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

As Scheyvens has argued the ultimate goal of community-based tourism is to empower the host community at four levels – economic, psychological, social and political.⁸ Brohman provides perhaps the most comprehensive definition of CBT:

“Community-based tourism development would seek to strengthen institutions designed to enhance local participation and promote the economic, social and cultural well-being of the popular majority. It would also seek to strike a balanced and harmonious approach to development that would stress considerations such as the compatibility of various forms of development with other components of the local economy; the quality of development, both culturally and environmentally; and the divergent needs, interests and potentials of the community and its inhabitants.”⁹

As alternatives to mainstream tourism ecotourism and CBT have such appeal that they are rarely subjected to critical review. There are very few studies of the actual contribution of either ecotourism or CBT to either conservation or community livelihood.¹⁰ However, despite very little demonstrable benefit the ideas remain attractive, largely because little effort has been made to record, measure or report the benefits accruing to conservation or local communities.

The importance of determining net benefits

In 2006 Goodwin asked whether “community-based tourism was failing to deliver?” Despite the interrogative, the question elicited antipathy.¹¹ Santilli’s research was designed to address this question not by undertaking a study of failed initiatives but rather to seek to identify CBT successes and then to report the results.

In 2008 Mitchell and Muckosy opined that many CBT projects in Latin America have failed and that a key cause of failure is the lack of financial viability, which they describe as “shocking”.¹² It may be objected that material livelihood benefits and economic sustainability are not important in assessing success or failure for CBT projects.¹³ However, many CBT projects involve a funded development agency partnering with a community to develop a lodge and they might reasonably be expected to want to know how successful such initiatives are. How, and to what extent, do they benefit communities?

Communities incur costs when they engage in CBT projects, they too have an interest in knowing how successful such initiatives are before engaging with NGOs and others to realise the aspiration of CBT. Will their engagement bring them net benefits? Will what they get from the initiative be larger than what they have to contribute? Scheyvens has pointed out that “communities rarely initiate tourism development without input from an external source”, for example an NGO, international conservation organisation or tour operator.¹⁴ The community contributes time and labour – it’s investment in the initiative. The time and labour of the

⁸ Scheyvens R (2002) Case Study: Ecotourism and Empowerment of Local Communities **Tourism Management 20 (2)** 59-62

⁹ Brohman, J, (1996) New Directions in Tourism for the Third World, **Annals of Tourism Research, 23(1):**48-70:60

¹⁰ Goodwin, H, Kent I, Parker K, Walpole, M (1998) [Tourism, Conservation and Sustainable Development](#) IIED; Goodwin, H (2000) Tourism, National Parks and Partnership in Butler R W and Boyd S W Tourism and National Parks: Issues and Implications, Wiley:245-262 ;Walpole M J, Goodwin H J (2001) Local attitudes towards conservation and tourism around Komodo National Park, Indonesia *Environmental Conservation* 28 (2):160-166; Goodwin H (2002) Local [Community Involvement in Tourism around National Parks: Opportunities and Constraints](#) in **Special Issue of Current Issues in Tourism 5(3&4)**

¹¹ Goodwin H (2006) [Community-based tourism: Failing to Deliver?](#) **ID21 Insights**, Issue #62

¹² Mitchell J & Muckosy P (2008) A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America *ODI Opinion* 102

¹³ See for example Chapter 7 Delivery and Re-Discovery in The Mountain Institute, (2000) **Community-Based Tourism for Conservation and Development: A Resource Kit**, The Mountain Institute www.mountain.org/docs/CBT-Kit-final-2003.pdf

¹⁴ Scheyvens R (2002) **Tourism for Development** Prentice Hall

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

community has value, there are often significant opportunity costs and for the poorest communities, engagement is prohibitive; they cannot afford to be distracted from subsistence activities. Without measuring the net benefits of the CBT initiative, income less the capital and recurrent costs, it is not possible to determine whether the community and individual households have benefited or been impoverished by the intervention.

Mitchell and Muckosy reported research by the Rainforest Alliance and Conservation International which reviewed 200 CBT projects across the Americas which showed that many accommodation providers had only 5% occupancy. The heavily subsidised Sicoya CBT project in Ecuador was reported to have generated only \$200-for the community fund in 1996, 80% of this was from tourism. By contrast the Zabalo initiative has good market access and in 1996 was reported to be making \$500 per community member per year, it has developed a co-operative structure.¹⁵ Mitchell and Muckosy concluded from their review that “the most likely outcome for a CBT initiative is collapse after funding dries up.” They reported that the main causes of collapse were poor market access and poor governance.¹⁶

What is community-based tourism?

As was argued above, CBT emerged as an alternative to mainstream tourism. Whilst CBT is largely dependent upon the same tourism infrastructure as mainstream tourism, particularly for transport, CBT is seen as an alternative and very few CBT initiatives are connected with the mainstream tourism industry, the market access of CBT projects is therefore generally poor.

Associated with this rejection of the market is a commitment to collective community benefit and community governance. Although research by Rainforest Alliance suggests that 40% of CBT projects in developing countries do not involve communities in decision-making, 60% do involve some form of community engagement in decision making.¹⁷ Mitchell and Muckosy associate this with the poor governance which they report as a characteristic of CBT.¹⁸

There is insufficient rigour in the use of the concept of community-based tourism. The concept is used flexibly. The Mountain Institute uses it very broadly to “describe a variety of activities that encourage and support a wide range of objectives in economic and social development and conservation.”¹⁹ The Thailand Community Based Tourism Institute defines CBT more rigorously as:

“tourism that takes environmental, social and cultural sustainability into account. It is managed and owned by the community, for the community, with the purpose of enabling visitors to increase their awareness and learn about the community and local ways of life.”²⁰

WWF defined it as a form of tourism “where the local community has substantial control over, and involvement in, its development and management, and a major proportion of the benefits remain within the community.” WWF accepted that the concept of community depends on local “social and institutional structures” and accepted that it “must also embrace individual initiatives within the community”.²¹

¹⁵ |Wood E (1998) **Meeting the global challenge of community participation in ecotourism: case studies and lessons from Ecuador** American Verde Working Paper 2 USAID & The Nature Conservancy available at www.parksinperil.org/files/d_4_c_comm_particip_ecotour_eng.pdf

¹⁶ Mitchell J & Muckosy P (2008) A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America ODI Opinion 102

¹⁷ Ibid

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ The Mountain Institute, (2000) **Community-Based Tourism for Conservation and Development: A Resource Kit**, The Mountain Institute: 1

²⁰ www.cbt-i.org accessed 10 Dec 2008

²¹ WWF International (2001) **Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development** WWF International

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Generally CBT projects provide collective benefits, for example through contributions to community funds for the development of community assets such as schools, clinics or grinding mills. CBT also creates opportunities for paid employment in the CBT enterprise and micro-enterprise sales. However, CBT is not so flexible as to include employment in tourism businesses unless they are communally owned and managed. The acceptable balance between individual initiatives and community benefits is constantly contested although generally not overtly. Mann defines community-based tourism so broadly that it appears to include almost all forms of tourism which involve community members and benefit them: “anything that involves genuine community participation and benefits.”²²

CBT can therefore be defined as tourism owned and/or managed by communities and intended to deliver wider community benefit.

The large majority of community-based tourism initiatives are based on the development of community-owned and managed lodges or homestays. La Yunga in Bolivia is one such initiative where NGOs encouraged the community to develop a lodge (see Box 1). The lodge has attracted only 60 visitors per year; a bed occupancy of 2.7%. The community subsequently developed a walking trail which in 2005 attracted 1000 people paying \$1.80 trail fee, grossing \$1800 plus guide fees and other purchases from the community. The example demonstrates that the common focus on accommodation is misplaced – the community benefited far more when it provided an activity, their initiative required a much smaller investment than the investment in the lodge and provided significantly larger benefits.

Box 1 : Case Study from La Yunga in Bolivia: Lodge or Footpath?

The La Yunga community is located near Santa Cruz, Bolivia, on the edge of the Amboró National Park. 250 Persons (37 families) live in this community, composed of local people and Bolivian migrants. The infrastructure is very basic; the village has just an elementary school and no medical station or telephone. The majority of the people are farmers.

The village itself can be reached by car or small bus throughout the year from Santa Cruz, Bolivia’s second largest city (three hours by car) or from Samaipata, a well-known domestic tourist spot (one hour).

In 2002, with financial and technical support from national and international NGOs, the community began the construction of a lodge which can provide accommodation for only six people but has a nice restaurant which seats 20. However, with 60 visitors per year, the lodge has a very low occupancy rate, and due to a lack of communication, organisation and reservation of bookings is rather complicated.

In 2003, the community completed the construction of a footpath which is surrounded by gigantic ferns and well integrated into the environment thanks to the natural resources used for its creation. People of all ages can easily walk along the footpath, the complete walk taking two to three and a half hours.

Domestic tourists pay an entrance fee of 10 boliviano (approx. US\$1.20) to the community; international tourists pay 15 boliviano (approx. US\$1.80). It is also possible to book a trained Spanish-speaking guide from La Yunga for US\$10. In 2005, around 1000 visitors walked along this footpath. While the community makes a direct income from the entrance fees and the guides, the tourists themselves do not spend more money or time in the village.

Nicole Häusler concluded that:

- instead of trying to find tourists to stay in the lodge, the main target group should be the day visitors who come to walk the trail;
- the restaurant should offer a lunch or snacks to the visitors, especially at weekends;
- the two bedrooms in the lodge should be redesigned as an “Interpretation Centre” and “Souvenir Shop” where the tourists would have the possibility to learn more about the region and buy the excellent, locally produced liquor and medical plants;
- if the tourists would like to stay there, several tents, a shower and a bathroom would be available.

²² Mann M (2000) **The Community Tourism Guide** Earthscan: 18

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

So, rather than wasting all their efforts, hopes, and time on the lodge, the villagers would be better advised to invest all the marketing efforts in the footpath and the additional products which can be easily offered to the walk-in tourists, such as local meals, beverages, souvenirs, and medical plants.

Source: Nicole Häusler ICRT Germany

Candirejo in Indonesia (see Box 2 below) presents an example where the focus was from the beginning on accommodation, transport and food. The diversified approach resulted in the creation of more employment.

Box 2 : Candirejo Village in Central Java

Candirejo Village is located near the Borobudur temple in Central Java. In 2002 there were only 10 home stays, 5 local transports and no local restaurants. As there are large numbers of tourists in the area it was decided to develop a whole series of small businesses. By 2004, there were 22 home stays, 22 local transports (Andong – local horse-drawn carts) and 6 warungs (local restaurants). All the poor people in this area have the potential to be involved full time or part time in the tourism sector through the Koperasi (co-operative).

All the income and profit are shared (entrance fees, handicraft sales, accommodation services, meals, etc.) and others organised in the local economic enterprises (Koperasi) through the tourism cooperative. The revenue is being used to maintain and improve village hygiene, the environment and facilities and ensure the equitable distribution of benefits to all community members.

63 jobs have been created and the community is now significantly better off. There was no collective community income before the village was established as a tourism village.

Source: WTO (2006) *Poverty Alleviation through Tourism A Compilation of Good Practices* WTO

Hitchins and Highstead in their critical review of the Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)²³ point to the isolation of CBT from the private sector in Namibia and the dependency on development aid which has been created by donors, concluding that “only a small number of members can be expected to survive as ongoing independent businesses in the medium to long-term.”²⁴ What distinguished sustainable development from charity is the ability of the CBT enterprise to become self-sufficient and sustainable. Too often a supported CBT enterprise is seen as having a social and educational function rather than a commercial business.”²⁵

Hitchins and Highstead report that there are only a small number of successful CBT enterprises, “usually in prime areas, with good proximity to established tourism routes and links to the private sector”²⁶ and they conclude that the most successful CBT enterprises have been those with the narrower ownership structures, which as they point out is consistent with learning from work on enterprise development.²⁷ They report that in Namibia there appears to have been no attempts to undertake cost-benefit analyses of interventions or to measure the impact, if any, on livelihoods and poverty reduction;²⁸ and they point out that “these omissions are an obstacle to learning, objective decision-making and improved practice.”²⁹

This research

This research project, undertaken by Rosa Santilli as part of her MSc at Greenwich University, analysed examples of community-based tourism projects which were identified by funders, conservationists and development workers as successful, allowing them to define “successful” as they wished; and then to approach the “successful” initiatives to seek data on that success.

²³ Hitchins R and Highstead J (2005) *Community Based Tourism in Namibia* ComMark Trust Johannesburg

²⁴ Ibid 12

²⁵ Hitchins and Highstead make a similar point *ibid.* 18

²⁶ *ibid.* 17

²⁷ *Ibid* 23

²⁸ *ibid.* 18

²⁹ *Ibid* 23

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Our approach was to ask practitioners how they would identify a successful CBT initiative, what criteria they would use; and then to approach those initiatives which had been defined as successful by funders, conservationists and development workers in order to identify their main characteristics and, so far as possible, to determine what had been achieved.

By adopting this approach we were consciously choosing to allow the funders, conservationists and development workers to define what constitutes a CBT initiative and what constitutes success. Our approach was inclusive and permissive. We sought examples of successful initiatives as defined by influential practitioners rather than by academics.

In choosing this approach we sought to avoid researcher bias and the tendency only to approach and research examples where there is a strong likelihood of securing good data. This results in substantial research bias with a focus on successful projects, as defined by the researcher, and those with available data.

There are however risks inherent in this approach. There is no guarantee at the outset that data will be available for those initiatives identified as a success by the key informants, in this case the funders, conservationists and development workers. However, the lack of availability of data may in itself be indicative.

In 2006 ResponsibleTravel.com, an on-line travel agency³⁰, collaborated with Conservation International to identify CBT projects with which they could work to improve their marketing. Through a combination of desk research, recommendations and direct contact from CBT projects that had received information about the programme via Conservation International, responsibletravel.com or world media, they identified 150 CBT organisations.³¹

Of the 150 CBT organisations identified 25 (16.6%) had a non-functioning email address, a further 72 (48%) did not return a questionnaire. Of those 53 (35.3%) that did return a questionnaire only 27 (18%) qualified as CBT organisations, defined for the purpose of the Conservation International/ResponsibleTravel.com project as projects owned by the community, where the community had a claim on the land or business. The majority of the enterprises which responded were already working with tour operators, in itself a significant finding. Although one CBT enterprise had 95% bed occupancy, the average was close to 5%.³²

The Conservation International/ResponsibleTravel.com project demonstrated both the small number of viable CBT projects and their relative lack of success: “The jury is still out on whether community based tourism can actually be profitable enough to create sustainable lifestyles, and so support conservation and local economic development.”³³

Research Objectives

The purpose of this research was to address two closely related issues:

1. What are the criteria for success which are used by funders, conservationists and development workers in assessing the relative success of projects?
2. How do projects identified as successful by funders, conservationists and development workers measure up against their criteria for success and what are the common characteristics of successful projects?

The objectives were to:

³⁰ www.responsibletravel.com

³¹ See www.responsibletravel.com/copy/Copy100814.htm accessed 12 December 2008

³² Ibid

³³ www.responsibletravel.com/copy/copy901178.htm accessed 12 December 2008

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

1. identify initiatives judged to be successful by funders, conservationists and development workers;
2. determine the criteria which they used to identify successful initiatives; and
3. determine how and to what extent projects identified as successful by funders, conservationists and development workers measure up against their criteria for success and to identify the common characteristics of successful projects.

The research was undertaken in two parts. The first part of the research focused on identifying projects which practitioners regarded as being a success and understanding why they were seen as successful. The second part of the research sought to collect some comparative information about nominated projects and the reasons for their success. The first stage of the research is reported and discussed in §2, perceptions of success in CBT initiatives; and in §3 characteristics of “successful” CBT projects are discussed, the successful initiatives being those identified by practitioners in the first stage of the research.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

2. Perceptions of success in CBT initiatives

Methodology

Our purpose in the first stage of the research was to identify initiatives which are regarded as successful by funders, conservationists and development workers; and the reasons why they are seen as successful by those respondents.

The first part of the research was conducted via email. A list of key informants was obtained from three sources, namely Harold Goodwin, Director - The International Centre for Responsible Tourism; Dr Matthew Walpole – Fauna and Flora International; and Giulia Carbone – Business and Biodiversity Programme Manager at the IUCN. Approximately 750 emails were distributed to the key informants who were practitioners in the tourism, conservation and development fields. From the 750 emails sent, 134 responses were received, which gives a response rate of 18%.

The initial email invited practitioners to identify examples of CBT initiatives which they considered to be successful. They were asked to nominate and provide full details (name of initiative, name of implementing organisation/manager, country, and contact details) of any successful CBT projects that they were currently involved with or were aware of, and comment on why the project was successful and what factors had led to this success.

The information requested in the first part of the research was deliberately open, allowing the respondent to provide their view as to why a particular project was successful. The aim of this was to ensure that the questions did not prompt a particular response. We were deliberately not prescriptive. We did not define success in order that respondents were free to use their own definition, to exercise their own professional judgment and to tell us what criteria they had used.

The questions posed were very open, see Box 3 below.

Box 3 : Invitation to nominate successful initiatives

“We are inviting you to identify for us examples of Community based tourism projects which you consider to have been successful. We are undertaking this research to identify:

- CBT initiatives which are considered successful by funders, academics, NGO's, consultants, conservation organizations and conservationists and the tourism industry.
- the factors that you consider have contributed to make these projects successful.

In this first round of the research we are interested in identifying projects which practitioners regard as being a success and understanding why they are seen as successful.”

“...we would be grateful if you could nominate and provide full details of any successful CBT projects that you are currently involved with or are aware of and comment on why the project is successful, what factors have led to this success and what indicators have been used in determining this success.”

Results

Of the 134 respondents, 116 gave sufficient information on the success factors used to identify their nominated project to be included in this first round of research. Table 1 shows the split in respondent type:

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Table 1 : Respondent Type

Respondent Type	Respondent Number	%
Conservation	18	13.4
Tourism	103	76.9
Tourism and Conservation	13	9.7
Total	134	100

We do not know whether or not one of the constraints on the number of responses was that those asked did not know of any successful initiatives. A negative response was not sought because the publication of the initial announcement³⁴ had resulted in some negative feedback and it was essential that the research was presented in a positive light in order to encourage responses. The research was framed positively in order to ensure that we did not cause non-participation by being dismissed as being anti-CBT.

Although there was some overlap in the lists of professional contacts provided for the first round of the survey there was a large and broad initial sample reflecting the divergent backgrounds of Goodwin, Walpole and Carbone. In common with all surveys which rely on self-completion there is a degree of self-selection amongst the respondents and it cannot be claimed with certainty that this group is necessarily representative of the broader population, nor that the initial population was necessarily representative of all those who might have a professional view about CBT. This is nonetheless a very divergent group of professionals involved with CBT.

The decision to use open questions enabled respondents to report freely on the criteria they had used in nominating particular initiatives as successful. In analysing the results of the open invitation to respondents to provide a “brief statement of why you regard [the nominated initiative] as a success” for reporting it was necessary to cluster the responses.

Table 2 records the range of reasons provided by the respondents and the way in which they were clustered in 10 categories for the purposes of this research. The clusters which resulted from the categorisation in Table 2 were then used to analyse the prevalence of particular reasons. Open questions result in untidy data but more reliably reflect the spread and nuanced thinking of respondents.

³⁴ Goodwin H (2006) [Community-based tourism: Failing to Deliver?](#) ID21 Insights, Issue #62

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Table 2 : Success Factor Clusters

A Improved Livelihoods / Standard of Living	B Local Economic Development	C Commercial Viability	D Collective Benefits	E Social Capital and Empowerment
Employment	Economic Development / Benefits	Profitable	Ability to fund social/other projects/products	Equal Opportunities
Increased livelihood options	Use of local products/reduce leakage	Commercially Functional	Regeneration /Infrastructure Development	Empowerment/Decision Making/Capacity Building
Establishment of micro-enterprises	Rural Development	Longevity of project		Local community management/ownership/leadership/governance
Poverty alleviation	Stakeholder partnerships / linkages	Sound business/project plan		Participation
Improved standard of living		Innovative/Good Product		Local community working together /compromise /interest
Income/Revenue generation		Growth /Opportunity for Growth		Minimal Impact on Community
		Sustainable		
		Increased/High Visitation		
		Achieved With Minimal Donor Intervention /Funding		
F Sense of Place	G Education	H Conservation & Environment	I Tourism	J Other
Cultural revitalisation / conservation	Education/Training/ Using Local Skills	Conservation - Environment/ Heritage	Tourist Experience (improved/ authentic)	Triggered replication of other projects
Raised community/tourist awareness of cultural/natural heritage & environmental issues		Sustainable Technologies/Use of Resources	Raised awareness of destination	Allowed sufficient time for project
Instilled sense of place/pride		Environmental Policies/Standards	Award Winner	Funding/investment
		Environmental Monitoring/Management		

N=116

Table 3 presents the frequency of clusters and Table 4 presents the clusters in order of frequency. There were 425 “reasons” cited by 116 respondents, on average each respondent gave 3.6 “reasons”.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Table 3 : Frequency of Clusters by Category

Category	Category Description	Frequency
A	Improved Livelihoods / Standard of Living	78
B	Local Economic Development	68
C	Commercial Viability	47
D	Collective Benefits	14
E	Social Capital and Empowerment	81
F	Sense of Place	26
G	Education	34
H	Conservation/Environment	46
I	Tourism	18
J	Other	13
Total		425

N=116

Table 4 : Category of Clusters by Frequency

Category	Category Description	Frequency	%
E	Social Capital and Empowerment	81	69.8
A	Improved Livelihoods / Standard of Living	78	67.2
B	Local Economic Development	68	58.6
C	Commercial Viability	47	40.5
H	Conservation/Environment	46	39.7
G	Education	34	29.3
F	Sense of Place	26	22.4
I	Tourism	18	15.5
D	Collective Benefits	14	12.1
J	Other	13	11.2
Total		425	

N=116

Social capital and empowerment (A) was the most frequently cited category mentioned by nearly 70% of respondents, only 40% of respondents mentioned anything which might be interpreted as referring to the importance of commercial viability, although this was very close to the number mentioning conservation or environmental benefits. Given the prominence of collective benefits in the literature it was surprising that only 12% of respondents mentioned collective benefits as a reason for a CBT initiative being a success.

The distinction between category A Improved Livelihoods and category B Local Economic Development is significant, the former refer to individual and household outcomes and the latter refers to a more general economic impact.

Table 5 “Ranked Success Categories” presents the same clusters reporting the prominence of the reason by respondent. For example, only one respondent placed collective benefits first, five placed it second. Only 12 respondents mentioned livelihoods first.

If we look only at first mentions then 30 (26%) respondents mention social capital and empowerment, 24 (21%) local economic development, 20 commercial viability and only 12 livelihoods, one more than mention conservation or environmental benefits. Only 1 mentioned collective benefits.

These results demonstrate that amongst informed respondents there is a very broad range of criteria which identify an initiative as CBT. Of the two most significant criteria used in the academic definition, community ownership and community benefit, only a quarter of respondents mentioned social capital and empowerment, although it was the most frequently first mentioned criteria. Only 1 respondent mentioned the other most frequently used academic criteria – collective benefits, suggesting that there is a major gap between the academic definition of the concept and the way it is used by practitioners.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Table 5 : Ranked Success Categories

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	
Social Capital and Empowerment	30	23	11	8	3	2	2	1	0	1	81
Livelihoods	12	18	20	14	4	6	2	1	1	0	78
Local Economic Development	24	16	16	6	2	3	0	0	0	1	68
Commercial Viability	20	6	6	3	6	3	2	0	1	0	47
Conservation/Environment	11	15	8	2	5	3	1	1	0	0	46
Education	7	11	2	5	3	4	2	0	0	0	34
Sense of Place	6	4	2	5	5	2	0	1	1	0	26
Tourism	3	3	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	18
Collective Benefits	1	5	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	14
Other	2	2	4	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	13

N=116

Table 6 (below) presents the same data focussing on the first two success categories mentioned. 45.7% of respondents mentioned social capital and empowerment first or second, local economic development was mentioned 1st or 2nd by one third of respondents, and a quarter mentioned livelihoods. Just over a fifth mentioned commercial viability 1st or 2nd and about one respondent in twenty mentioned collective benefits 1st or 2nd.

Table 7 (below) presents the same data focussing on the first three categories mentioned by respondents. Given that the average number of reasons given was 3.6 it is reasonable to consider the distribution of opinion based on the first three reasons given. Although the inclusion of the third reasons makes no difference to the hierarchy of reasons, it is striking that less than 7% of respondents mention collective benefits and only 27.6% mention commercial viability amongst their first three reasons identifying the initiative as a success.

Table 6 : Success Categories mentioned 1st and 2nd

	1st	2nd	Σ	%
Social Capital and Empowerment	30	23	53	45.7
Local Economic Development	24	16	40	34.5
Livelihoods	12	18	30	25.9
Conservation/Environment	11	15	26	22.4
Commercial Viability	20	6	26	22.4
Education	7	11	18	15.5
Sense of Place	6	4	10	8.6
Tourism	3	3	6	5.2
Collective Benefits	1	5	6	5.2
Other	2	2	4	3.4

% is sum out of 116

Table 7 : Success Categories mentioned 1st, 2nd and 3rd

	1st	2nd	3rd	Σ	%
Social Capital and Empowerment	30	23	11	64	55.2
Local Economic Development	24	16	16	56	48.3
Livelihoods	12	18	20	50	43.1
Conservation/Environment	11	15	8	34	29.3
Commercial Viability	20	6	6	32	27.6
Education	7	11	2	20	17.2
Sense of Place	6	4	2	12	10.3
Tourism	3	3	5	11	9.5
Collective Benefits	1	5	2	8	6.9
Other	2	2	4	8	6.9

% is sum out of 116

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Conclusions

There are a wide range of reasons given for identifying particular CBT initiatives as successful. The five main reasons given for initiatives being regarded as successful are Social Capital and Empowerment, Local Economic Development, Livelihoods, Conservation/Environment and Commercial Viability.

- **Social Capital and Empowerment**

This is the most frequently cited reason for a CBT initiative being identified as a success. $\pm 70\%$ of respondents cited this as a reason and a quarter of respondents cited this first. This suggests that for a significant number of respondents the social impacts are of primary importance. SNV's review of CBT projects in Botswana suggested that community empowerment can be considered the most important benefit of CBT.³⁵

- **Conservation/Environment**

Conservation and environment reasons were given by $\pm 40\%$ of respondents and $\pm 30\%$ of respondents mentioned this reason first. This reflects perhaps the relatively small number of conservationists who responded to the survey, it does suggest that the conservation "history" of CBT still influences perceptions of it.

- **Improved Livelihoods and Standard of Living**

Improved livelihoods and standard of living reasons were given by 67% of respondents of whom one in ten gave this as their first reason.

- **Local Economic Development**

Local economic development cited by 58%, differs from livelihoods being less focussed on individuals and households and more focussed on broad local economic effects. Twice as many respondents cited local economic development impacts (24) as their first reason for regarding a CBT initiative as a success as did livelihood impacts (12).

- **Commercial Viability**

As might reasonably have been expected from the literature and case studies this is only mentioned as a first reason by 17% of respondents and by 40% of all respondents.

- **Collective Benefits**

Collective benefits are generally identified in the literature and by practitioners as central to the concept of CBT. Only 14 respondents (12%) cited collective benefits as a reason for a CBT initiative being regarded as successful. Only one person cited it as their first reason. The one person who cited this as their first reason gave no other reasons indicating its primacy for them.

It may be legitimately countered that other social benefits are accorded prominence, 81 respondents (69.8%) cited social capital and empowerment as a reason for identifying a CBT project as a success; 34 (29.3%) cited education and 26 (22.4%) cited "sense of place" reasons. Whilst these are all reasons which attribute importance to social benefits, only 33 participants (28%) gave a "social" reason first compared with 56 (48%) who gave an economic reason first (local economic development, commercial viability or livelihoods), if collective benefits are added this increases to 57 (49%).

If, in describing successful CBT projects and initiatives, knowledgeable practitioners are not using the criteria used by academics to define the concept where does that leave the definition? Clearly it has little utility in defining that class of initiatives which are regarded by practitioners as CBT successes.

³⁵ SNV Netherlands Development Organisation, 2001, Community-Based Tourism in Botswana, The SNV experience in three community-tourism projects, SNV:61 available at www.snvworld.org/irj/go/km/docs/SNVdocuments/community%20based%20tourism%20in%20Botswana.pdf

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

3. Characteristics of projects identified by experts as “successful” examples of CBT

Having determined the criteria used to identify successful CBT projects the next stage of the research was to look in more detail at the projects nominated by participants in the first part of the research.

Methodology

There were 139 nominations made by participants in the first round of the research, for 6 it was not possible to secure adequate contact details which meant that it was possible to send out 133 surveys. These were followed-up and chased twice but only 28 completed surveys were received, a response rate of 21%. The survey form was 9 sides of A4 and although the survey was simplified by requiring participants merely to tick boxes, the length of the survey may have deterred potential respondents.

Results: Relative Importance of “Success” Criteria

Each respondent from the initiatives was asked to use a Likert scale to rate the relative importance of the characteristics identified in the first stage of the research. The index suggests that those involved in managing the initiatives place a higher importance on livelihoods, tourism and commercial viability, and were prompted on the issue of managing negative impacts. In these responses there is relatively little difference between the economic and social criteria for success, but collective benefits were again scored very low.

Table 8 : Relative Importance of Criteria for Project Respondents

Category	Category Description	1	2	3	4	5	Index
A	Improved Livelihoods / Standard of Living	1	0	3	6	16	4.4
B	Local Economic Development	1	2	8	8	8	3.7
C	Commercial Viability	1	2	2	9	13	4.1
D	Collective Benefits	1	2	6	8	10	3.9
E	Social Capital and Empowerment	1	2	2	7	15	4.2
F	Sense of Place	1	0	7	4	14	4.2
G	Education	1	0	6	9	11	4.1
H	Conservation/Environment	1	1	4	5	16	4.3
I	Tourism	1	2	1	6	17	4.3
J	Managing Negative Impacts	1	0	8	9	9	3.9

Likert Scale (index created by multiplying each score by the header and dividing by number of responses.

1 - not necessary

2 - relatively unimportant

3 - necessary

4 - important

5 - very important

Table 9 :Ranked Importance of Criteria for Project Respondents

Category	Category Description	1	2	3	4	5	Index
A	Improved Livelihoods / Standard of Living	1	0	3	6	16	4.4
H	Conservation/Environment	1	1	4	5	16	4.3
I	Tourism	1	2	1	6	17	4.3
E	Social Capital and Empowerment	1	2	2	7	15	4.2
F	Sense of Place	1	0	7	4	14	4.2
C	Commercial Viability	1	2	2	9	13	4.1
G	Education	1	0	6	9	11	4.1
D	Collective Benefits	1	2	6	8	10	3.9
	Managing Negative Impacts	1	0	8	9	9	3.9
B	Local Economic Development	1	2	8	8	8	3.7

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

CBT managers rank social capital and empowerment 4th and collective benefits 8th, there is little to choose between the two criteria ranked as of most importance, improved livelihoods and conservation.

Conclusions

There is a very marked disparity between the views of the experts nominating successful CBT projects and those managing the projects identified by the experts as successful.

Table 10 : Ranked Importance of Criteria for Managers and Experts

Category	Category Description	Managers	Experts
A	Improved Livelihoods / Standard of Living	1.	3
H	Conservation/Environment	2.	4
I	Tourism	3.	8
E	Social Capital and Empowerment	4.	1
F	Sense of Place	5.	7
C	Commercial Viability	6.	5
G	Education	7.	6
D	Collective Benefits	8.	9
B	Local Economic Development	9.	2

Expert views based on top 2 choices as I Table 6 above

Neither the experts nor the managers place any importance on collective benefits, ranked 9th and 8th respectively. The experts place more importance on social capital (1st) and local economic development (2nd) than do the managers who rate them 4th and 9th respectively. It is not surprising perhaps that the managers place considerably more emphasis on livelihood impacts (1st) than the more general local economic development 9th.

It is evident from the surveys that there is no agreement about the meaning of CBT and that whenever the words are used the meaning needs to be made clear. In the surveys undertaken for this research the concept of CBT has been used to describe projects and initiatives which have some of these characteristics:

- benefits going to individuals or households in the community
- collective benefits – creation of assets which are used by the community as a whole, roads, schools, clinics etc
- community benefits where there is a distribution of benefit to all households in the community
- conservation initiatives with community and collective benefits
- joint ventures with community and/or collective benefits, including an anticipated transfer of management
- community owned and managed enterprises
- private sector enterprises with community benefits
- product networks developed for marketing tourism in a local area
- community enterprise within a broader co-operative
- private sector development within a community owned reserve

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

4. The Case Studies

The data presented here is from the survey forms returned by the nominated CBT projects as at October 2007.

Community-Based Tourism

Table 11 below presents a description of each of the 28 projects which were identified as successful CBT initiatives by the experts.

Of these only 15 can be categorised as CBT initiatives in the traditional meaning of the word, being community owned and with some element of collective benefits.

Table 12 presents the 15 projects which can be considered CBT initiatives, the reasons for excluding the other 13 nominated initiatives are provided in Table 11. Five of the CBT case studies are from Asia, six are from Africa and four are from the Americas. Most of the CBT case studies provide accommodation and activities, although two provide only activities

Table 11 : Descriptions of the 28 successful CBT projects identified by experts

Project Name:	CBT?
Andaman Discoveries, Thailand Laemson National Park www.andamandiscoveries.com Opened 2006 Andaman Discoveries in an initiative which grew out of an NGO Tsunami relief programme (the North Andaman Tsunami Relief Programme) and is an initiative which supports and promotes CBT and organises tours, workshops and volunteer placements to various CBT projects. Tourism products offered include accommodation, guiding, excursions, activities, transport, cultural heritage and the sale of meals and crafts. Visitor, education and training centres also exist and there are good transportation links.	Yes NGO led
Baltit Fort, Hunza Valley Pakistan http://baltitfort.org/ Opened 1996 Baltit Fort is an Aga Khan Development Network cultural heritage restoration project and is operated and maintained by the Baltit Heritage Trust. The Fort's restoration was undertaken by the Aga Khan Trust for Culture in Geneva in association with the Aga Khan Cultural Service Pakistan and was supported by Getty Grant Program (USA), NORAD (Norway) and the French Government. The Fort lies at the heart of a community heavily engaged in tourism and is a major tourism attraction.	No Cultural Heritage initiative with community benefits
Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism Kanchanaburi, Thailand Opened 1998 Initiative which provides activities, including performance, and an opportunity to purchase crafts and souvenirs. Provides meals and there is also a folk museum. Also has a volunteer programme. Has successfully engaged with local tour operator.	Yes
Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project (BECTP), Tanahun District Nepal http://www.bandipur tourism.com/contact_us.php Opened 2005 Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project is an EC/Asia Urbs funded partnership project in conjunction with two European cities – the Municipality of Hydra in Greece and Comune di Riomaggiore in Italy. Its aim is to develop the potentials of Bandipur as a sustainable eco-cultural tourist destination. They offer accommodation, guiding, excursions, activities with cultural and natural heritage. There is also a visitor's centre and food available to purchase.	Survey mentioned project would be community owned in 2007
Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise Bwindi Impenetrable NP Uganda Opened 2002 Initiative instigated by the community living in and around the Bwindi Impenetrable NP. The initiative is based around a three hour walk designed to be taken during the afternoon when camp site guests have no programme following their gorilla tracking in the morning. The initiative includes a handicraft workshop, waterfall, tea plantations, traditional healer and various other activities. First CBT initiative to be set up in Uganda	Yes

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

<p>Bum Hill Community Campsite Caprivi, Namibia Opened 2004 A community campsite, part of the Kwando Conservancy. Members of the community run the campsite and all the proceeds from the camp are used for the benefit of the community and conservation. Bookable through NACOBTA.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Casa Machiguenga, Manu National Park, Peru Opened 1998 A 24 bed jungle lodge which was established and is run by native Matsigenka Amerindians from two communities located in the Manu National Park. As well as providing accommodation, the lodge caters provides “cultural experiences” and hosts an ethno-botany course every summer.</p>	<p>Yes Lodge built by, owned and managed by the community</p>
<p>Cerro Escondido, Karen Mogensen Reserve Puntarenas, Costa Rica Opened 2000 A 16 bed lodge (B&B and campsite) located in the Karen Morgensen Reserve National Wildlife Refuge. The lodge organises tours to local villages, hikes in the forest and other “natural” areas as well as activities – mountain climbing, bird-watching etc.</p>	<p>Yes Lodge built by, owned and managed by the community</p>
<p>Chumbe Island Coral Park Ltd. (CHICOP) Zanzibar/Tanzania www.chumbeisland.com Opened 1998 Forest reserve and reef sanctuary with accommodation and activities (all-inclusive). The Government of Zanzibar declared the area a closed forest in 1994, and the management was entrusted to Chumbe Island Coral Park Ltd. (CHICOP). This Project is managed in collaboration between Chumbe Island Coral Park (CHICOP) and The Wildlife Division of The Department of Commercial Crops, Fruits and Forestry (formally the Commission for Natural Resources) within the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environment and Co-operatives of Zanzibar.</p>	<p>No – private enterprise resort</p>
<p>Covane Community Lodge Limpopo National Park, Mozambique Opened 2004 Community initiative – lodge and campsite – planned in cooperation with HELVETAS, a Swiss organization assisting with rural development. The Lodge was built by the local Canhane Community, with guidance from a locally elected steering committee. The Lodge offers traditional dancing, food, arts and crafts and tours with local experts on plants, medicines and local stories, as well as various activities, such as boat trips, walking trails and bike hire.</p>	<p>Yes Lodge managed by the community – ownership will eventually be passed to the community</p>
<p>De Heart uh Barbados® - Heritage Celebration, Barbados St. Thomas http://www.heritage.gov.bb/dhub_whatisit.html Started 1999 A “brand” was developed to highlight the central highlands of St. Thomas and St. Joseph on Barbados and its tourism potential, particularly to create livelihood options for local communities. Attraction owners, volunteers, communities and government bodies involved in establishing the brand and implementing sustainable practices and management strategies – the main focus being on the proposed classification of the national park.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development Xuan Thuy National Park Vietnam Opened 2006 A community-based ecotourism project in the Giao Xuan community in the buffer zone of the Xuan Thuy National Park. The project’s overall objective is to “strengthen capacity for community and other relevant bodies through developing an eco-tourism model in Giao Xuan Commune”. Initiative 24bed home-stay accommodation, which is sold via local tour operators.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Amazon Headwaters with the Huaorani, Yasuni National Park Ecudaor www.huaorani.com Commenced 1994, lodge open in 2008 Ec lodge developed by the Ecotourism Association of Quehueri’ono representing five communities on the upper Shripuno River in conjunction with Tropic - Journeys in Nature – a local tour operator. The ten bed lodge offers an accommodation and activity package. Tropic facilitates the sales, marketing and management of the venture until such time as the Huaorani choose and are able to take over all aspects the initiative.</p>	<p>No - joint venture</p>
<p>Kahawa Shamba Moshi Tanzania Opened 2004 CBT initiative that aims to provide coffee growers with an alternative source of income via tourism. The initiative provides activities as well as offering accommodation, hosted by local families. Project operates as supplementary livelihood opportunity for coffee farmers.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Nkwichi Lodge - Manda Wilderness, Manda Wilderness Community Conservation Area Mozambique http://www.mandawilderness.org/ Opened 2003</p>	<p>No. The Lodge is privately owned; the</p>

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Remote wilderness lodge which supports community projects in the surrounding area via their community trust as well as conservation objectives. They offer activities – bird-watching, snorkelling, sailing, etc. Their vision is to “balance community development with conservation through the creation of a sustainable wilderness reserve”	conservation area is community owned
Meket Community Tourism Project Amhara, Ethiopia Opened 2003 Small remote lodge, which provides “all-inclusive” packages and organises treks with overnight stops, sleeping in tukuls (circular huts) built by the villagers, who also act as donkey guides, chefs and guards.	Yes The lodges are owned and managed by the community
Nambwa Campsite Mayuni Conservancy Caprivi Namibia Opened 2004 Community campsite which is owned and managed by the conservancy. Project was initially funded by WWF Life and IRDNC. Provides accommodation and guiding and also some revenue from firewood.	Yes
Posada Amazonas, Tambopata Peru Opened 1998 Community partnership initiative that is jointly owned by the Ese-Eja community of Infierno and is situated inside the community's private reserve. The lodge has 30 beds and provides full-board and activities. Tambopata itself hosts about 40,000 tourists a year; it is a huge reserve (1.5 m hectares). The lodge is well integrated into the tourism industry. Investment funded by RFE (private company) MacArthur and Fondo Peru-Canada.	Yes Community owned and managed
Prainha do Canto Verde Ceara State , Beberibe, Brazil http://www.prainhadocantoverde.org/ Opened 1998 Accommodation based initiative providing meals and guiding/excursions in the local area. The community used zoning regulations to resist aggressive attempts by a Brazilian real estate company to establish a resort. There are 5 guest houses and a wide range of tourism services.	Not conventionally CBT
Puerto Hondo, Costa del Ecuador, Ecuador http://www.tropiceco.com/journeys/communitybased /puerto_hondo.htm Opened 1996 The town of Puerto Hondo is situated on the southern coast of Ecuador, close to the city of Guayaquil. It is close to one of the best-conserved mangrove eco-systems in the region, which is managed by the community. The initiative encompasses accommodation, excursions, an education centre, and meals.	Yes
Rinjani Trek, Gunung Rinjani Indonesia http://www.rinjanitrek.com/ Opened in 2000 Sells trekking and local walks directly and indirectly through travel agents. A highly diversified product, including accommodation, guiding, excursions, transport, natural heritage, provision of porters.	Not conventionally CBT – managed by an NGO
Shigar Fort Residence, Skardu, Pakistan http://www.shigarfort.com/ Opened 2005 Heritage hotel development (20 rooms, 27 beds) incorporating a small museum. Hotel also organises guiding, excursions, and transportation can also be arranged. There is also a restaurant. Ownership of the hotel will pass to the community in 10 to 15 years time.	Not conventionally CBT – heritage hotel with strong community engagement
Sup Sai Tong Authentic Home Stay Village Development, Thailand Peace Train Cultural Travel – Thailand Opened 2006 “Authentic” home-stay initiative, which includes a 14 day volunteer programme staying in the village – a 200 bhat fee is charged per day per person. The money is then divided among the villagers included in the home-stay group and used for other community developments.	Not a conventional CBT initiative – insufficient data and track record to judge
Rasuwa , TRPAP Nepal (Tourism for Rural Poverty Alleviation) Nepal Opened 2002 The project encompasses 9 villages along a trekking route, with tourism enterprises – accommodation, guiding, activities, the opportunity to buy arts/crafts and souvenirs – in an area rich in cultural and natural history.	Yes
Uakari Lodge, Mamiraua Sustainable Development Reserve Brazil, http://www.uakarilodge.com.br/ Opened 1998 Floating lodge with 20 beds linked to the Mamirauá Institute’s Ecotourism Program. Provides accommodation guides, excursions, boats and full-board, using local products where able.	Joint venture

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

<p>Woodlands Network (aka Centre for Hill Country Eco tourism), Bandarawela Sri Lanka www.visitwoodlandsnetwork.org Opened 1993</p> <p>Woodlands Network is a self-employed women's group. They run an office in Bandarawela and are involved in social projects and in the development of ecotourism in Uva. Although they are not a travel agent, they offer individual travellers and small groups with assistance in organising tours throughout Sri Lanka. They also work with tour operators organising programs in the Uva area. Provides free information, guided walks, cooking demonstrations, lodging, village home-stays, internet access and sales of tea, herbs and spices.</p>	Not CBT in any conventional sense
<p>West Kilimanjaro Camp, Amboseli Tanzania Opened 2000</p> <p>Safari camp 45 km from Kilimanjaro National Park offering all-inclusive accommodation, guiding and transportation. Product based on cultural and natural heritage. Crafts and souvenirs also sold.</p>	No.
<p>Yachana Lodge, Ecuador http://www.yachana.com/ Opened 1995</p> <p>Lodge which offers activities such as guiding, hiking, canoeing, etc. Hires almost all local staff and indigenous naturalist guides. Also provides food. Focus also on educating visitors on the cultural and natural heritage of the area and the communities. Owned by Amazonian development organisation - the Yachana Foundation.</p>	No – not owned or managed by the community but strong community engagement

CBT projects displayed bold

Table 12 : CBT Initiatives

		Country	Accommodation	Activity
1.	Andaman Discoveries	Thailand	Y	Y
2.	Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism	Thailand		Y
3.	Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project	Nepal	Y	Y
4.	Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise	Uganda		Y
5.	Bum Hill Community Campsite	Namibia	Y	
6.	Casa Machiguenga	Peru	Y	Limited
7.	Cerro Escondido	Costa Rica	Y	Y
8.	Covane Community Lodge	Mozambique	Y	Y
9.	Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development	Vietnam	Y	
10.	Kahawa Shamba	Tanzania	Y	Y
11.	Meket Community Tourism Project	Ethiopia	Y	Y
12.	Nambwa Campsite	Namibia	Y	
13.	Posada Amazonas	Peru	Y	Y
14.	Puerto Hondo	Ecuador	Y	Y
15.	Rasuwa	Nepal	Y	Y

Y Yes; N No; JV Joint Venture

Community Benefits

The data is not readily simplified and in any event the impact on livelihoods and the number benefiting is largely a function of scale. 64% of projects reported that they provided an additional income, 96% of projects reported that they had contributed to reducing poverty and/or improved the standard of living of the community

Table 13 below summarises the data provided on the percentage of enterprise earnings which go to the community as a whole: the collective benefit. Where known this varies between 5% and 100%. It should also be noted that some projects which are not CBT have a high proportion of earnings going to the community, for example the Baltit Fort 60%, Manda Wilderness Lodge 30% and Yachana Lodge 60%. It is not the case that only CBT initiatives provide community benefits.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Table 13 : CBT Projects: proportion of earnings going to the community as a whole

1.	Andaman Discoveries	30%
2.	Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism	?
3.	Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project	?
4.	Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise	40%
5.	Bum Hill Community Campsite	5%
6.	Casa Machiguenga	100%
7.	Cerro Escondido	?
8.	Covane Community Lodge	5%
9.	Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development	“Not much”
10.	Kahawa Shamba	30%
11.	Meket Community Tourism Project	?
12.	Nambwa Campsite	15%
13.	Posada Amazonas	50%+
14.	Puerto Hondo	?
15.	Rasuwa	?

In the next section we consider the collective benefits which are generated by the 15 CBT initiatives.

Collective Benefits

Table 14 reports the survey results for collective benefits from the 15 CBT initiatives. It is clear from the survey that only 5, one third of the initiatives, distribute a cash dividend to households. All but one of the initiatives has resulted in an improvement in community assets ranging from road improvements to classical music lessons.

Table 14 Collective Benefits

Project		Distributed
Andaman Discoveries	Floating pier and new bridges built, providing easier access for local people. Project has allowed for Tung Dap Waste management and mangrove conservation. 134 long-term scholarships, Lam Neaw Waste Management, Tung Dap water tower to provide fresh drinking water, BTN Community Centre, Kids activities, BTN Youth Conservation Group, Classical Music lessons, CBT workshops, reef friendly practises for boat guides, hospitality training with host families, BTN Waste management.	No
Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism	OTOP centre (village-based shopping centre to sell local products and handicrafts), cultural playground set up, proper toilets built, signs set up at key places, resting and parking area constructed, village clean-up project at household level.	No
Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project (BECTP)	Mentioned that collective benefits had been provided but only transportation identified.	None identified
Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise	Contributions from visitors to Mukono Community School. Well maintained trails and more purchasing power within the community.	Yes – UGX 26,030,000
Bum Hill Community Campsite	The Conservancy determines how to spend the small dividend received from the campsite. Social projects – renovations of school, clinic, improved local transportation etc.	Yes – although the major beneficiaries are the employees, there is some distribution of collective benefit
Casa Machiguenga	Medicines, boats and engines have been purchased	No – income has accrued to individuals and their households
Cerro Escondido	None identified	No

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Project		Distributed
Covane Community Lodge	School and water sanitation improved in each household.	Yes - 30% of income has been distributed to the community and 20% retained as savings
Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development	A microcredit programme is lending for improvements.	No
Kahawa Shamba	Road maintenance, construction of community schools, establishment of coffee tree seedling nurseries.	Yes - through % 8,000 per year.
Meket Community Tourism Project	Some development of local roads, micro-credit and grain bank. Payment out of profits of community land tax. Communities aware of communal savings as yet unspent.	No distribution to households.
Nambwa Campsite	Conservancy determines how to spend the dividends received from the campsite. Social projects – renovations of school, clinic, improved local transportation etc. N\$80,000 per annum	No distribution to households. Collective benefit through conservancy.
Posada Amazonas	Secondary school, water system, two roads to ports and a computer house – 130,000\$ to the benefit of the community.	Yearly distribution of dividends.
Puerto Hondo	Have built environmental education center which is used by visitors to learn more about mangrove forests	No
Rasuwa (TRPAP)	Trails improved, bridges developed, micro hydro built, community center established, drinking water supply, etc. infrastructures and rural energy sector developed in partnership with many agencies.	No

Again it is important to recognise that some of the non-CBT initiatives make a significant contribution to the community collectively. For example Manda Wilderness reports that it has generated earnings which have been used to build “a central clinic, 7 schools, 60kms of roads and a market place for the sale of agricultural produce. Set up legal association to protect communities’ land and civil rights, as well as to create a platform for the communities to participate in their own development. Boat service and air strip, health and HIV training, agricultural development.”³⁶

Across the larger sample of 28 initiatives only two thirds (61%) reported that the benefits had been provided equally. The reasons given for why some members of the local community are not able to benefit equally from the projects were:

- community too large for all members to derive benefit
- limited involvement by community
- project targeted select part of community
- visitor numbers still small
- poorest members of the community could not participate in the main tourism development process

CBT initiatives are generally small-scale and it is not possible for all members of larger communities to be involved and thus derive benefits; if communities are not able to participate fully, the benefits they derive may be limited; and communities are hierarchical and often elites garner the benefits of CBT development – it is very often the marginalised and poorest members of the community that remain on the periphery which could be down to class, gender, religion, culture or political affiliation. In these circumstances, CBT is not able to deliver on its basic

³⁶ Verbatim from the survey form

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

premise of community participation and the equitable share of benefits to all community members.

Local Economic Development Impacts

There is a very wide range of different linkages between the projects and the local economy detailed in Table 15 – these linkages are extremely difficult to quantify and to do so was beyond the resources of this research project. It has not been possible to determine whether or not CBT initiatives contribute more than the others, but this is very unlikely as the major determinant of impact is scale.

Table 15: Local Economic Linkages of CBT Projects

Project Linkages	Economic Benefits
<p>Andaman Discoveries Work with local stakeholders – local government, CBT tourism committee, local tour businesses, youth group, tourism authorities, responsible travel websites and local and international tour operators. Also, work with conservation and NGO stakeholders. Uses local produce, products and services - vegetables, fruit and nuts for home-stay food; locally made shrimp paste for home-stay cooking; batik prints, locally hand made soap and nipa palm weaving from local handicraft groups; massage lady available using traditional herbal facial masks; building materials locally sourced from sustainable sources; use locally owned transport where possible (not tour company transport); villagers provide the entertainment; cultural exchange workshops. Village is far from nearest town so people can only use local craftsmen. Microenterprise created – community-based tourism committee and handicraft cooperatives.</p>	<p>Allowed both men and women to stay in village, not move to larger towns to work in shrimp factories; community centre built; instigated waste collection by local authorities</p>
<p>Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism Provides tourism activities and experiences in the local community and opportunities for the sale of local food products, hand woven cloth, baskets and bamboo ware and cultural shows. Source products locally, e.g. palm cake, rice whiskey, palm fruit juice and artisan products. Local musicians and painters used. Put on cultural shows and use of local transport – local trucks and bikes. Have linkages with travel agents in Bangkok and overseas.</p>	<p>Provides additional tourism services in an established centre</p>
<p>Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project (BECTP) Sources local products – food products, e.g. oranges, and building materials. The folk singers, dancers and tradesmen (masons, carpenters, plumbers and electricians) are all members of the local community. Local transportation also used.</p>	<p>Provides employment and additional livelihoods for members of the community</p>
<p>Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise Linkages with community camp site, Bwindi Impenetrable Forest NP, development partners and tour companies. Uses local products – bananas, herbal medicine, baskets, carvings and painting. Has created microenterprise opportunities in beekeeping, mushroom growing, handicraft making and herbal medicine from the traditional healer.</p>	<p>Additional livelihoods based on tourism attracted to gorilla viewing</p>
<p>Bum Hill Community Campsite The lodge has good commercial linkages with local and international tour operators. There are some opportunities for the sale of baskets and other crafts and local skills are used, e.g. construction and renovation; although the camp is relatively isolated in the National Park. Local purchases spend in the local economy N\$2,000.</p>	<p>Community owned lodge with good linkages with tour operators</p>
<p>Casa Machiguenga Some linkages formed with tourism agencies. Sources local products - crafts and souvenirs from men and women in the community and building products. Craft shop has made sales of USD 1390 in previous 12 months.</p>	<p>Limited linkages, but major source of employment.</p>
<p>Cerro Escondido Enabled creation of micro-enterprises - families sell chicken, cheese, vegetables and fish; they also provide transportation and offer horse riding.</p>	<p>Insufficient detail but no linkages with local or international tour operators</p>
<p>Covane Community Lodge</p>	<p>Significant in the local</p>

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Sales of food and beverage to the lodge amount to 24,000 meticais per month and 1,000 from craft shop sales. Small enterprises on agricultural production, fishing, construction materials and crafting shop	community
Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development Source local products - rice, fish sauce, marine products, embroidery and flowers. Also use local transportation – bikes and boats and local people provide opera performances. Have link with a video tour company who assist with marketing, product design and development.	Good linkages
Kahawa Shamba Womens groups have started their own pigary unit and a shop in the village. Youths have purchased mountain bikes for renting to tourists to increase their income. Local food produce and clay pots are sold to tourists. Use of local building materials. Local transport also used.	Extensive linkages
Meket Community Tourism Project Use of local products - vegetables, eggs, chickens, eucalyptus timber and honey. Local crafts sold - cotton shawls//woollen hats. Use of locally owned transport – horses and donkeys. Local people perform traditional dances. All construction is with locally sourced materials.	Good linkages
Nambwa Campsite The campsite is isolated in the National Park – there are some additional earnings in the community from guiding and the sale of crafts and in construction and renovation – 5,000N\$ per annum spent of local goods and services.	Weak linkages
Posada Amazonas Locally sourced produce and products - manios, bananas, seed necklaces and wood carvings. There is a local fish farm and small port and also an ethno botanical centre and an ecotourism concession. More products/service are expected. 35,000\$ in local purchasing.	Developing linkages
Puerto Hondo Link to Fundación Pro-Bosque who promote area/community and can handle tourist reservations. Use recycled paper for cards.	Diversified local economy
Rasuwa TRPAP Nepal (Tourism for Rural Poverty Alleviation) Sources local food products – rice, millet, wheat, vegetables, dairy products, poultry, fish, honey – as well as woolen knit wear/carpets and wooden crafts. Micro-enterprises created - home stays, handicrafts, vegetable farming, fish farming, bee keeping, lodge operation, bakery, tea shops, souvenir shop and communication center.	Insufficient data

Nkwichi Lodge, is run by Manda Wilderness a private company, on a community owned reserve. The lodge demonstrates the significant local linkages which such developments are capable of generating. “The lodge locally sources fruit and vegetables (30%), fish, honey, mushrooms, hand made soaps, woven and carved handicrafts. Use of local choirs and dance groups - \$19,000 per annum spent on local procurement. Manda Wilderness has helped set up 3 back packer lodges (rest houses) owned and run by community members. The Agricultural project has worked with over 700 farmers to set up small scale businesses. Assistance has been provided to establish over 10 local shops. Local arts and crafts are purchased from over 15 individuals. All building materials (thatching grass, bricks, timber etc) are purchased from local producers.” The survey further reports: “Through knock on effects, all 20,000 people have benefited as there is more cash in the economy and less dependency on barter systems. For example, each village now has a general store / shop - before the arrival of the project, they did not.”

Sustainability: Commercial Viability

Table 16 presents information drawn from the survey relating to the success of the CBT projects and a column providing an assessment of the viability of the project, based on the information provided on the survey form. Two are Joint Ventures (JV) and successful as a result of the close relationship with a commercial organisation, a further four initiatives had attained viability in October 2007; the remainder are not yet economically sustainable without further grant aid.

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Table 16 CBT Initiatives: Success and Viability

		Assessment	Summative
1.	Andaman Discoveries	No. Dependent upon donations for its viability. Still requires donor funding	N
2.	Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism	Yes – but not conventionally CBT – has characteristics of joint venture.	JV
3.	Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project	Not yet – still needs donor funding, although the visitor centre is self-sufficient and has room to grow	N
4.	Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise	Yes – this enterprise contributes to collective benefits, although there is still a requirement for continued funding and it was indicated that this requirement would not cease.	Y
5.	Bum Hill Community Campsite	Not yet – the enterprise will become sustainable “If a more business oriented approach is taken with linkages created with business service providers and payments for services commences.”	N
6.	Casa Machiguenga	No – not meeting costs of reinvesting in the lodge, unsustainable, requires donor funding but does not have any. Currently visitor numbers declining.	N
7.	Cerro Escondido	No – the project is not sustainable without additional donor funding.	N
8.	Covane Community Lodge	Not yet – currently requires additional funding – is expected to become self reliant.	N
9.	Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development	As yet very low bed occupancy with insufficient visitors to give every home-stay one bed night per month. Funded to 2011 – seeking further funding, apparently not expecting to be self-sufficient	Not yet – not a priority
10.	Kahawa Shamba	Very sustainable, operating at capacity and being replicated. Well connected to the market – although still seeking donor funding for development.	Y
11.	Meket Community Tourism Project	The three lodges and trekking between them now fully operational and sustainable.	Y
12.	Nambwa Campsite	Fully established and potentially sustainable.	Y
13.	Posada Amazonas	No – not in the strict sense. This is a joint venture operation between Rainforest Expeditions and the community	JV
14.	Puerto Hondo	Not at present – still needs donor funding, but hope to be able to be sustainable	N
15.	Rasuwa	Not clear, insufficient data. Funding for the project was terminated in July 2007.	?

Y Yes; N No; JV Joint Venture

Of the 15 CBT enterprises identified six can be considered, on the basis of the survey form completed, to be economically sustainable. Two of these are joint ventures: Ban Nong Khao in Thailand which provides activities and a volunteer programme, works very closely with a local tour operator; and Posada Amazonas in Peru, a joint venture between the local community and Rain Forest Expeditions.

The remaining four successful CBT projects are:

- Buhoma Village Walk, Uganda - provides an activity in a period of the day when visitors to the gorillas are otherwise at leisure

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

- Kahawa Shamba, Tanzania - a very successful coffee farm visit, with lunch and option of overnight accommodation for groups, partners closely with one overseas tour operators and supported by the Coffee Co-operative structure within which it sits
- Meket Community Tourism Project, Ethiopia - three community owned lodges and trekking between them, good links with tour operators
- Nambwa Campsite, Namibia, owned by a conservancy it provides pitches and some activities

Only one third of the managers who responded to the survey (35%) mentioned commercial viability as a factor for success. Although as Hitchins and Highstead³⁷ contend, “If tourism businesses are to succeed they need to be understood within the context of successful business practices and the realities of markets and customer demand.” Thus, as with any business, if commercial viability is not achieved the likelihood of project failure is high. One of the key determinants of success is whether or not links have been created to the mainstream industry³⁸.

82% reported that they considered the project successful, only 14% said that there were elements of success, as well as failure. This despite the reliance on continuing subsidy; three quarters of the larger sample said that they were still dependent on donor funding.

According to the survey the average length of time funding is made available is 5 years; this period may not be an adequate enough time for local communities to be able take over the management of a CBT initiative both from a financial point of view and a skills perspective. 77% of respondents said that donor funding was still required.

Social Capital and Empowerment

Table 17 reports the survey responses to a question about how the initiatives are run. As might be expected the responses are very diverse. It was beyond the scope of the current study to enquire further into the forms of organisation and the extent to which there is effective community management. The responses are reported here to demonstrate their diversity. At Bum Hill Community Campsite the community management is credited with having “catalysed the creation of new cultural skills and institutions”

Table 17 : Social Capital and Empowerment

<p>Andaman Discoveries Andaman Discoveries is a non profit NGO, that uses CBT as a development tool. The village CBT is owned and managed by each village themselves, with Andaman Discoveries sending in and coordinating trips.</p>
<p>Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism Tourism is not a major livelihood in the village but the community was involved in an orientation of the village, analysing process of tourism assets, route & itinerary planning.</p>
<p>Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project Community not involved in project development but were involved in project implementation. Managed by the community and it was mentioned that ownership would pass to them in 2007.</p>
<p>Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise The enterprise is entirely community owned and managed – there is reported to has been some drunkenness as a result of the increased incomes in the community.</p>
<p>Bum Hill Community Campsite 100% community owned, participation in all aspects of planning and business development “Participation in the project has forced the Matsigenka - a notoriously autonomous and acephalous society - to organise themselves politically, socially and logistically, in order to coordinate group construction efforts, negotiate the business structure with INRENA and GTZ, distribute wages equably, and support the lodge workers with food and transport. In essence, the lodge project has catalysed the creation of new cultural skills and institutions in these indigenous communities, especially managerial</p>

³⁷ Hitchins R and Highstead J (2005) Community Based Tourism in Namibia ComMark Trust
Johannesburg:2

³⁸ Ibid:14

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

capacity and improved ability (both individually and collectively) to interact and negotiate with outsiders. Two former lodge employees now work outside their communities (one in tourism, the other as a park guard), earning approximately US\$ 200 per month, an excellent salary considering the local economy and their educational background.”
Casa Machiguenga The lodge is 100% community owned. The community built the lodge and manage it.
Cerro Escondido The lodge is community owned and managed.
Covane Community Lodge The lodge is community owned and managed, the community decides the priorities on how to spend revenues, what to invest in the community and at the lodge.
Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development Community participated in project planning and designing of the community based ecotourism (CBET) model development – project is community managed – the homes remain owned by households.
Kahawa Shamba Village meetings conducted to sensitise communities. Community land/plots donated for camping site. Private coffee farms used for excursions. The programme is community owned (70%) and managed
Meket Community Tourism Project Byelaws now protect the endemic Gelada Baboon, community have implemented with TESFA user rights enclosures to protect degraded areas. Still some issues with jealousies and the lodge in one community is not yet functioning.
Nambwa Campsite Participation in all aspects of planning and business development
Posada Amazonas Engagement in decision-making and capital projects.
Puerto Hondo Community participated in establishment of project and gained employment escorting tourists in canoes through the mangroves. 100% owned and managed by the community.
Rasuwa “Full participation right from the beginning

This is a strong note of realism in the response from the larger group of initiatives when asked whether all members of the community were interested in the project at inception, less than half - 46% - stated that they were. Some of the reasons for this lack of interest were given as:

- community had no knowledge of tourism and thus could not understand benefits
- some community members were not interested in taking part
- conservation new concept
- scepticism and suspicion
- lack of understanding and experience
- lack of familiarity with concept of CBT

In terms of participation, almost all communities – 82% - participated in the establishment of the project. This participation took varying forms:

- community feasibility studies
- workshops
- identification of sites
- participation in all aspects of planning and business development
- community providing labour for building works
- voluntary work
- community suggesting candidates to be trained and employed as park rangers
- community land/plots donated for camping site
- private coffee farms used for excursions
- community formed representative committee/organisation to deal with stakeholders and provide voice for community
- surveys undertaken in and outside the community

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Participation is crucial to the formation of CBT initiatives as defined in the literature and whilst it is encouraging that communities participated in the majority of the projects surveyed, there was little suggestion that this was in fact the level of participation that allows for community management, without which the basic premise of CBT is undermined.

Conservation & Environment

Surprisingly, only 34% of the manager respondents mentioned conservation or positive environmental impacts as a factor leading to the success of their projects. There is no apparent correlation between successful CBT initiatives and particularly significant conservation or positive environmental impacts

Table 18 : Conservation and Environment

<p>Andaman Discoveries Coral reef protection training, environmental education. Nature trails frequently used by tourists prevent logging by giving economic value to the trees in the forest and increasing the visibility of illegal logging. CBT provides an economic alternative to fishing, hunting, and harvesting forest and mangrove products. CT also builds resilience against more destructive forms of tourism and land development.</p>
<p>Ban Nong Khao Community Tourism Nothing Reported</p>
<p>Bandipur Eco-Cultural Tourism Project Not near a protected area but in Himalayan foothills and 143 kms to Kathmandu. Not environmental policies, but harvest rain water and use solar energy.</p>
<p>Buhoma Village Walk Enterprise Based in a National Park. Impacts measured by walking the trail.</p>
<p>Bum Hill Community Campsite Situated in BwaBwata National Park. There has been improved acceptance of wildlife & management of natural resources. Increased wildlife numbers & reduced poaching. Campsite uses solar water panels.</p>
<p>Casa Machiguenga Based in a national park. Tourism developed as livelihood alternative for the community as an alternative to resource extraction. The lodge uses solar energy for the radio and a water filter system for the shower and toilet.</p>
<p>Cerro Escondido Project based in the Reserva Karen Mogensen, a private 900ha reserve owned by ASEPALECO. There is no electricity, only solar panels are used. There is a recycling system and no cars are allowed. "We bought 900 hectares of old farms, cattle ranching was the most extensive use of this land. Now the forest has come back, bringing all the benefits (biodiversity, water, soil conservation and some income from visitors from all over the world."</p>
<p>Covane Community Lodge The Lodge is sited within the Limpopo National Park.</p>
<p>Giao Xuan Community Ecotourism Development The objective is to develop sustainable livelihoods for the community and to contribute to coastal wetland conservation. The awareness of environmental protection, cultural conservation of the community in Giao Xuan is increasingly raised. The community learning center is one of the places and tools to conduct a wide range of community environmental education and training activities.</p>
<p>Kahawa Shamba Villagers are involved in protecting forest in their area</p>
<p>Meket Community Tourism Project Urine separating composting toilet, sun heated water for shower.</p>
<p>Nambwa Campsite Improved acceptance of wildlife & management of natural resources. Increased wildlife numbers & reduced poaching. Solar water panels.</p>
<p>Posada Amazonas Tambopata National Reserve, macaw and giant river otter research.</p>
<p>Puerto Hondo Bosque Protector Cerro Blanco (private forest reserve); Reserva de Producción Faunística Manglares El Salado (state protected forest reserve). Produce recycled paper to make crafts. No environmental policy.</p>
<p>Rasuwa Intensive training on Tourism and Environment Awareness programme (TEAP). Solar energy, bottle recycling, waste management, micro hydro power, bio-gas.</p>

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

Conclusion

This research identified and analysed examples of community-based tourism projects which were identified by funders, conservationists and development workers (the experts) as successful. The experts were allowed to define “successful” as they wished in order to ensure that as many initiatives as possible were identified. 116 successful initiatives were identified. It is clear from this part of the research that there is little consensus amongst the experts about the meaning of the concept, the concept should therefore not be used undefined. Only 40% of respondents mentioned anything which might be interpreted as referring to the importance of commercial viability in assessing success.

In the next stage of the research the 116 “successful” initiatives were surveyed to seek data on that success. Of the 28 responses secured, 15 could be considered to be CBT in that they met the academic definition. Of these 6 CBT initiatives could be considered economically sustainable and two of these are joint ventures. It is disappointing that only 28 out of 116 “success stories” were able and willing to share those stories.

It is important to remember that this research purposefully used a very broad approach to identify CBT successes. Other evidence suggests that average bed occupancy achieved by CBT initiatives is around 5% and that this unsustainable. The research has demonstrated that there are a number of initiatives which are not CBT which have demonstrated very considerable employment, local economic development and collective community benefits, for example Manda Wilderness (Mozambique), Aga Khan Development Network in Pakistan (Baltit and Shigar Forts) and Chumbe Island (Tanzania).

Recommendations:

1. Initiatives need to be judged on their outcomes in creating local economic development and reducing poverty.
2. Funders should expect managers to report on the outcomes of the initiatives and in particular on employment, local economic linkages, community economic benefits and economic sustainability. Where the initiative is claimed to be a CBT initiative detailed reports of the community’s engagement in the management should be required.
3. Funders should assure themselves that the initiative will find an adequate market to ensure economic sustainability before committing resources; it is clear from the figures on average occupancy that this is the major issue. Initiatives are being funded which do not find a market adequate to ensure their sustainability, strong market linkages are essential to sustainability. Joint ventures are one of the ways of ensuring this. Private sector investments can also deliver significant employment and broader conservation and community benefits.
4. Donor dependency is common in CBT – nine of the 15 CBT projects identified in this research were still dependent upon, or seeking, donor funding. Some argue that five years is not long enough to secure sustainability and that it can take longer for a CBT project to prove itself. It seems more likely that these initiatives were ill-conceived from the outset.
5. There would be considerable value in a funder reviewing its CBT investments using a comparative approach to determine the degree of success and, with a more complete set of returns, to assess the preconditions for success.
6. There are only two differences between CBT projects and conventional investments:
 - a. Community level, collective, benefits; however, increasing numbers of private sector investments have these benefits, they need to be measured and reported

Community-Based Tourism: a success?

too. Data collected for this research suggests that private sector initiatives perform at least as well as, and in some instances better than, CBT initiatives. They should be assessed on the outcomes and donor funding considered against the outcomes.

- b. There is a clear case for CBT being different from a private sector initiative in the empowerment of the community. The Bum Hill Community Campsite clearly demonstrates the way in which a CBT initiative can build social capital and empower a community – although this initiative is still not economically sustainable. The claims made for community empowerment by CBT initiatives cannot be taken at face value, the gains can be important and significant for communities but they need to be demonstrated and subject to critical review.