



Beyond Greening

Reflections on Tourism in the Rio-Process

A Reader from Alba Sud, Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa,
Kabani – the other direction, Terramar and EED Tourism Watch

Edited by Christina Kamp

Impressum

Published by:

Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e.V.
Tourism Watch
Ulrich-von-Hassell-Str. 76
D-53123 Bonn
Germany
Phone: +49 (0)228 8101-0
E-Mail: eed@eed.de
www.eed.de

In cooperation with:

Alba Sud, Spain
Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa
Instituto Terramar, Brazil
Kabani – the other direction, India

With contributions from:

Equations, India
Tourism Concern, UK

Editor: Christina Kamp

Editorial Team: Antje Monshausen, Ernest Cañada, Heinz Fuchs (responsible), Jennifer Seif, René Schärer, Sumesh Mangalasseri

Photocredit: Alba Sud (p. 22, 27, 29, 34, 75, 76, 78), Christina Kamp (p.16, 55, 57), Equations (p. 32, 85) Heinz Fuchs (p. 58, 61, 91), René Schärer (p. 35, 82), Sabine Minninger (p.title picture, 12, 19, 47, 49, 52), Tourism Concern (p. 20, 43, 44,)

Views expressed in this publication are those of the authors, and not necessarily of EED Tourism Watch

Bonn, June 2012



Beyond Greening: Reflections on Tourism in the Rio-Process

"We do not inherit the earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children."

Native American Proverb

Content

Abbreviations	6
Part 1: Tourism in the Context of the Green Economy, Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication	14
From Rio to Rio+20: Tourism on the International Agenda	14
The Green Economy – No Limits to Growth? Tourism as a "Key Sector" in Sustainable Development	18
Far from a Green Economy: Environmental Neglect by Transnational Corporations	21
Forests, Communities and the "Green India Mission": Promises and Failures of Ecotourism	26
The Potential of Community-based Tourism for Local Development: Networking for Sustainable Alternatives in Brazil	33
Tourism and Food Sovereignty: Risks and Opportunities of Tourism in Rural Settings	37
Water Equity in Tourism: Vital to a Green Economy	42
Tourism and Climate Change: How the Myth of Poverty Alleviation through Tourism Prevents Progress	46
The "Saharisation" of the Mediterranean: For a Shared Agenda on Climate Justice	52
Part 2: The Challenge of Good Governance: Institutional Frameworks for Tourism and Sustainable Development	57
Regulator or Facilitator? Redefining the Role of Governments	57
The Role of Tourism Corporations: The Neoliberal Attack on Local and Global Democracy	62
Sustainable Consumption and Production in Tourism – Quo Vadis? Private Sector Initiatives and Corporate Social Responsibility	66
Tourism as a Field of Development Cooperation: The Conceptualisation of Poverty in Pro-Poor Tourism Discourse	75

Environmental Stewardship: Governance Incorporating Local Communities in Brazil	79
International Financial Institutions Gaining Ground: Tourism Infrastructure Development in India	85
The Challenge of Meaningful Participation: Time for the UNWTO to Open its Doors to Civil Society	89
Organisations	99

Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AGF	UN Secretary-General's High-level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CAG	Comptroller and Auditor General of India
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRT	Center for Responsible Tourism, Goa/India
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic & Social Council
ECPAT	End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and the Trafficking of Children
EED	Church Development Service, Germany
ETS	Emission Trading Scheme
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FEPTCE	Plurinational Federation of Community Tourism of Ecuador
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GCSF	Global Civil Society Forum
GCSF	Global Civil Society Forum
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIM	Green India Mission
GIST	Group to Research Sustainability and Territory
GPST	Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism
GSTC	Global Sustainable Tourism Council
GTIF	Global Tourism Interventions Forum
HDR	Human Development Report
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
IAPAL	International Air Passenger Adaptation Levy
IASG	Inter Agency Support Group
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organisation

ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICMBio	Instituto Chico Mendes for Conservation of Biodiversity, Brazil
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFI	International Financial Institution
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
IL&FS	Infrastructure Leasing and Financial Services Ltd, India
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILP	Line Permit
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IYE	International Year of Ecotourism (2002)
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LDC	Least Developed Country
LECZ	low elevation coastal zone
LSGI	Local Self Governance Institution, India
MAB	Man and the Biosphere
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MGFC	Major Groups Facilitating Committee
MoEF	Ministry of Environment & Forests, India
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NAPCC	National Action Plan on Climate Change, India
NEF	New Economics Foundation
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NTFP	Non Timber Forest Products
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PAC	Public Accounts Committee, India
PAP	Protected Area Permit, India
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PPT	Pro-Poor Tourism
PROMAR	Association of Sea Coast Tourism Developers, El Salvador

PSC	Parliamentary Standing Committee, India
RAP	Restricted Area Permit
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
RESEX	Extractive Reserves (Portuguese: Reservas Extrativistas)
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SASEC	South Asia Subregional Economic Cooperation
SCP	Sustainable consumption and production
SEZ	Special Economic Zones
SIDS	Small Island Development States
SITS	International Seminar for Sustainable Tourism, Brazil
SNUC	National System for Conservation Units
SPFII	Secretariat for the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
SRSG	Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary General
SST	Foundation for Solidarity in Tourism, Switzerland
STDC	State Tourism Development Corporation
ST-EP	Sustainable Tourism – Eliminating Poverty
TNCs	Transnational Corporations
TUCUM	Community-based Tourism Network of Ceará, Brazil
TURISOL	Brazilian Network on Solidarity and community-based tourism
UIB	University of the Balearic Islands
UN	United Nations
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCSD	United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNPFII	United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
UNWTO	United Nations World Tourism Organization

WCTE	World Committee on Tourism Ethics
WDM	World Development Movement
WHO	World Health Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WNBR	World Network of Biosphere Reserves
WSF	World Social Forum
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organization
WTTC	World Travel & Tourism Council

Introduction: Towards Rio+20

At the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, the international community adopted important resolutions concerning how the precious resources of our planet should be equitably shared and protected for present and future generations. Despite positive projects achieved over the past two decades, we are a far cry from the sustainable path. Sustainability is often reduced to its ecological and economic aspects. Social impacts, human rights and equity concerns are not sufficiently taken into account, and people (including the economically poor) pay taxes that continue to finance unsustainable practices.

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012 focuses on the "green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication", and on the "institutional framework for sustainable development – in relation to the objective of renewed political commitment to sustainable development, reviewing progress and implementation gaps and addressing new and emerging challenges". New momentum is urgently needed, given the failure of international actors to keep most of the promises of Rio.

Tourism and sustainable development

"The sheer size and reach of the sector makes it critically important from a global resource perspective", says the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). Tourism is often seen as a relatively eco-friendly alternative to other industries like mining and manufacturing. International tourism has been identified within the "green economy" debate as one of ten sectors that can lead the transformation to this new model. But testimonies from tourism destinations show that unsustainable tourism development is often taking place locally, undermining real progress towards this proposed new model. What is needed, therefore, is more stringent regulation.

The "Green Economy Report" (2011) published by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) dedicates one chapter to the tourism sector. The UNWTO co-authored this chapter and is taking Rio+20 as an opportunity to promote tourism as "one of the most promising drivers of growth for the world economy". The UNWTO amongst others argue that because of its cross-cutting nature, sustainable tourism can "address meaningfully a range of priority issues identified, in the context of sustainable development at Rio+20. Among these are: energy, water, oceans, green jobs, sustainable cities, sustainable agriculture and food security, disaster risk reduction, and investing in health, education, youth, gender equality and women's empowerment." However, current mainstream tourism development undermines progress in all these sectors. The growth forecast by UNWTO is incompatible with real sustainability.

The need for scrutiny

The strategies discussed in Rio+20 and the underlying paradigms must be scrutinized by civil society. The "green economy" concept focuses on investment in energy and resource efficiency. It fails to question the prevailing growth paradigm and seriously neglects fundamental challenges of global equity and human development. According to its proponents, in particular UNEP and UNWTO, the best way of responding to the challenges posed by environmental destruction and poverty is through more growth. However, this very growth-oriented paradigm has led to environmental destruction and human rights violations in the first place. The debate therefore has to be focussed not only on "green" and "economy", but also on human rights, equity and justice. There is a need for a paradigm shift in tourism development.

While Rio+20 examines the international governance architecture for sustainable development, there is a need also to look at the roles of various players who influence the ways in which the tourism sector operates and affects peoples' lives and the environment. To achieve sustainable development, the participation of a broad range of stakeholders and rights holders in the governance process is vital. Decentralization and the strengthening of local governance allow closer involvement of citizens in the policy process. It is a fundamental ingredient for good governance. Good governance is about more than the objectives of nation-states. Good governance is about anti-corruption and making authority and its institutions accountable, effective and efficient, participatory, transparent, responsive, consensus-oriented, and equitable.

Key challenges

This publication places tourism in the context of the Rio+20 themes "green economy" and governance. It aims to raise awareness of the challenges in tourism and encourage reflection and debate. It highlights the role that tourism plays with regard to key sustainability challenges that are being addressed or need to be addressed in the Rio process. Case studies and analyses focus on the human rights dimension in the sustainability discussion, such as the right of access to natural resources and the right to land for residence and self-sustaining agricultural production.

Authors from different parts of the world caution against easy solutions such as the "green economy" and "pro-poor tourism". The "green economy" concept promoted by UNEP advocates efficiency, but fails to question the prevailing growth paradigm. Questions of resource allocation, rights to resources and access to governance processes are also very important. The pro-poor tourism concept assumes that any kind of tourism that somehow makes some of the poor better off can be justified as a path to development. Both concepts fail to address the complexities of direct and indirect impacts of tourism on people's livelihoods and human rights. Livelihood means much more than "income". It is rooted in the culture and identity of people and is dependent upon the landscape and ecology. It is connected with community and property rights that determine dignity, control, empowerment and sustainability.

Communities within destinations, in particular the economically poor, must not bear the costs of meeting the requirements and demands of tourists and businesses. Tourism activities are usually based on existing unequal, exploitative relationships and consequently the poorer and more vulnerable groups in the destination shoulder the negative impacts of tourism. The impacts on the environment and the lives and livelihoods of vulnerable communities and their culture are immense. Inequalities and the exploitation of the poor by the rich and powerful are inherent in the worst forms of tourism practices, resulting in serious violations of various human and other rights of local communities.

To achieve growth in tourism, local resources and economic activities are mainly used for and targeted at the development of the industry and not for the well-being of communities. Local communities' rights to land, water, natural resources, health care, education and housing are often compromised by the tourism industry or tourist activities.

Land grabbing

Mainstream tourism promotion strategies bypass and ignore weaker parties whose rights to land, resources and livelihood are violated. Land speculation and land grabbing have become common phenomena in areas of interest to the tourism sector, leading to the physical and economic displacement of local people. Coastal areas in developing and emerging countries, including regions in Asia affected by the Tsunami of 2004, are being destroyed by tourism

resorts at the expense of local communities whose agricultural and occupational land will be used to develop accommodation, entertainment facilities and tourism infrastructure. Land is turned into recreational space for tourists. None of these concerns are adequately reflected in the current discourse, which relies on market-based self-regulatory mechanisms and propagates more growth.

Threats to food sovereignty and access to water

Tourism can threaten food sovereignty by affecting fisheries resources, access to the beach or to hunting grounds, and subsistence agriculture. Tourism and conservation have become kissing cousins, displacing people, especially indigenous communities, from the forest and their resources. The "commoditization" of natural resources and biodiversity for tourism accelerates this process. The main actors in this business are big conservation groups, international financial institutions, donors and state agencies.

Local communities lose out to tourism in terms of access to water, especially in water-scarce regions. Water grabbing by hotels and resorts violates people's right to water, which is a fundamental human right.

Climate change

Tourism contributes significantly to global climate change, which threatens the lives and livelihoods of hundreds of millions of people. Based on current growth forecasts, by 2035 tourism will grow by 179 percent and its contribution to greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) will increase by 188 percent, mainly as a result of increased air traffic. Although the International Panel on Climate Change is calling for a 50 percent reduction of current GHGs by 2050, tourism industry lobbies including UNWTO have been obstructing progress towards binding regulations of aviation



emissions. Propagating and introducing market based mechanisms is further delaying or undermining progress. The efficiency gains in the aviation sector have been far too small and far too slow to get the industry onto a sustainable path. The impact of unsustainable consumption patterns by the rich on the lives of the poor is strikingly evident in the context of climate justice.

Whether it is the impacts of climate change or false solutions, the prime victims are poor and marginalised communities. New climate mitigation initiatives such as carbon trading and experiments with biofuels are accelerating this victimisation. Climate change is not just an issue of mitigation and adaptation. It demands a complete paradigm shift from the current form of neo-liberal capitalist development to a people-centric approach.

Participation

At all levels, the participation of local communities involved in or affected by tourism still leaves much to be desired: in international negotiating processes, in national policy formulation as well as in and around the development and management of tourist destinations. Civil society organisations have been stressing the need for their greater participation in these processes, in particular in the work of the UNWTO, which although a

UN agency acts more as a tourism industry lobby than as a facilitator for sustainable development – in contravention to the principles of good governance.

At grassroots level, the participation of local communities is a necessary condition for sustainable development. Participation is about much more than jobs and income; it is above all about people's ownership and control of decision-making in matters that affect their lives. Where tourism is deemed an acceptable development option, participation ideally occurs in the form of community-driven tourism. Community-driven initiatives benefit greatly from the exchange of experiences with other communities, from the involvement in civil society networks and from the support of NGOs. This applies particularly to coastal communities facing similar threats across the globe, such as land grabbing by tourism enterprises, displacement, destruction of coastal ecosystems, industrial fishing, and rising sea levels. It also applies to forest communities who in many parts of the world are displaced to make way for national parks, in the name of conservation and "eco-tourism." Alternative models, such as the Brazilian concept of extractive reserves (RESEX), help local communities protect their land and manage their resources sustainably.

The way forward

We have only a few decades left to deal intelligently with climate change, water stress and the devastation of the last remaining essential ecosystems. In light of the current world situation, we are at a crossroads as a civilisation: the crisis of turbo-capitalism may lead to greater inequality, misery and conflict, but it could also be an opportunity to begin to make peace with the planet, provide possibilities for human development for the impoverished majority, and increase levels of real democracy.

The mass tourism industry represents a serious obstacle to the task of creating a sustainable world with a future where communities count and democracy is real. Tourism has a huge direct and indirect influence on the global economy. It fuels expectations of indefinite growth on an environmentally precarious planet. It suffers from the hegemony of transnational corporations and their synergy with a financial capitalism focussed on by quick private profits, and it plays a role in our failure to improve human development in the countries concerned.

It is very important to divorce the sustainable tourism concept from the idea of economic growth and GDP-centric development. Tourism is not a viable option for the poor and should not be promoted as such. It is counter-productive to make poor nations dependent on an industry like tourism that is highly vulnerable to many external factors.

Agencies like UNWTO and UNEP should work out stringent regulatory mechanisms which can control unsustainable tourism practices instead of pushing for more market-based solutions. They should seriously take into account the concerns of global civil society and affected populations. People's participation at various levels of governance is a key issue in any discussion related to sustainable development.

Civil society organisations across the world engaged in challenging the harmful impacts of tourism and offering a critical perspective on this massive global industry need to link up and organise themselves more effectively. There is immense potential for a global civil society network to draw strength from its diversity while being unified under a call for just, equitable, democratic, people-centred and environmentally sustainable tourism – including the right of communities to say no to the development of tourism in their homes.

Part 1: Tourism in the Context of the Green Economy, Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication

From Rio to Rio+20: Tourism on the International Agenda

By Christina Kamp

In 1992 – at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) – in Rio de Janeiro the states of the world committed themselves to a sustainable development path. In Agenda 21, the action programme for the 21st century, tourism did not play a major role. The principles of sustainability, however, soon found their application in tourism. The new paradigm encompassed all the important aspects that had previously been discussed with regard to the impacts of tourism. Tourism had long been identified as an ambiguous phenomenon. It plays an important role in the social, economic and political development of many countries. It has the potential to contribute to social and economic development, conservation, and cultural exchange. However, many hopes in tourism as a driver of development have been disappointed. At the same time, tourism has many adverse impacts on individuals, communities, societies, cultures, ecosystems and biodiversity, the global climate and local economies.

For tourism to contribute to sustainable development in a meaningful manner, it must fulfil the criteria of sustainability. The various dimensions – social, cultural, ecological, and economic – are closely related, interact and have to be seen and treated in an integrated manner. Long-haul tourism in most cases involves flights or other unsustainable means of transport with major environmental impacts. Therefore it is usually inappropriate to speak of "sustainable tourism" as such – and more appropriate to look at tourism in the context of sustainable development.

World Conference on Sustainable Tourism, Lanzarote (1995)

An early attempt to take up tourism in the Rio process and to put it on the agenda of the United Nations was the World Conference on Sustainable Tourism in April 1995 in Lanzarote. This conference was not held by the UN, but upon invitation of UNESCO and the Spanish Government. The outcome of the conference, the Lanzarote Charter for Sustainable Tourism addresses governments and the United Nations and includes both environmental and developmental aspects.

Sustainable tourism and biological diversity

Upon initiative of the German Environment Ministry, an international Conference on Tourism and Biological Diversity took place in March 1997 in Berlin. The outcome of the conference, the "Berlin Declaration" was the starting point of a process under the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD). The parties to the convention decided at their 5th conference in May 2000 in Nairobi to contribute to global guidelines on sustainable tourism under the biodiversity convention. These guidelines were then developed under the UNCBD and adopted at the Conference of the Parties 2004 as "Guidelines on Biological Diversity and Tourism Development"¹. Several pilot projects were started to

¹ www.cbd.int/doc/publications/tou-gdl-en.pdf

implement these guidelines. A Consulting Unit of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) on Biodiversity and Tourism for Tsunami Affected Countries was set up in Bonn.²

Commission on Sustainable Development (UN-CSD-7), New York (1999)

In 1997, the United Nations Special General Assembly adopted a resolution on "Sustainable Tourism"³ as part of its "Programme for the further implementation of Agenda 21", the action programme adopted at the Rio Earth Summit. This resolution acknowledges the need to consider further the importance of tourism in the context of Agenda 21. Among other things, it states: "For sustainable patterns of consumption and production in the tourism sector, it is essential to strengthen national policy development and enhance capacity in the areas of physical planning, impact assessment, and the use of economic and regulatory instruments, as well as in the areas of information, education and marketing." Furthermore, the resolution states that "policy development and implementation should take place in cooperation with all interested parties, especially the private sector and local and indigenous communities".

Following the mandate by the UN Special General Assembly, the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) at its 7th session in April 1999 in New York adopted a comprehensive programme of work on tourism and sustainable development. The UNCSD is the high-level forum for sustainable development within the United Nations system. In its decision of 1999, the UN Commission calls upon governments, the tourism industry, major groups and the UN system to take concrete action. It considers economic, environmental, social and cultural aspects of tourism and stresses the involvement and cooperation of all major groups (as defined in Agenda 21) and the principle of participation.

The International Year of Ecotourism (2002)

One of the most contested initiatives at the international level was the International Year of Ecotourism 2002 (IYE), declared by the United Nations. It was led by the World Tourism Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The Third World Network called for an assessment of "eco-tourism" instead of promoting it through a UN year. NGOs feared that under the guise of eco-tourism, new niche markets would be opened up. UNEP confirmed in its evaluation of the IYE that the results were mixed.⁴ Eco-tourism can help protect biological diversity and benefit local communities, but there was also "green washing". The conclusion was that the challenge consisted in applying the principles of eco-tourism to all forms of tourism.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

With the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁵ of the United Nations (2001), the international community placed poverty alleviation at the top of the agenda. By 2015, the percentage of people living in extreme poverty should be halved. The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), since 2003 a specialized agency of the United Nations, started to promote tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation.⁶ However, NGOs question whether tourism

² <http://biodiv.unwto.org/en/content/about-us-9>

³ www.un.org/documents/ga/res/spec/aress19-2.htm

⁴ United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP): Outcomes of the IYE 2002 Three main conclusions.

⁵ www.un.org/millenniumgoals/

⁶ Vgl. World Tourism Organization (WTO) (2002): Tourism and Poverty Alleviation. Madrid. Vgl. World Tourism Organization (WTO) (2004): Tourism and Poverty Alleviation. Recommendations for Action. Madrid.

can play a meaningful role in alleviating poverty. The poorest of the poor hardly ever benefit from tourism.

Rio+10 – World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg (2002)

At the Rio+10 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) 2002 in Johannesburg, heads of state were far from reviewing progress achieved, as suggested in the programme of work adopted by the UNCSD in 1999. The few paragraphs on tourism which came out of Rio+10 contained nothing new and nothing remotely tangible. The perspective was reduced to eco-tourism as a niche segment. The decision of the World Summit⁷ has a much stronger bias to economic aspects than the UNCSD programme of work, which had demanded the active participation of all major groups, especially local and indigenous communities. On the occasion of the Rio+10 summit, NGOs from Germany, Austria and Switzerland published a "Red Card For Tourism", formulating 10 key challenges and calling for "fair play" in tourism (AKTE/Fernweh, 2002).

As a side event preceding the WSSD, a Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations was organised in Cape Town by the Responsible Tourism Partnership and Western Cape Tourism. It passed the "Cape Town Declaration".⁸ Following the Conference, the International Centre for Responsible Tourism⁹ started to promote the concept of "responsible tourism", focussing on the responsibility of individuals, organisations and businesses for their actions and the impacts of their actions.

World Social Forum, Mumbai (2004), Porto Alegre (2005, 2009)

The World Social Forum (WSF) in Mumbai in January 2004 was the first one where tourism groups and NGOs from different parts of the world made use of this global civil society platform in order to raise their concerns and to network with grassroots groups and NGOs working on related issues. It showed the diversity of approaches and perspectives – from denouncing neo-liberal trade liberalisation to the support of small, socially responsible tourism initiatives. The discussion was continued at the World Social Forum 2005 in Porto Alegre. WSF 2005 was under the shock of the devastating tsunami in the Indian Ocean. Tourism NGOs called for solidarity with the affected population and for a cautious approach in the reconstruction of tourism infrastructure (GTIF, 2005).



In 2009 again, tourism was among the issues raised at the World Social Forum. WSF 2009 took place in Belém, Brazil, where members of the Global Tourism Interventions Forum (GTIF) passed the "Declaration of Belém"¹⁰, denouncing hegemonic tourism policies.

⁷ Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD_POI_PD/English/POIChapter4.htm

⁸ International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations (2002) The Cape Town Declaration, Cape Town. www.responsibletourismpartnership.org/CapeTown.html

⁹ www.icrtourism.org/

¹⁰ GTIF Declaration of Belém, World Social Forum, Belém do Pará – Brazil, 28 January to 1 February 2009. www.tourism-watch.de/node/1234

Tourism events were organised on issues such as land speculation, tourism policies, climate change and community-based initiatives. WSF brought together tourism NGOs and other groups and social movements that can strengthen each other.

International Taskforce on Sustainable Tourism Development (2006-2009)

The 9th Special Session of UNEP's Governing Council in Dubai in 2006 focused on tourism and sustainable consumption and production. An International Taskforce on Sustainable Tourism Development was initiated on that occasion, aimed at encouraging participants in the so-called "Marrakech Process" on globally sustainable consumption and production to promote sustainable tourism by providing support tools and presenting existing initiatives that may inspire pilot projects and good practice in other countries. In order to establish a broader institutional and financial base to continue and expand the work of the task force, a "Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism" was formed.

Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism (2011)

With the "Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism" the United Nations want to support changes in tourism towards more sustainability. The secretariat is hosted by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in Paris. The partnership has more than 80 members, including national governments, UN organisations such as the UNWTO, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and other international organisations and associations, companies and NGOs (see also p. 89).

Rio+20 - United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro (2012)

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012 has a focus on the "green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication", and on the "institutional framework for sustainable development – in relation to the objective of renewed political commitment to sustainable development, reviewing progress and implementation gaps and addressing new and emerging challenges". It will also look at developing "Sustainable Development Goals" to replace the Millennium Development Goals after 2015. Despite the "Green Economy Report" published in 2011 by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)¹¹, which dedicated one chapter to tourism as a "key sector", tourism did not feature in the Zero Draft. However, the current draft for the Rio+20 outcome document still under negotiation contains two short and weak paragraphs which are likely to be included in the outcome document. In a similar way as the "Green Economy Report", they focus on investment and market-based mechanisms instead of human rights, participation and equity.

References

GTIF (2005): Solidarity with the Victims of the Tsunami in the Indian Ocean. Solidarity in Tourism? A Call for Action. In: Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED) Tourism Watch: TourismWatch Informationsdienst Dritte Welt-Tourismus. No. 38 (3/2005). Bonn. Annex. www.tourism-watch.de/files/Tsunami_Call.pdf

¹¹ See "The Green Economy – No Limits to Growth?", p. 18

AKTE/Fernweh (2002): Rio+10. Red card for tourism. 10 Principles and challenges for a sustainable tourism development in the 21st Century. Working Group on Tourism & Development (AKTE), Basel/FernWeh - Tourism Review, Freiburg i. Br.

The Green Economy – No Limits to Growth? Tourism as a "Key Sector" in Sustainable Development

By Christina Kamp

It is being opposed to "business as usual", at least rhetorically: the "green economy" – one of the subjects on top of the agenda of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012. The concept, however, fails to question the prevailing growth paradigm and seriously neglects fundamental challenges of global equity and human development. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) released a report "Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication" in 2011. Written in collaboration with UNWTO, one chapter of the report is dedicated to tourism, which has been assigned an important role in the "green economy".¹²

In theory, the definition sounds good. "A Green Economy can be defined as an economy that results in improved human well-being and reduced inequalities over the long term, while not exposing future generations to significant environmental risks and ecological scarcities," says Luigi Cabrini, Director of Sustainable Development of Tourism at the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).¹³ To achieve it, however, requires a paradigm shift away from the growth model and innovative ways of addressing the issues that have been affecting the tourism sector's sustainability performance. More efficiency is certainly not sufficient.

More efficiently more of the same?

The tourism chapter advocates investments in greener and sustainable tourism "as a means to create jobs and reduce poverty while also improving environmental outcomes". In essence, the paper reinforces the growth paradigm and suggests that more energy efficiency, reductions in water consumption and better waste management can somehow solve the problems – while tourism can keep growing as projected: from about 980 million international arrivals in 2011 (UNWTO, 2012) to about 1.6 billion by 2020 (UNWTO, 2001), in addition to around four billion estimated domestic arrivals (in 2008 – a figure that is also likely to grow significantly in the future).

For development to be globally sustainable and to support a world population of nine billion by 2050, such growth cannot and must not be the objective. In many countries of the world, the ecological footprint is already far too large. The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992)¹⁴ clearly called upon states to reduce and eliminate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption.

12 Available at www.unep.org/greeneconomy/Portals/88/documents/ger/GER_11_Tourism.pdf

13 Cabrini, Luigi (2012) Tourism in the UN Green Economy Report. Presentation at UNWTO high-level regional conference on green tourism, 3 May 2012, Chiang Mai, Thailand (http://asiapacific.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/2012may_chiangmai_lc_0.pdf)

14 Available at www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=78&articleid=1163

Reducing unsustainable resource consumption (while maintaining or increasing quality of life) is difficult enough at current levels, and even more difficult if growth rates are factored in.



How would more people travelling more and longer distances possibly lead to less energy consumption and less CO₂ emissions than we have today (or than we had in any given base year in the past)? They won't, as UNEP and UNWTO acknowledge: "Given the rising global trend for travel and the growing energy intensity of most trips, future emissions from the tourism sector are expected to increase substantially, even considering current trends in technological energy-efficiency gains in transport (air and ground) and accommodation."

If UNWTO and UNEP talk about a green-economy investment scenario entailing significant environmental benefits, the stress is on "compared with business-as-usual" – while "business as usual" indeed means the projected growth path. According to the report, in the "business as usual" scenario up to 2050, tourism growth will imply increases in energy consumption (111 percent), greenhouse gas emissions (105 percent), water consumption (150 percent), and solid waste disposal (252 percent). The "green" scenario is expected to "undercut" this by (merely!) 18 percent for water consumption, 44 percent for energy supply and demand, and 52 percent for CO₂ emissions. This still leads to an enormous sacrifice of environmental quality.

What gives rise to serious concern is that this sacrifice will be the consequence of luxury consumption, not of fulfilling the development needs of the poor who, under a global justice imperative, need to – and have the right to – increase their consumption. Advocating tourism as a "key sector" for sustainable development means a promotion of unsustainable consumption of the rich – allegedly (but not necessarily) to the benefit of the poor.

Investing in greening vs. investing in (green) tourism

In their report, UNEP and UNWTO try their best to place emphasis on the "greening of tourism" – like investments in energy efficiency – which can improve environmental outcomes. This, however, is not the same as "investments in green tourism" which may well be (mis-?)understood as a new promotion strategy for the tourism sector. There is a risk that this will be the way in which tourism will be taken up in the outcome document at Rio+20.

It would provide governments with handy advice: The majority of tourism businesses are small and medium enterprises. According to UNEP and UNWTO, "governments and international organisations can facilitate the financial flow to these important actors with an emphasis on contributions to the local economy and poverty reduction." In essence, any kind of tourism promotion can nowadays be justified by claiming that it contributes to poverty reduction, ignoring that tourism activities as such are unlikely to be sustainable. They are embedded in a larger context that includes challenges of equity and justice, both globally and locally. Who travels, who does not? Who benefits from tourism, and who loses in the process? The losers are not only those who simply do not benefit. In many cases, they are the poor who are disproportionately affected and get marginalised further.

The negative distributive effects need to be addressed if tourism is to lead to sustainable outcomes. The report stresses that there is a business case for "greening" in terms of cost savings and increased attractiveness of destinations. At the same time, it advocates subsidies for the tourism sector, ignoring the high opportunity costs especially in developing countries. Using public money to cater to the needs of the industry distorts development priorities. Money spent by governments on subsidising tourism does not get invested in human development for the poor, such as better health and education.



In the tourism promotion strategy proposed by UNEP and UNWTO, land as a resource of vital importance for the poor is taken into account in a manner that fails to acknowledge realities in a large number of destinations, not only in the South: "The price of land in tourist-desirable locations will be governed by competition with other land uses which may be able to pay more (due to higher returns)" (UNEP, 2011, p. 432). Or less (which the authors fail to mention), so that tourism is likely to displace other less "profitable" but more sustainable forms of land use, such as traditional agriculture or fishing. More often than not, tourism has become a major land grabber, to the detriment of local people.

While some people may benefit from tourism (usually not the poorest of the poor), others (often the most marginalised) experience displacement and are being deprived of their livelihoods. Assuming that tourism is the best option for sustainable development is highly misleading. Whether tourism does or does not contribute to sustainable development requires careful investigation in each individual case, taking into account complex direct and indirect impacts as well as alternative development options. Ignoring such impacts is not sustainable, as the development goals are not going to be achieved. The conclusion suggested by UNEP and UNWTO is no consolation: "Tourism is expected to grow faster than most other sectors; and, without green investments, its environmental impacts would be much higher." After all, Rio+20 is about "The Future We Want".

References

UNWTO (2001): Tourism 2020 Vision. World Tourism Organization. Madrid.

UNEP (2011): Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication (www.unep.org/greeneconomy)

UNWTO (2012): International tourism to reach one billion in 2012. Press Release. World Tourism Organization. Madrid. <http://media.unwto.org/en/press-release/2012-01-16/international-tourism-reach-one-billion-2012>

Far from a Green Economy: Environmental Neglect by Transnational Corporations

By Joan Buades

While transnational corporations (TNCs) boast of their environmental commitments and awards, they neglect to take responsibility for three main issues in the global crisis that is affecting the planet: climate change, the loss of biodiversity and water stress. As we know by its effect on the world economy and its share of responsibility regarding climate change, the exploitation of common goods and the colonisation of the planet's impoverished communities, actions regarding international tourism will be decisive in the coming years.

Climate Change

Normally, emphasis tends to be placed on how the greenhouse effect might influence the feasibility of the tourist trade in the various regions of the world. However, official calculations regarding the extent to which tourism is contributing to climate deterioration are becoming increasingly worrying. A recent report by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) draws attention to the extent to which the sector's influence on climate change is underestimated. Moving beyond the usually quoted figure of five percent of responsibility, the UN states that if all greenhouse gases are considered rather than just CO₂, tourism would be responsible for as much as 14 percent of all emissions. What is more, the report admits that the calculation is a conservative one, as it does not include the energy cost of building hotels, airports, roads and motorways.

Focusing on CO₂ generation, the five percent from tourism is heavily influenced by the massive repercussions transport has on this figure (up to 90 percent). Furthermore, the type of transport matters: air travel accounts for 54 to 75 percent of emissions. Buses and trains account for 34 percent of journeys made by tourists, but are responsible for only 13 percent of the emissions. However, although long-haul air travel accounts for barely 2.7 percent of international tourism, it produces 17 percent of tourism-related CO₂ emissions. The UN adds the revealing point that responsibility is highly unequal, as international tourism is a product that is enjoyed each year by around 140 million people, barely two percent of the world population (Simpson et al, 2008, pp. 15-16 and 66-67).

Medium-term forecasts are much worse: by around 2035, tourism will grow by 179 percent and its contribution to the greenhouse effect will increase by 188 percent, essentially as a result of increased air traffic. All of this will occur in a scenario within which the International Panel on Climate Change is calling for a 50 percent reduction of current greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 (Simpson et al, 2008, pp. 15-16). In this context, even media outlets as unlikely to be accused of radicalism as the Financial Times have published that it will not be long before international tourism "will be considered environmental enemy number one" (Tomkins, 2006).

In light of this evidence, how have TNCs responded? For the most part, their reaction has involved lobbying to prevent the Kyoto Protocol and its possible 2012 substitute from including any references to specific targets to limit the growth of air travel, much less the possibility of using environmental fiscal policy mechanisms to help reduce emissions. The aim of both the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the World Travel & Tourism

Council (WTTC) is to enter voluntarily the “carbon emissions market” and to introduce the use of biofuels (UNWTO, 2007; WTTC, 2009).

This means that emphasis is placed on improving efficiency and mitigating the impact of individual journeys without addressing the need for real change in the underlying trend, namely the constant and meteoric growth of air travel and long-haul international tourism from North America and Europe to East Asia, the Pacific, the Caribbean and the Emirates, the areas attracting the largest share of tourism in the medium term. In Spain, for example, not a single TNC has reviewed its policy of directing an increasingly large contingent of its customers to Mexico, the Caribbean and Central America. Besides the transport factor, there are currently no plans to install solar energy in any TNC resorts or accommodation sites, which is simply incredible when the vast majority of their establishments are in areas with the highest annual levels of solar radiation on the planet (the Mediterranean, Caribbean and tropics). What sense does it then make to flaunt a pilot programme to replace incandescent bulbs with an efficient lighting system if it is for resorts with an energy design that is completely unsustainable in terms of form, materials used, insulation and refrigeration?

Loss of Biodiversity

A second environmental factor is the extent to which international tourism contributes to the loss of biodiversity, identified at the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit as another major global environmental challenge. The lack of responsibility of TNCs in this regard is manifest in three decisive areas:

- The colonisation and tourism-based artificialisation of tropical areas with a high ecological value as the richest biomass on the planet. This is the case of several tourism and property development projects in Costa Rica and Indonesia.



- The generalised devastation of the coastline, both in the Mediterranean and in Mexico and Central America. The "residentialisation" of tourism and the massive development of airport infrastructures, motorways and roads continually sacrifice beaches, dune-based ecosystems, wetlands and protected areas.

If the extreme urbanisation of the Spanish coastline is a constant point at issue, the coastlines of Croatia, Turkey, Tunisia and Morocco are coming increasingly to resemble this model. The huge complex that Barceló and Iberostar are building in Saïdia (Rif) at the expense of the Mouluya wetlands, an area "protected" by the Moroccan State¹⁵, could be seen as a painful example of this "business as usual" development.

- A preference for island locations and sites in the tropics, the most ecologically fragile areas of the planet. Spanish TNCs are the true owners not only of the Balearic and Canary Islands, but also of the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Jamaica and Cape Verde (Buades, 2006, pp. 59-119).

A logical consequence of this tourism-led colonisation of tropical, coastal and island regions is the use of the term “natural” as a commercial hook as used in both old and new “resorts” (from Majorca to Brazil and Costa Rica). Protected areas thus become a calling card with

¹⁵ See the website for the Rif NGO Humains et Environnement: www.hee.org

which to attract new residential and tourist developments which, once completed, lead to the disappearance or major deterioration of those same areas¹⁶. According to the United Nations Environment Programme, tourism in the most environmentally threatened areas of the planet will have doubled in the 1990s (Christ et al, 2003).

Water

Water stress always accompanies tourism-led industrialisation. On the one hand, the sector's water consumption is much higher than the consumption of local residents. For example, a tourist consumes 3.8 times more water than a resident in Lanzarote (Canary Islands), and in Barbados this figure can be as much as ten times more (Buades, 2008). Various extravagant uses linked to tourism (such as golf courses, swimming pools and water parks, as well as residential parks and condo hotels) cause consumption levels to shoot up. A golf course needs as much water per year as a community of eight thousand people (GOB Mallorca, 2000).

The majority of the most heavily exploited tourist regions are located in areas where there is a water shortage to begin with or where it becomes scarce due to over-consumption as a result of tourism and "residentialisation". Whereas in the Mediterranean pressure from tourism and residential development advocates generating fresh water artificially to sustain growth at any cost (by transferring the problem to the climate, as production dramatically increases CO₂ emissions), in the Caribbean and Central America, the dispute over water translates into citizen-led struggles to defend aquifers from the threat of being privatised and used up by tourism and property development TNCs. The case of the Nimboyore river in the Guanacaste province of Costa Rica against hotel and residential projects such as the Sol Meliá at Playa Conchal and Reserva Conchal, or Riu and others at El Coco and Ocotol, is paradigmatic (Ramírez Cover, 2008).¹⁷ Another example is the battle by local people and even institutions against the Riu, Iberostar and Fiesta TNCs in Jamaica over the risks that the TNCs' megaprojects are posing to the supply of water as a common good in regions such as Negril.¹⁸

Going beyond the multiplication of "pilot projects"

The crucial point is to go beyond the multiplication of "pilot projects" and micro actions in "end of pipeline" measures. TNCs and governments have spent years demonstrating how to save energy by switching off lights when leaving a room, or by attaching water diffusers to certain devices. By their very nature, which is often subordinate to the requirements of a company's image or brand, the results have been practically irrelevant.

The international tourist industry must consider a green reform of its products in order to create a positive effect on the environmental balance. Strategic priorities should include:

- The "greening" of existing sites and services. TNCs could implement plans to install solar energy and energy efficiency measures in all their facilities, with the aim of lowering the amount of CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions, and to relieve pressure for more fossil-fuel or nuclear power plants. At the same time, they should also implement general plans to minimise and reuse water and waste products. Desirable initiatives would include considering doing away with golf courses and water parks in the most bio-climatically fragile areas, such as the Mediterranean and the Caribbean. The industry could also implement minimum waste programmes by drastically reducing the use of plastics and non-recyclable materials.

¹⁶ See www.salvemmallorca.org for the situation in the hyper-touristified Majorca

¹⁷ For an idea of just how much water is required for development in this area, visit www.reservaconchal.com

¹⁸ www.jamaica-gleaner.com, 25 August and 17 September 2006

- Active and non-parasitic support for biodiversity protection, particularly in tropical forests and protected/coastal sites. Rather than using the “shop window” model, which turns protected areas into little more than advertising material for hotels and property developments, TNCs could contribute financially to conservation management and agree not to develop any new facilities or establishments within such areas. This commitment would include a sine qua non condition of necessary participation of local communities and citizen associations in the planning and management, with the aim of guaranteeing that any environmental protection measures also include the societies that have cared for these areas throughout their history.
- Priority to regional transport over transcontinental travel. This would include setting an overall limit to long-haul air travel within the framework of the climate protection agreements that will replace the Kyoto Protocol (which deliberately ignored the huge global responsibility of aviation). Despite the fiasco of the Copenhagen Conference (December 2009), the tourism industry should become an active party with firm commitments to mitigation. Naturally, this would involve prioritising intracontinental or regional holiday destinations, increasing resources to boost collective forms of transport, whether on land (trains and buses) or by sea, all of which have a much lower carbon footprint than air travel.
- Minimising the transportation of materials and foods by adapting to local produce. An extremely important part of the services (food) and even the facilities themselves (building materials, finishes, etc.) provided or used by the tourist industry have a very high environmental cost as they are sourced from elsewhere, even from very distant places. Any initiative that involves using local or regional supplies can only improve the overall environmental balance. The results obtained from this new “mission” by tourism TNCs should help them to lower their carbon footprint in biophysical terms to some degree. To obtain a relevant comparison, in a society so radically modelled by the economics of tourism as the Balearic islands, the current carbon footprint (equivalent to almost six times the region’s bioproductive capacity) must be reduced and the industry itself must assume a large part of the responsibility to make this happen (Murray et al, 2005).

Key aspects for the tourism industry’s imperative responsibility

In light of the current world situation, we are at a crossroads as a civilisation: the crisis of turbo-capitalism may lead to greater inequality, misery and conflict, but it could also be an opportunity to begin to make peace with the planet, provide possibilities for human development for the impoverished majority, and increase levels of real democracy.

Given that the “market with democracy” system (including economic democracy) is the lesser evil, the time has come to change the framework in which world tourism operates. Despite “intercultural” differences between TNCs, governments and the societies affected, there are three major factors that encourage co-operation:

We are running out of time to act in order to safeguard quality of life and guarantee the tourism business. We have only a few decades left to deal intelligently with climate change, water stress and the devastation of the last remaining essential ecosystems. If we do nothing, a large part of the “resorts” themselves will disappear (Simpson et al, 2008).

Awareness amongst a large part of the international leisure classes and many TNC owners and executives is changing, and they are not prepared to simply give the product a “facelift”. In fact, they boast that what they would like to do is add quality and innovation to the services provided with regard to the business itself and to the care of untouchable “common goods” (climate, landscape, water and minimum welfare conditions for communities affected by the industry).

Certain types of tourism that are respectful of environmental balance and generate direct welfare for the communities that democratically decide to promote tourism may be decisive in sustaining societies that are currently on the verge of poverty and condemned to mass emigration.

References

Buades, J. (2006): Exportando paraísos. La colonización turística del planeta, Palma: La Lucerna.

Buades, J. (2008): Dessalar la Mediterrània? De quimera, negocis i béns comuns, Scripta Nova. Revista electronica de geografia y ciencias sociales, XII (270(30)). www.ub.es/geocrit/sn/sn-270/sn-270-30.htm

Christ, C., Hillel, O., Matus, S., & Sweeting, J. (2003): Tourism and Biodiversity. Mapping Tourism's Global Footprint, Washington: Conservation International y United Nations Environment Programme. www.unep.org

GOB Mallorca. (2000): Camps de golf: "Lobos con piel de cordero". Palma: GOB Mallorca. www.gobmallorca.com

Murray, I., Rullan, O., & Blàzquez, M. (2005): «Las huellas territoriales de deterioro ecologico. El trasfondo oculto de la explotación turística de Baleares», Scripta Nova. Revista electrónica de geografía y ciencias sociales, IX (199). www.ub.es/geocrit/sn/sn-199.htm

Ramírez Cover, A. (2008): Turismo como nuevas forma de acumulación y conflictividad socio-ambiental relacionada a los recursos hídricos: perspectivas para Guanacaste. San José: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales (Universidad de Costa Rica). www.iis.ucr.ac.cr/jornadas/12.php

Simpson, M., Gössling, S., Scott, D., Hall, C., & Gladin, E. (2008): Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the Tourism Sector: Frameworks, Tools and Practices, Paris: UNEP, University of Oxford, UNWTO, WMO. www.geog.ox.ac.uk/news/events/ccamts

Tomkins, R. (2006): Welcome to the age of less, Financial Times. 11/11/2006

UNWTO (2007): De Davos a Bali: La contribución del turismo al reto del cambio climático. Madrid: OMT. <http://www.unwto.org/climate/index.php>

WTTC. (2009): Leading the challenge on climate change, London: WTTC. www.wttc.org/bin/pdf/original_pdf_file/climate_change_final.pdf

Joan Buades is a critical researcher in tourism, environment and globalisation and member of the Alba Sud research team. He also works with the Research Group on Sustainability and Territory (GIST) at the University of the Balearic Islands (UIB) and with other social organisations.

This article is an excerpt from "Turismo y bien común: De la Irresponsabilidad Corporativa a la Responsabilidad Comunitaria", by Joan Buades. Alba Sud, September 2010.

English translation: Centro Superior de Idiomas de la Universidad de Alicante, S.A.U.

Forests, Communities and the "Green India Mission": Promises and Failures of Ecotourism

By Equations

Market-based conservation schemes seek to mobilise and channel private sector contributions for the sake of environmental conservation and to resolve various environmental problems. They are actively propagated as an innovative approach "[t]o attract private contributions, introduce sustainable resource management practices compatible with the Rio Conventions' objectives and principles, and contribute to the development of economic opportunities in poor, rural areas of the world" (Paquin/Mayrand, 2005). These schemes are promoted by a large variety of governmental and non-governmental actors as a possible new and innovative way to finance the conservation of forests and other ecosystems¹⁹. In India, ecotourism is one such scheme being promoted because it speaks the language of conservation.

Tourism is a sector that is built and relies on natural capital (both human and ecological) and this makes issues of sustainability very critical. Globally, the new interest in tourism-environment interrelations is particularly notable with rising concerns about the links between tourism and climate change. In this context, an interesting trend is evident when notions of sustainability lead to class dimensions of tourism. Under the banner of sustainability, policy makers clamour for "high-value low-volume" tourists. This is a recurrent theme in several tourism policy and planning documents in India. This suggests a form of neo-colonialism disguised as green, as it defines those who deserve to travel solely by their ability to spend.

India's National Action Plan on Climate Change

The Government of India announced its first ever National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) in June 2008 to identify measures and steps to advance climate change-related actions in its domestic sphere. Eight National Missions in the areas of solar energy, enhanced energy efficiency, sustainable agriculture, sustainable habitat, water, the Himalayan ecosystem, increasing forest cover and strategic knowledge for climate change were incorporated under the Plan by the Prime Minister's Council on Climate Change, reflecting India's vision and domestic strategies for sustainable development and the steps it must take to realize it.

According to the NAPCC, the Green India Mission (GIM), being one of the eight National Missions, was launched to enhance eco-system services, including carbon sinks, to be called Green India. "The Mission on Green India will be taken up on degraded forest land through direct action by communities, organized through Joint Forest Management Committees and guided by the department of forest in state governments", the NAPCC document stated. The Mission has two focused objectives – increasing forest cover and density as a whole of the country and conserving biodiversity and recommended implementation of the already announced Greening India Programme.

The Green India Mission document envisages tourism as offering an alternative livelihood to communities dependent on natural resources in coastal ecosystems like mangroves and in

¹⁹For example, in his note on Incentive Measures to the 11th meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity states that "market creation has often proved to be an effective means for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity".

forests. The implications of this are many. Today, community-driven tourism initiatives are still playing a marginal role and do not receive the impetus they need from the Government through schemes and incentives. In the absence of this communities will not be able to compete with big operators with the capacity to acquire large tracts of land and convert them into private forests which are then promoted as tourism products in themselves. In fact, it is not mere schemes that are needed to ensure that tourism is community driven. What is needed is a change in the way ecotourism is envisaged – where communities are central to the venture and not merely profits of large tour operators and income for the nation. Furthermore, starting a tourism enterprise might not even be in the interests of the community and the state would need to recognise and respect this.

Existing tourism development does not involve the Local Self Governance Institutions (LSGIs) in its decision making process, planning and implementation. All the ministries' plans and schemes should factor in a mechanism to get approval of the LSGIs before a tourism project is initiated. Apart from mega projects, this should hold true even to hotels, lodges, resorts and other infrastructure to be developed in villages in eco-sensitive areas. Given the strict laws regarding forest and coastal governance in the country, the impacts on local communities reach much greater proportions.

Further, indigenous practices of forest conservation will be lost to market-based conservation mechanisms. The GIM talks of not only increasing the forest cover through the usual afforestation programme and plantations, but emphasizes improving the quality of forest cover in 4.9 million ha of forest and non-forest areas representing diversity in forest density, tenure and ownership. This includes 1.5 million ha of moderately dense forest, 3 million ha of open forests and 0.4 million ha of grasslands. The eco-restoration of degraded open forests with a target area double that of the moderately dense forest cover will have



more profound impact on the forest communities. The majority of the forest people in India today have shifted to or are being expelled to these open forests which are of less intrinsic value and considered uneconomic (Lahiri, 2009). Forest communities extract fuel wood, fodder, and small timber from these forests and graze their cattle. GIM targets these areas for large scale afforestation programmes with fast growing native species and closure to grazing on rotational basis thereby preparing the ground for displacing the forest communities

from these last forest areas, so depriving them of their habitat and livelihood options.

The Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF) has emphasized improving the quality of forest cover and restoration of eco-systems while remaining silent on the continued deforestation through mining, indiscriminate industrialization, mega infrastructure projects and the active promotion of wildlife tourism in forest areas in the name of ecotourism.

Green India Mission represents an institutional mechanism to promote India's REDD+ ambitions²⁰. REDD+ "has specifically opened the possibilities for the country to expect compensation for its pro-conservation approach and sustainable management of forests resulting in even further increase of forest cover and thereby its forest carbon stocks." (MoEF, 2010). The MoEF is unscrupulous in openly declaring that forest certification system will "enable unbridled access to ethical trading and market arenas with price premiums." It does not matter whether the same forests and resources belong to the forest communities.

Ecotourism and Community Development

Ecotourism is increasingly being seen as a driver for the eradication of poverty through economic development of communities. Impacts of ecotourism are seen in its multiplier effects, ability to create livelihood alternatives, governance and land use patterns. Ecotourism is also believed to create an enabling environment for conservation as well as generating a monetary resource base for conservation. Conservation education for tourists is also seen as an important outcome of ecotourism. Ecotourism in forest areas is primarily located in or around protected areas and areas identified as Critical Wildlife Habitats including Critical Tiger Habitats, which has resulted in opposing interests and conflict between the adivasis²¹, the state and other actors.

Over the past eight to ten years, there has been a rapid increase in the number of ecotourism enterprises at well established existing destinations. Further, newer destinations have also emerged. Today, it appears that ecotourism is at its peak and it is important that there be extensive debates to understand the implications of ecotourism and to facilitate the positive impacts while mitigating its negative impacts. For ecotourism to be sustainable, the following process needs to be followed:

- Ensure prior informed participation of all stakeholders
- Ensure equal, effective and active participation of all stakeholders at all stages in the ecotourism projects
- Acknowledge adivasis'/other forest dwellers'/ local communities' right to say "no" to tourism
- Development – to be fully informed, effective and active participants in the development of tourism activities within their communities, lands and territories
- Promote processes for adivasis'/other forest dwellers'/local communities to control and maintain their resources, culture and rights.

Ecotourism and Conservation

Tourism may generate funds for conservation related activities. However, estimating the costs of regeneration and the sources of funds received by the State Forest Department is a difficult task. Identifying and segregating different cost components is a challenge since administrative costs overlap various activities including conservation and management.

Fundamentally, the issue here is to examine whether income generated from ecotourism activities goes back to the Forest Department. Currently, all earnings from forests (Non

²⁰ REDD = Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation, see www.un-redd.org

²¹ The word adivasi literally means 'indigenous people' or 'original inhabitants'.

Timber Forest Products – NTFP, timber, entry fees, etc.) go into a common pool wherein all non-plan income of the state is parked, from where allocations for different expenses are made. There is no way to ensure that the incomes from tourism are ploughed back to the Forest Department for regeneration work. Therefore, the only directly traceable benefit is salaries people receive when they are employed at tourism sites. This creates a rupture in the idea that ecotourism can be used as an income generation method for forest conservation. Madhya Pradesh is the only state where each national park has created a fund into which money collected through gate receipts feeds.

It has been found that almost 70 percent of income from wildlife tourism is from the fees collected at the entry gate, which means the larger the number of tourists, the greater the earnings of the Forest Department. This is in complete opposition to the concept of ecotourism. Additionally, the large sunk cost of tourism infrastructure developed at the sites becomes redundant since many tourists prefer day visits to overnight stays (Swaminathan/Purushothaman, 2000).

One of the aspirations for ecotourism is conservation education of the tourists. However, not much has been done by way of actualising this potential. A part of the conservation education is to also recognise the role that local communities have historically played in the conservation of the country's natural resources and the continued struggle to do this in the light of a fast developing nation. This will instil respect for local communities in the tourists and will change the perspective with which they are viewed. The change in the mind set of tourists towards local communities would also positively influence their behaviour vis-à-vis local communities, which today is oppressive, patronising and condescending.



The mainstream notion of conservation overlooks and does not acknowledge the role that is played by adivasis and other forest dwelling communities in conserving the forests as well as the diversity. Forms of conservation are also very often indigenous in nature and are tied with the religious and spiritual beliefs of communities. Some of the conservation practices that have been recorded are the existence of sacred groves, "navai", a harvest festival in Western Madhya Pradesh, during which the "gayana" is performed. The "gayana" chronicles the evolution of humankind. It is an oral tradition teaching the future generation their past and possibly indicating their future by describing the symbiotic relationship that exists between man and nature and the importance of this relationship for sustenance. This instils in the younger generations a respect for nature while also teaching them about their rights to the forest²²

Ecotourism, Employment and Livelihoods

The forests, in the form of protected areas, national parks and wildlife sanctuaries, are the main tourism product in ecotourism. The creation of these areas has caused land alienation and displacement in large numbers. This change in land use pattern and land dispossession, lack of access to forest resources has led to social injustices like loss of dignity and livelihoods

²² See "In the Belly of the River: Tribal Conflicts over Development in the Narmada Valley (Studies in Social Ecology and Environmental History) by Amita Baviskar, Oxford University Press, 2005

of the adivasis and other forest dwellers. Therefore, in stark contrast to the claim that ecotourism furthers community development, it in fact bases itself on a paradigm of forest conservation and protection, which has taken away the existing livelihoods of people.

It is true that tourism development generates employment opportunities for local communities. However, the lodge or jeep owners are usually not from the region. They are more often than not from nearby cities/towns and sometimes from as far away places like New Delhi, Kolkata and Mumbai. The income thus generated from tourism is taken away from the region and into the bigger cities. There is also the issue of self-determination here. People who used to own land have, due to poverty, been forced to sell out to the companies and become employed as guides and drivers if lucky, but usually end up working as security guards, gardeners, waiters at the restaurant, etc. Therefore, the mere generation of employment, though an often repeated argument, is highly overestimated as it does not counter the disempowerment and lack of dignified life that the adivasis experience.

Today, community-driven tourism initiatives are still playing a marginal role and do not receive the impetus they need from the government through schemes and incentives. In the absence of this communities will not be able to compete with big operators with the capacity to acquire large tracts of land and convert them into private forests, which are then promoted as tourism products in themselves. In fact, it is not mere schemes that are needed to ensure that tourism is community driven. What is needed is a change in the way ecotourism is envisaged – where communities are central to the venture and not merely profits of large tour operators and income for the nation. Furthermore, starting a tourism enterprise might not even be in the interests of the community and the state would need to recognise and respect this.

Ecotourism needs to go beyond community welfare to being community-centred if it wants to achieve its goal of conservation and community development. In the context of livelihoods, ecotourism can only generate employment and for communities it is employment at the lower end of the hierarchical corporate ladder. There is a very important contradiction and difference between livelihood and employment.

Livelihood is a much broader sociological term rooted in the concept of social justice where culture and identity form its basis and is dependent upon the landscape and ecology. It is connected with community and property rights indicating dignity, control, empowerment and sustainability apart from income generation.

Employment on the other hand is an economic term denoting work done and money earned. It is individualistic, governed by a set of rules between two individuals/entities where capital dominates and is irrespective of any location/landscape/ecology and pays for labour that produces and reproduces for consumption for another and does not consider the issue of sustainability.

Community Involvement

The role of community involvement maybe spread over a broad spectrum from minimal tokenistic involvement of the community to community-based ecotourism. Along this spectrum are several levels of community involvement:

- Tokenism – employing members of the community as drivers, tour guides etc.
- Informing – where communities are informed about the ecotourism development being planned and are involved through employment in the ecotourism activities

- Consulting – where the communities are consulted with but where the aspirations of the community might or might not be addressed. In this instance the community would have the space to influence decisions while not being a formal part of the decision making process
- Collaborating – where communities are seen as equal partners in the ecotourism development planned and are formally part of the decision making process. The community would then have control over the impacts as well as the benefits of ecotourism.
- Ownership – where the community owns the enterprise, which becomes the capital of the community. Where the pace, nature, forms, stakeholders are all decided by the communities and all others involved are supporters of the enterprise.

Studies show that unless there has been either proactive response by the community or intervention by an outside agency, most ecotourism developments see the following impacts which need to be taken into account while planning for any ecotourism programme:²³

- The nature of ecotourism activities are similar across almost all ecotourism sites. Clearly the activities do not take into account the cultural and social specificities of communities in the region. Neither do they take into the account the special skills that each of the communities has in terms of conservation.
- Displacement of adivasis from protected areas, which are then later promoted as ecotourism destinations.
- Objectification of adivasis by the government in their promotional material and literature, the tourism industry and by the tourists in the way they see the adivasis.
- Very often ecotourism activities impinge on resources that are otherwise used by the adivasis for livelihood, health and other purposes making them self-reliant and self-sufficient.
- Construction of tourism infrastructure like roads, accommodation structures like permanent tents, cottages etc. further damage the environment and also are a threat to the adivasis.
- The use of AC tents and other construction material result in increased energy consumption, where the resorts have captive generation of electricity, while very often the villages nearby have not yet been electrified/see frequent power cuts.
- Carrying capacity/limits of acceptable change are very often not taken into consideration while planning ecotourism initiatives.
- Solid waste produced due to tourism initiatives is not properly managed impacting both the environment as well as the people.

Legislation for Ecotourism in Forest Areas in India

India's forests are governed by a series of acts, policies, regulations and guidelines. However, there seems to be little application of these in the context of tourism. While only the guidelines for the declaration of Eco Sensitive Zones talk of specific guidelines for tourism, from some of the sections like Section 4 (2) (f) of the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006, the boundaries for the operation of

²³ Equations (2010): Note on Community Involvement in Ecotourism, www.equitabletourism.org/readfull.php?AID=1226

tourism enterprises can be deduced. In protected areas, reserve areas and areas declared as critical wildlife habitat, local governance is almost non-existent as all decisions regarding the villages are taken by the Forest Department.

The (Draft) Guidelines for Ecotourism In and Around Protected Areas issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forests on June 2, 2011 lay out a detailed set of framework guidelines on the selection, planning, development, implementation and monitoring of ecotourism in India. Recognising however, that India's wildlife landscapes are diverse, these guidelines should be necessarily broad, with specific State Ecotourism Strategies to be developed by the concerned State Governments, and Ecotourism Plans to be developed by the concerned authorities



mandatorily taking into account these guidelines. The following core values should be central to the guidelines: people-centred, accountable, democratic/participatory/equitable and non-exploitative, which mandatorily will have to be reflected in the state ecotourism strategies. Roles and responsibilities should be enumerated for different stakeholders: State Governments, Protected Area management, tourist facilities/tour operators, local communities, temple boards and general public. Types of tourism activities allowable should also be enumerated.

The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 has not been considered while formulating the draft guidelines. It needs to be ensured that the final guidelines will guarantee that the provisions of this key Act are upheld in the context of the governance and regulation of tourism and rights of forest dwelling communities.

What Needs To Be Done

It is important that forests not be seen merely as providing ecosystem services alone but as an ecosystem which comprises of the people living in and around the forests including their historical relationship with the forests, the flora and fauna. By turning ecosystems into tourism products, they are also made vulnerable to the market (demand and supply). This is done without taking into consideration the communities living in these areas who have for centuries been the custodians of the resources and who have a symbiotic relationship with them. Further, the life-cycle of the ecosystems themselves is not considered while planning for tourism development in these fragile spaces.

Ecotourism, when practiced correctly, has the scope to link to a wider constituency and build conservation support while raising awareness about the worth and fragility of such ecosystems in the public at large. It also promotes the non-consumptive use of wilderness areas, for the benefit of local communities living in and around, and dependent on these fragile landscapes. The first benefit from ecotourism must go to the local people, and in the long-run, capacity-building should be carried out to forge a sustainable partnership between the forest department, tourism department, tourism professionals and local communities. The long term goal is for communities to own the ecotourism enterprises through active participation in their governance.

It is important to promote ecotourism with the strictest of regulations. While the Ministry of Environment and Forests has issued draft guidelines, it is important that these are finalised after taking into account the responses from the communities and civil society organisations. Finally, there is a dire need for a revised policy on ecotourism, the responsibility for which should lie with the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

References

Friends of the Earth International (2005): Nature: poor people's wealth - a position paper for the UN World Summit and the Review of the Millennium Development Goals, 14 - 16 September 2005

Lahiri, Souparna (2009): Exploring the Road to REDD in India, REDD Realities, published by Global Forest Coalition, December 2009

MoEF (2010): India's Forests & and REDD+, Ministry of Environment & Forests, Government of India 30 November 2010

Paquin, Marc & Mayrand, Karel (2005): "MEA-based Markets for Ecosystem Services - Draft concept paper prepared for the OECD Workshop on Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Private Investment, Helsinki, Finland, 16-17 June 2005", Unisféra International Centre, data sourced from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/14/62/35000276.pdf> data retrieved in November 2006

Swaminathan I.P. & Purushothaman, Seema (2000): "Forest Conservation, Tourism and Extraction: An Economic Perspective" published in Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics Vol. 55 No. 3, July-September 2000

Equations is a research, policy, advocacy and campaigning organisation working on tourism and development issues in India since 1985. Large parts of this paper are drawn from "Green India Mission: India's REDD+ Action Plan to disempower and evict forest communities from their own homelands" by Souparna Lahiri and "Forests, Communities And Ecotourism" by Swathi Seshadri.

www.equitabletourism.org

The Potential of Community-based Tourism for Local Development: Networking for Sustainable Alternatives in Brazil

By René Schärer

Fisheries resources were abundant and the land of artisanal fisherfolk protected until the end of 1950. There was no demand for land for second residences and beach tourism, and no industrial fleet to compete with artisanal fishers for land and fish. In the 1960s, millions of dollars in government subsidies created the lobster fishing industry and led to overfishing of the valuable lobster resource. At the same time, forward looking real estate companies started to go for beach property while communities were ill prepared to defend themselves. Nobody had ever asked them for a land title before and land grabbers were quick to take advantage of millions of illiterate coastal residents.

It was high time to take steps against the irresponsible exploitation of fisheries resources and against the development of second residences, vacation resorts and apartment condos. The campaign SOS Survival originated in the village of Prainha do Canto Verde a year after the UN Conference of Sustainable Development in Rio (1992) to demand participation of communities in the management of the coastal zone. The Jangada (sail raft) with four fishers aboard and two young women accompanying on land took 74 days to sail to Rio de Janeiro.

They protested against predatory fishing, real estate speculation, development of mass tourism and the abandonment of artisanal fishers and mobilized 20 communities along the route to Rio. Nineteen years later, fishers are participating in fisheries management and are working towards certification of the lobster fisheries from artisanal fisher communities. Most resort projects in the state of Ceará have been stopped and community tourism is a reality.

Community-based tourism can provide alternatives. It has the potential to contribute to local development, especially if it offers a complementary income for communities in natural environments and in particular in protected areas. In order to develop tourism as a viable economic activity, communities need to have their basic rights guaranteed, just as any other national or international company or investor. The UN establishes the responsibility of businesses, including the tourism industry, to respect and not impinge upon the rights of others. However, despite the numerous human rights conventions and the clear lines of responsibility for ensuring that rights are protected, serious abuses occur all over the world in the name of tourism (Barnett et al.)



Respect for human rights is a global issue for community development, regardless of origin or activity. There is an urgent need for public policies to prevent land grabbing. UN organizations, multilateral banks, cooperation agencies and private funders should provide technical and financial assistance to develop community-based tourism.

Community-based tourism vs. conventional tourism

In Praia das Fontes, in the Brazilian state of Ceará, the impact of conventional tourism becomes visible when visiting the beach resorts where local residents have no access and tourists are discouraged from mixing with the natives. Two meter high walls, guards with watchdogs are clear signs. The "all inclusive" bracelets separate tourists from prospective local intruders. When both the community Praia das Fontes and the neighbouring fishing community of Prainha do Canto Verde suffered pressure from land grabbers in the 1980s, the people of Praia das Fontes caved in and settled for a small piece of land for themselves to live on. The fisherfolk of Prainha, however, decided to resist and go to court. It took 25 years, but finally the Superior Court of Justice condemned the land grabbers and opened the way for the fishing community to register their right to land.

Governments in eleven states of the north-east of Brazil, backed by Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) projects, have been investing heavily over the last 20 years to provide infrastructure like airports, highways and access to electricity and sanitation to attract investors for the development of wealth-concentrating tourism ventures, facilitated by tax incentives and subsidized loans. No wonder the number of resorts has multiplied and tourist arrivals are on the increase on regularly scheduled and charter flights to the north-eastern cities of Salvador, Recife, Natal, and Fortaleza.

The need for networking

In 2003, the 1st International Seminar for Sustainable Tourism (SITS) was organised in Fortaleza, Ceará. A week before the opening session, 40 members from 15 communities from north-eastern and northern regions of Brazil got together for the first gathering ever to discuss community-based tourism in Brazil. The workshop took place in the small fishing village of Prainha do Canto Verde, 110 km from Fortaleza. Though they had never met before, participants from the Atlantic Ocean, community representatives from the state of Roraima and Ceará, women from the mountains of Cariri, Ceará and Pará where the Amazon meets the sea, started to discover how much they had in common.

Mostly traditional and indigenous people, they were pursuing protected areas to have a legal basis for land rights and conservation. Being from communities which struggled to defend their homeland and care for their natural support system – nature – united them in solidarity.



The great majority of the communities have some kind of environmental education project for children and adults in the communities. They all protect their natural heritage and preserve the history of their ancestors. Unknown to most outsiders, they care for the environment without charging for the services. They are stewards of the environment. Six of the 15 communities were already offering tourism services and the other nine had come to join the new network. They travelled home with the certainty that yes, "A different kind of tourism is possible".

The conference in Fortaleza was the first of its kind in Brazil and the community representatives who met the week before in Prainha do Canto Verde made the opening presentation to over 400 participants from civil society, government academics and tourism professionals. Tourism Secretary representatives and the trade were clearly not prepared for what was going to be presented over the next three days. Human rights issues were a priority, not overnights and tourist arrivals. The conservation of coastal marine resources and illegal fishing are crucial issues for the survival of communities, but do not seem to be important for investors, the government or the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The organizers – the local NGO Terramar and State of Ceará University, together with European NGOs such as EED Tourism Watch (Germany), the Working Group on Tourism and Development and the Foundation for Solidarity in Tourism (Switzerland), ECPAT Netherlands, and Turismo Responsabile (Italy), prepared the field and put community tourism on the agenda in order to start lobbying federal, state and municipal governments to give communities a fair share in developing tourism as an instrument for local economic development in communities all over Brazil.

After the 1st SITS, NGOs and communities started to network with other Latin American countries like Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Mexico and others where community tourism had been developed about 20 years earlier. They discovered the same common bonds – traditional and indigenous people struggling for land rights, protecting the environment and using sustainable methods to use natural resources and treat the land with respect for nature. The majority of the destinations, whether on the coast or in forests, were either already part of protected areas or were in the process of creating them. Until three years ago, the

International Labour Organization (ILO) supported the development of the community tourism network Redturs in 15 countries of Latin America.²⁴

One example is Ecuador, where the Plurinational Federation of Community Tourism of Ecuador (FEPTCE) assists 57 communities, providing technical and marketing assistance which helps communities to generate complementary income in addition to fishing, hunting, agriculture, fruit and nut collection, while protecting their land and environment. FEPTCE and other Latin American communities participated in the 2nd SITS in 2008 and witnessed the launch of the first community tourism network of Brazil – TUCUM²⁵. This time the Tourism Ministry was there to support the consolidated community tourism movement of the country and acknowledge that community tourism is a reality. It seemed a miracle when the Brazilian government opened a project line in the amount of US\$100,000.00 each and financed projects in over 50 community tourism destinations. Together with the airline TAM, the government sponsored the first general assembly of the emerging Brazilian Community Tourisms Network TURISOL in Ilheus, Bahia, in 2010. Unfortunately, a wave of corruption scandals hit Brazil and among seven other ministers, President Dilma Rousseff sent the Tourism Minister packing. Support for community tourism has since stopped.

Just before the Rio+20 Conference in June 2012, the outlook for community tourism is rather cloudy. Brazil as the host of the conference will miss an opportunity to present itself as a visionary force and show off the Brazilian Community Tourism Network to the world. The ILO has abandoned the Latin American Network. The proposal of the "green economy" in tourism is just another green wash after the Year of Ecotourism in 2002. The paper presents the vision of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), which is dominated by business interests and is totally closed to participation by civil society organisations. European civil society organisations have been calling on the UNWTO to open dialogue and consider supporting communities. The same NGOs are having more and more difficulties staying alive for lack of financial support. In Asia, international cooperation agencies, the World Bank and ADB took advantage of the (2004) Tsunami clearing beach territory to develop resort tourism in countries hard hit by the catastrophe, such as India and Sri Lanka. Will sustainable tourism be reduced to some courageous communities around the world?

References

Barnett T, Nobel R, Patullo P, Eriksson J. Putting Tourism to Rights, A challenge to human rights abuses in the tourism industry

René Schärer works with communities in the fishing village of Prainha do Canto Verde in the north-eastern state of Ceará, Brazil, supporting local development, environmentally and socially responsible tourism and fighting land speculation. He is a founding member of the NGO Instituto Terramar, Brazil, and the philanthropic association Amigos da Prainha do Canto Verde, Switzerland.

www.prainhadocantoverde.org

²⁴ www.redturs.org

²⁵ www.tucum.org

Tourism and Food Sovereignty: Risks and Opportunities of Tourism in Rural Settings

By Ernest Cañada

The growing spread of tourist activities in various parts of the world, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere's new "peripheries of pleasure" and in areas with a tradition of agriculture, livestock or fishing at the hands of peasant farmers and fishing communities, has intensified the debate about the relationship between tourism and rural development. However, this discussion cannot take place without first considering the conflict that exists between two differing perspectives on the future of agriculture and food production, which is central to any analysis of rurality.

Tourism in the confrontation between the agro-industry sector and food sovereignty

The predominant rural model is one of neo-liberal inspiration, driven by large international agro-industrial companies and based on intensive production for export. The logic behind this model is that each region should specialise in the activities that give it comparative advantages over other areas of the planet in a strongly globalised economy. This means that producing food for the people living where that food is produced is not a primary concern. The focus is on selling it on the world market. There is also a growing tendency for foreign companies to control production in certain parts of the world with the aim of guaranteeing subsequent export to the markets where they have most interest, leading to the phenomenon of land grabbing. In this arrangement, not even food production itself is given priority, due to the greater profitability, in certain circumstances, of products such as agrofuels. These require intensive land use, agrochemicals, genetically modified seeds, heavy machinery, and so on. Incentives for export-oriented agriculture promote the sale of food products in other markets below the costs of production (dumping). Situations of food insecurity in a particular area or region are not believed to be of major concern, as necessary food can be brought in from other areas where it is cheaper to produce and acquire. In this context, the peasant family unit becomes an anachronism in danger of disappearing due to inefficiency.

Other activities that operate with this same logic of regional specialisation and are equally geared toward the international market include resource extraction (oil, minerals, wood, etc.) and tourism. By one route or another, the affected rural population is pressured into taking part in these activities, succumbing to the interests and strategies of large corporations. They are forced into highly precarious conditions, or into leaving their places of origin and finding work elsewhere. The spread of these forms of "rural development" has meant a head-on attack against family-based peasant farming.

Rural organisations, meanwhile, co-ordinated internationally through the Via Campesina movement, have formulated and defended another model, based on food sovereignty and an understanding of food as a fundamental human right and not just goods for sale. The first World Forum on Food Sovereignty, held in Havana in 2001, defined this new concept as follows:

"The peoples' right to define their own policies and strategies for the sustainable production, distribution and consumption of food that guarantee the right to food for the entire population, on the basis of small and medium-sized production, respecting their own cultures and the

diversity of peasant, fishing and indigenous forms of agricultural production, marketing and management of rural areas, in which women play a fundamental role".²⁶

Seen from this perspective, peasant family economics, organic farming, producing food for local markets, native seeds, diversified production and complementarities between different activities become central to a strategy to reappraise peasantry. Food sovereignty is put forward as the basis for a different, comprehensive model of rural development.

The impacts of tourism on farming and fishing economies

The advance of tourist activities in rural areas is a new source of difficulties for peasant farming and fishing economies. Regional specialisation based on tourism can conflict with the interests of the peasant farmers and fishing communities in that area. This is the case, for example, of the current conflict in Costa Rica between coastal communities (which earn a living from fishing and the regulated extraction of natural resources, as well as tourism through small-scale community or private initiatives) and large investments in residential tourist development. The growing interest of large corporations in coastal areas, backed by the government of Costa Rica, has led to progressive displacement. Space is reorganised according to a new economic dynamic, by means of supposedly participative mechanisms, such as the regulatory plans implemented as part of the country's Maritime-Land Zone Act. Faced with this process of de facto expulsion from areas where they had lived for years, and unable to access their means of livelihood, more than seventy communities organised a National Front of Coastal Communities to formulate and present a bill to the Legislative Assembly that would grant them security and guarantees so that local populations could continue to live on the coast. The conflict over the Coastal Territories and Communities Act clearly shows two opposing views of how to approach rural development in coastal areas. Growth in tourism entails a process of usurpation and degradation of resources that are essential for peasant economies to function, such as land, water and the natural environment.

Competition over land and water

Competition over land is the first major impact on peasant economies when this type of tourist development begins in a particular area. Dispossession processes can occur by various means: through planning mechanisms and spatial reorganisation, which at times has led to coercion and manifest violence, and through market pressure. In this sense, land speculation favours the transformation of agricultural areas into land for development. This is the case, for example, in the Nicaraguan coastal municipality of Tola, one of the region's main centres of residential and tourism-driven land speculation, where in a period of just over two years between 2005 and 2007, the price of land jumped from just under US\$ 50,000 per block (0.7 hectares) to more than US\$ 250,000. Peasant families and co-operatives found it very hard not to sell their land, even though they ended up with nothing or with working on that same land as labourers or security guards.

The construction and operation of new tourist areas is accompanied by a large demand for and use of water, which is linked both to individual use by tourists and to maintaining infrastructure and services (swimming pools, watering gardens and golf courses, etc.). This tourist demand often conflicts with other agricultural and domestic needs, so that controlling aquifer resources becomes a strategic issue. In the province of Guanacaste in Costa Rica, one of the main tourist and residential development areas in the country, this situation has

²⁶ For the peoples' right to produce, feed themselves and exercise their food sovereignty. Final Declaration of the World Forum on Food Sovereignty, Havana, 7 September 2001.

reached the point that the authorities of the Catholic Church referred to it in a pastoral letter by Monsignor Victorino Girardi from the diocese of Tilarán-Liberia, who stated: “We note with sorrow that whereas in various coastal communities of Santa Cruz there is an alarming shortage of water in the summer, the same does not occur in the neighbouring hotels, where water is not rationed and is wasted in large quantities” (Girardi, 2009, p. 14). This led the bishop to call for a moratorium on all projects requiring large amounts of water to allow for a thorough review of how it was being distributed, and a second moratorium specifically for any tourism initiatives to assess their impact before allowing any more hotel chains to establish themselves in the area.

This conflict of interests has resulted in a series of conflicts that have become notorious in recent years, with emblematic cases such as the attempts to control the aquifer of the Nimboyores river by the Hotel Meliá Conchal – Reserva Conchal, or the aquifer of El Sardinal by a group of entrepreneurs, who with backing from the government wanted to build an aqueduct that would carry water to the residential and tourist projects at Playa del Coco and Playa Hermosa. The seriousness of these events led the United Nations, through its Human Rights Council, to issue a report urging the Government “to take all appropriate measures to ensure the effective participation of the communities affected in monitoring the application of the project, with a view to ensuring the sustainable management and use of the Sardinal aquifer” (United Nations, 2009).

Environmental impacts

Despite describing itself as “an industry without chimneys,” the dominant tourist model has major and serious environmental impacts, which transform, degrade and artificialise the surrounding environment, in a process of adaptation and homogenisation of the landscape based on certain advertising and commercial images. A common and recurring situation is the destruction of mangrove swamps. These habitats are not only vital to reduce vulnerability when faced with certain natural phenomena, such as tsunamis, but also as producers of animal and plant life. The disappearance of such habitats, which is common in the construction of new tourist enclaves in virgin areas, has a major effect on the environment and on how artisan fishing communities make a living. A recent example, which is particularly striking because of its absurdity, can be found in one of the proposals put forward by tourist business interests in El Salvador, grouped together as the Association of Sea Coast Tourism Developers (PROMAR). Among the initiatives for which it wanted public support, it proposed the construction of an airport on Isla Perico in the Gulf of Fonseca, in a protected area containing large mangrove swamps. Fortunately these demands clashed with the position held by the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources, which took an opposing view and opted to protect the mangroves and reactivate artisan fishing.

However, the stockpiling of essential resources and the degradation of ecosystems due to the penetration of large tourist companies is also leading to a breaking up of the territoriality of rural communities. These do not live solely within the limits of the plots of land that they own, but rather they occupy and reproduce (materially and culturally) in much broader spaces, which allow them to come together as a group. The closure of traditional paths or the displacement and distancing from their means of livelihood, as is the case of fishing populations moved inland to make way for coastal tourism, strangles the traditional functioning of rural communities.

Increasing territorial imbalance

Added to this process of usurpation and disintegration is the increasing territorial imbalance, through the strengthening of tourism under the domain of large companies over alternative means of production. One of the main factors causing this imbalance is a budgetary policy which, through investment in infrastructures and services, training, fiscal incentives, etc., concentrates public resources on territories under a specific model, while ignoring the needs of peasant and fishing family economies. The end result is that some areas are favoured over others which are progressively marginalised or transformed and part of their populations moved elsewhere.

The progressive consequence of territorial imbalances of this kind is the increase of population movements from impoverished agricultural areas to new centres of tourist development. This is particularly acute in construction work for tourist infrastructure. It is the case, for example, of the Nicaraguans in Guanacaste (Costa Rica), Haitians in Punta Cana/Bávaro (Dominican Republic) and Central Americans and Chiapanecos in Cancún and Riviera Maya (Mexico). A second phase also focuses on low-skilled and poorly paid jobs in tourism-based services (cleaning, cooking, security, gardening, entertainment, etc.) and in the economies generated in these new urban centres associated with tourism. It is the impoverishment of large agricultural areas that allows the tourist industry to avail itself of abundant manpower that it can keep in precarious conditions. Dynamics of this kind end up affecting generational renewal and fostering processes of "depeasantisation".

Diversification of rural livelihoods

In this context, any action that might be taken with regard to tourism in rural areas from a position that is favourable to food sovereignty could involve two forms of intervention. On the one hand, tourism models that for different reasons pose a threat to the economies of peasant farmers and fishing communities, and therefore limit their possibilities for development, would need to be addressed. On the other hand, it would also be necessary to promote a form of tourism in which peasant families and fishing communities play a leading and controlling role, and which is integrated into a strategy of diversification, complementing their sources of income.

Up to now, this first dimension of the relationship between tourism and food sovereignty has been assumed with greater ease by social organisations and movements of an alternative nature. However, it has been difficult to draw the other perspective into debates about food sovereignty. The fundamental question, therefore, would be what can be contributed by a model of tourism that is controlled and developed by the rural populations themselves, through the various forms of collective organisation, in the defence of food sovereignty.

Tourism that is managed and controlled by peasant and fishing families may be a way of increasing and diversifying their income, generating rural employment, capitalising on the countryside, reappraising peasant culture in a broad sense and stimulating development in their own territories. All this may help to consolidate a living rural environment with a productive rural population that is rooted in its territories. It is not designed as a method to replace traditional farming activities, but rather as a way of complementing them. Viewed from this perspective, tourism would generate a certain perception of potential improvement, which would be particularly relevant for younger generations and would discourage them from emigrating.

Furthermore, the experiential and respectful rapprochement of urban populations in the countryside through initiatives of this type helps to stimulate a broad cultural movement that finds value in rural areas and peasant culture. This type of tourism acts as a bridge, as a

cultural facilitator between two worlds that have a mutual need for one another. In a food sovereignty strategy, weaving together synergies of this kind is fundamental.

From another perspective, the consolidation of a rural world in which peasant families predominate with better conditions and greater life expectancy leads to positive effects of another kind on a global scale, from which society as a whole can benefit. This is a rural population that produces food for the local and national market, providing water, creating spaces for collective memory, and caring for and conserving the natural environment, among other aspects.

Tourism in the hands of rural populations

The ways in which this kind of tourism in the hands of rural populations is organised varies enormously, depending on the context and the historical characteristics of the community organisation of each place. In some countries in Latin America, there has been a predominance of community tourism or family-based peasant initiatives.

In each place, rural populations that are territorially connected in both productive and cultural terms must find ways to organise themselves and form alliances that best suit their interests. In this process, it would be desirable for peasant organisations not to lose sight of the need to strengthen “proximity tourism” with less energy consumption than air and long-distance transport. Successful experiences such as the Cerrato Brothers’ finca in Estelí in Nicaragua, among many others, show the possibilities of a community tourism model based mainly on a national clientele that lives in the same area (less than an hour from the closest urban centre in this case). The finca combines a varied range of organically produced food and ornamental plants, with livestock and dairy products as well as tourist services.

The offer should also take into account the average economic capacity of the national population, and avoid a kind of elite rural tourism, catering only to tourists with greater purchasing power. In El Salvador, for example, community initiatives such as the Cinquera Forest and the Peace Route show the potential of tourism geared toward low- and middle-income segments of society.

The growing trend of global “touristisation” which is also occurring in many rural areas that are directly or indirectly affected by this activity requires a greater reflection of the tourism phenomenon under the angle of food sovereignty. Every day it becomes harder not to take tourism into account as a key factor in redefining rurality. Securing a greater degree of control for rural populations over their territories and resources, including in terms of tourism, is a fundamental challenge.

References:

Girardi Stelin, Monsignor Victorino (2009): “Carta Pastoral. Discípulos, tras las huellas de Cristo, promoviendo la vida en Él, al Norte de Costa Rica”, Diocese of Tilarán-Liberia, Costa Rica, 19/7/2009

United Nations (2009): Report by the Independent Expert on the Issue of Human Rights Obligations Related to Access to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque, A/HRC/12/24/Add.1, 23/6/2009

Ernest Cañada is coordinator of the Catalan organisation Alba Sud – Investigation and Communication for Development, and member of the Group to Research Sustainability and Territory (GIST) at the University of the Balearic Islands.

English translation: Centro Superior de Idiomas de la Universidad de Alicante, S.A.U.

Water Equity in Tourism: Vital to a Green Economy

By Rachel Noble

The right to water constitutes one of the most fundamental human rights. However, for many communities, particularly in the global South, this right is being compromised by tourism. The inequities of water access and consumption between tourist resorts and local communities are starkly played out in holiday destinations in some of the world's poorest countries. Tourism development is concentrated in coastal areas and on islands, where potable water is scarce, while peak tourist seasons coincide with the driest months of the year. However, while larger tourism businesses have the money and resources to ensure their guests enjoy several showers a day, swimming pools, a round of golf, and lush landscaped gardens, neighbouring households, small businesses and agricultural producers may regularly face water scarcity.

The depletion and inequitable appropriation of freshwater resources by tourism is hampering its potential to contribute to poverty eradication and sustainable development, both of which form facets of a "green economy" – one theme of the 2012 UN Conference on Sustainable Development. Weak and poorly integrated tourism and water governance at local and global levels must also be rectified in order to build institutional frameworks for sustainable development – the second theme of this year's conference.

A precious global resource

Just three per cent of the Earth's water is fresh and some 70 percent of this is frozen in the polar icecaps. Meanwhile, water demand has tripled in the last 50 years due to population growth, intensive agriculture and other water-hungry industries (Stockholm International Water Institute, 2010). Climate change is causing seawater levels to rise, while triggering shifts in rainfall patterns. Many regions are experiencing more prolonged periods of drought as a result, which subsequently increase the risk of flooding. These factors, combined with high rates of deforestation and urbanisation, are placing unprecedented pressure on this precious resource (ibid).

Water is intrinsically connected to life and health, food production, livelihoods, and our dignity as humans. Nevertheless, some 884 million people are without access to safe water (UNGA, 2010), while two million people – most of them children – die from diarrhoea-related diseases annually (WHO, 2011). In fact, more children lose their lives from insufficient access to water and sanitation than die from HIV/Aids, malaria and measles combined (UNGA, 2010).

More often than not, water scarcity is not due to an environmental absence of water, but is rather caused by inadequate infrastructure, pollution, and a lack of economic resources, underscored by lack of political will and government capacity. Furthermore, the physically burdensome and time-consuming task of collecting water usually falls to women. This prevents them for engaging in other socioeconomic activities that could help lift themselves and their families out of poverty.

Breaking this vicious cycle in the interests of sustainable development has long been identified as a priority by the international community. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) aim at halving the proportion of the population without access to water and sanitation by 2015²⁷, while Agenda 21 sets out a range of water-related targets²⁸. The right to water is

²⁷ See www.un.org/millenniumgoals/environ.shtml

enshrined within international human rights standards, many of which are legally binding on States²⁹. In 2010, the UN General Assembly (2010) and UN Human Rights Council reaffirmed the right to water and sanitation (UN, 2011), reinforcing the obligations on states to uphold, fulfil and protect this right. In terms of the private sector, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which were unanimously endorsed by the UN Human Rights Council in 2011, clearly set out the responsibility of all businesses everywhere to respect human rights as a global baseline norm (UNHRC, 2011).

Tourism and a green economy?

Tourism is one of the largest and fastest growing service industries in the world, with arrivals predicted to hit 1.8 billion by 2030 (UNWTO, 2011). The potential for tourism to generate economic growth through jobs and foreign exchange means it is harnessed as a development driver by countries all over the world. This includes many in the global South which may lack export industries, but are rich in coastlines and sunshine.

However, new research by Tourism Concern indicates that, in many cases, tourism's inequitable consumption of water is exacerbating poverty, curtailing socioeconomic opportunities and degrading the environment, while undermining food security, livelihoods and wider sustainable development (Tourism Concern, 2012). Case studies from Bali (Indonesia), Goa and Kerala (South India), The Gambia (West Africa), and Zanzibar (Tanzania, East Africa), demonstrate how the water demands of tourism are directly infringing water rights of local communities through the over-exploitation of aquifers, lowering of groundwater tables, and contamination of freshwater by saltwater, sewage and waste. The superior infrastructure of large resorts and hotels, such as wide pipes and powerful electric pumps, is enabling them to appropriate water from public supplies at the expense of local people, including small-scale tourism entrepreneurs. These issues are underpinned by weak tourism and water governance, rule-flouting by the industry, resource limitations, and lack of awareness of the issues and how to address them among governments, industry and tourists alike.



The current scenario is leading to resentment and conflict between local people and the tourism sector. It is neither socially, environmentally nor economically sustainable. Given the heavy dependency on tourism in all the case-study destinations for livelihoods and economic development, this situation has to be redressed.

In Nungwi and Kiwengwa in Zanzibar, community resentment is so acute that some hotels employ guards to patrol their water pipelines to prevent them from being vandalised. "The caves that produce water... are the property of our village, but they are colonised by the investors and they do whatever they want", stated one villager. As tourism has accelerated, well water has

²⁸ Agenda 21 is an action plan arising from the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

²⁹ Such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).

reportedly become increasingly saline. However, piped supplies are inadequate, and power cuts frequently halt water flow. In the village of Jambiani, another major resort area, a three-month electricity outage in 2010 led to a cholera outbreak in which at least four people died (Tourism Concern, 2012; Slade, 2011). This suggests that sewage from unlined soak-pits – which are widely used by hotels – had leached into the ground.

In the densely built up resort of Calangute, Goa, one elderly resident reports: "All these hotels get a good supply of water. They can afford to buy from the [private] tankers. There are no regulations for these... We only get water every second day from the public supply and only for a couple of hours. This is hardly enough. Luckily I'm OK as I have my well... but the water level is depleting" (Tourism Concern, 2012). In Kerala, in the backwater regions of Alappuzha and Kottayam, many marginalised communities depend upon the backwaters – an intricate system of lakes and waterways – for washing, drinking and bathing, and for fishing and farming – their main livelihood sources. An explosion in houseboat numbers offering backwater tours is causing major pollution and degradation of this precious ecosystem, threatening the health and livelihoods of local people (ibid).

In The Gambia, most hotels dig their own boreholes to counter unreliable piped supplies. However, this practice is entirely unmonitored. Hoteliers broadly consider water from boreholes as free and unlimited, while many report having faulty water meters. This means they have little idea of how much water they consume, and pay the same rates to the under-resourced water authorities regardless of occupancy levels (Tourism Concern, 2012; Latchford and Niang, 2011).

The water demands of resort developments in Bali, which are themselves inflating land values and with them the taxes farmers must pay, are fuelling an unprecedented loss of agricultural land. Experts warn of a pending water crisis, engendering risks to food security, the environment, as well as Bali's tourism industry (ibid; Cole, 2012).

Principles of water equity in tourism

All tourism and water stakeholders have a responsibility to work together to redress these issues. However, particular responsibility rests with governments, and those inequitably consuming water, in positions of power and with greater access to resources. Tourism Concern has developed nine "Principles of Water Equity in Tourism" which aim to galvanize more equitable management of water resources in tourism development (Tourism Concern, 2012; Slade, 2011; CRT, 2011; Latchford and Niang, 2011).



1. The right to water and sanitation should not be compromised by tourism

Governments should uphold their international legal obligations to fulfil and protect the right to water and sanitation of citizens as a priority. Governments should issue guidelines to tourism businesses operating locally and overseas on their business responsibility to respect human rights.

2. Governments should implement clear regulations for equitable and sustainable water and tourism management

Destination governments should implement clear regulatory and institutional frameworks for sustainable, equitable, integrated water and tourism planning and management. Transgressors should be penalised; good examples should be championed.

3. Land use and tourism planning should be based on assessments of water resources

Land use planning should be based on assessments of water resources and infrastructure, and tourism carrying capacities established. These should take into account livelihood needs, food security, population growth, climate change, and wider watershed degradation.

4. Land use, tourism and water planning should be undertaken participatively

Land use, tourism and water planning should be undertaken transparently and participatively, with adequate community representation, particularly of women.

5. Governments and tourism businesses should be accountable to local communities

This includes providing access to redress where water rights have been violated.

6. Tourism businesses should implement their business responsibility to respect the right to water

Tourism businesses should move beyond technical approaches and implement their business responsibility to respect the right to water and sanitation in their activities and supply chains.

7. Tourism businesses should abide by the law

Tourism businesses should adhere to national regulations governing water use and waste management, even where these are poorly enforced. This includes paying for what they consume.

8. Tourism businesses should reduce their water consumption

Tourism businesses should work towards reducing their water consumption and contributing to water conservation by making use of existing industry guidelines.

9. Cooperation to further water equity should be pursued by all stakeholders

Cooperation and collaboration should be pursued by government, international donors, tourism, and civil society stakeholders in resourcing and undertaking data collection, improvements to community water access, advocacy, capacity-building, technology transfer, and tourist sensitisation.

References

Center for Responsible Tourism, Goa (2011): Reclaiming water rights: Towards an equitable social contract in Goa. Center for Responsible Tourism, Goa, for Tourism Concern, 2011.

Cole, S. (2012): A political ecology of water equity in tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (3), 2012. (Forthcoming)

Latchford, R. and Niang, D. (2011): Water equity in tourism in The Gambia. Senghore Associates for Tourism Concern, 2011.

SIWI (Stockholm International Water Institute): www.sivi.org

Slade, L. (2011): Water Equity in Tourism: Zanzibar Case Study, Villages of Kiwengwa, Nungwi and Jambiani'. Report by Mwambao Coastal Community Network for Tourism Concern.

Tourism Concern (2012): Water Equity in Tourism: A Human Right, A Global Responsibility. London. Available at www.tourismconcern.org.uk

UN, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UN, Available at: www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml#a2

UN (01/10/2011): Right to water and sanitation is legally binding, affirms key UN body, UN News Centre. Available at: www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=36308

UNGA (28/07/2010): General Assembly Adopts Resolution Recognizing Access to Clean Water, Sanitation as Human Right, by Recorded Vote of 122 in Favour, None against, 41 Abstentions', Sixty-fourth General Assembly Plenary 108th Meeting (AM), UN General Assembly, 28th July 2010. Available at: www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/ga10967.doc.htm

UNHRC (2011): Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, John Ruggie - Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework. 17th Session, Agenda Item 3. Available at: www.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/ruggie/ruggie-guiding-principles-21-mar-2011.pdf

UNWTO (11/10/2011): International tourists to hit 1.8 billion by 2030. Available at: <http://media.unwto.org/en/press-release/2011-10-11/international-tourists-hit-18-billion-2030>

WHO (2012): Water supply, sanitation and hygiene development, Available at: www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/hygiene/en/

Rachel Noble is Head of Policy and Research at Tourism Concern. Tourism Concern is a UK-based NGO campaigning for ethical tourism that always benefits local communities. www.tourismconcern.org.uk

This article is based on extracts from Tourism Concern's latest report, Water Equity in Tourism: A human right; a global responsibility.

Tourism and Climate Change: How the Myth of Poverty Alleviation through Tourism Prevents Progress

By Sabine Minninger

Emissions from tourism contribute to global warming, but have not been addressed by any international regime so far. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) has attempted to reduce emissions caused by tourism by giving recommendations, but when it comes to binding agreements, the UNWTO has been protecting business interests. A large part of the emissions caused by tourism – those from aviation and shipping – are negotiated under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). However, there is no global agreement on these emissions yet. The European Union is the only region which has included aviation into their emission trading scheme, with effect from 2012.

The UNFCCC is an international environmental treaty produced at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. It is aimed at stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. The Conference of the Parties (COP) is the convention's highest decision-making authority, involving all the countries that are parties to the convention. The COP meets every year, unless the parties decide otherwise. In 2011 in Durban the COP held its 17th meeting and agreed to continue

the Kyoto Protocol until a new global regime is agreed. The first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol is going to end in 2012.

The Kyoto Protocol, adopted in 1997 in Japan, is a protocol to the UNFCCC, aimed at fighting global warming. Under the Protocol, the rich countries commit themselves to a reduction of four types of greenhouse gases and two groups of gases produced by them. Developing countries also made general commitments. The rich countries collectively agreed to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 5.2 percent on average for the period 2008-2012 relative to their annual emissions in the base year 1990. Unfortunately, these emission limits do not apply to emissions from international aviation and shipping – the majority of emissions caused by tourism.

UNWTO's approach to climate change

The UNWTO would be the appropriate UN body to tackle any issues related to tourism, including climate change. However, UNWTO does not have a mandate to develop a framework under which to negotiate binding regulations for the mitigation of tourism emissions. Rather, UNWTO may develop guidelines and recommendations for their members.

Tourism is a victim of global warming, but also contributes to it. This led the UNWTO to hold the 1st International Conference on Climate Change and Tourism in Djerba, Tunisia, in 2003. The conference brought together tourism authorities, organizations, businesses and scientists to exchange views on the consequences, opportunities and risks for the tourism sector as a result of climate change.

The UNWTO, together with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), held the Second International Conference on Climate Change and Tourism in Davos, Switzerland, in 2007. The conference outcome was documented in the Davos Declaration which gives detailed advice, guidance and recommendations to all stakeholders in tourism. As it is only a recommendation and not a binding agreement, the Davos Declaration lacks ambition to motivate the relevant stakeholders. It does not require concrete implementation or transparent information.

UNFCCC: Slow progress on bunkers

Even though emissions from tourism are not directly subject to the negotiations, tourism does play a role in the UNFCCC process, in two ways: Emissions from tourism are indirectly negotiated as part of the emissions from aviation and shipping. However, the alleged economic benefits generated by tourism are used to sabotage binding regulations for emissions in the aviation sector. The tourism industry lobby argues that a regulative framework capping emissions from international air traffic – for instance a global fuel tax, levy or emission trading scheme – could affect tourism revenues that are assumed to contribute to poverty alleviation in developing countries. It might result in increased costs for passenger transportation, which would reduce demand, which in turn would impact negatively on the economies of developing countries. It is claimed that people in developing countries that are heavily dependent on tourism revenues would be doubly affected – on the one hand through direct impacts from climate change, and on the other



hand from reduced income associated with decreased tourism arrivals. The UNWTO argues – in line with industry lobbies – that climate regulations must not put a disproportionate burden on the tourism sector and must not impair its ability to grow.

Tourism NGOs have described these concerns as "highly simplistic" and have called for a serious and differentiated debate on tourism and poverty alleviation in the UNFCCC negotiations. The travel and tourism industry has to date protected its business interests in the name of poverty alleviation. However, it is urgent to highlight the complex social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts of tourism in destinations, particularly as these affect workers and communities, and to draw attention to the irresponsible stance of the tourism industry in the UNFCCC process. The debate on the role of tourism in achieving a "green economy" must go beyond the statements repeated ad nauseam, presenting only the positive economic spin-offs of tourism growth. It is time seriously to debate the consequences of the rapid growth of the tourism sector and its impacts on the climate, biodiversity and natural resources and human well-being and development.

NGOs have endorsed a position paper on the occasion of the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP17) in Durban, in which they outlined the myths around tourism and climate change from a human rights based perspective and sustainability approach. The position paper was endorsed by over 30 groups from the global South and North³⁰.

Tourism will certainly be one of the victims of climate change when tourism destinations such as the Maldives and Pacific islands are affected by rising sea levels, and snow capped mountains lose their snow due to global warming and become unattractive to tourists. But the tourism sector is also one of the "culprits". It accounts for an estimated five percent of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions, but its overall contribution to climate change, if measured as radiative forcing of all greenhouse gases, is in the order of 5.2-12.5 percent (Scott et al., 2009). Aviation accounts for 40 percent of tourism's CO₂ emissions, road transport for 32 percent and accommodation for 21 percent. The remaining seven percent arise from activities by tourists (four percent) and other forms of transport (three percent), including cruise ships. It is forecast that carbon emissions from tourism will grow by 162 percent during the period 2005-2035 (UNWTO, 2008).

However, under the UNFCCC, only emissions from aviation are negotiated, together with emissions from shipping (the so called bunker fuels or bunkers). In a recent study, authors working with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) conclude that considering the best available estimates for non-CO₂ effects, global aviation contributed 4.9 percent, in the worst scenario even up to 14 percent to man-made climate change in 2005 (Lee et al., 2009). These climate impacts from air travel are caused by a relatively small fraction of around two percent of the world population that actively takes part in air travel. So far the negotiations on bunker fuels have been conducted in a half-hearted way. After so many years, the bunkers are still not subject to any binding emission reduction targets. Bunker fuels are not bound by the Kyoto Protocol. In 1997, the responsibility to reduce aviation and shipping emissions was handed over to the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO). Both organizations were commissioned to develop a suitable climate protection mechanism for the sector. Both have failed miserably. After 15 years, the ICAO and IMO are yet to come up with significant, internationally binding targets.

³⁰ Tourism Watch (2011): [Last call to Durban. Beyond Numbers: A call for social, economic and climate justice in tourism](#)

Neither ICAO nor UNWTO, for that matter, have ever gone beyond their defensive stance, nor have they made any concrete proposals regarding the design of regulative climate solutions for the aviation sector, the securing of funds to finance adaptation measures in developing countries, or ways forward on how to deal with the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" of the Convention.

The oft-painted picture that tourism growth equals revenues, which equals poverty alleviation, is highly simplistic, as is the notion that this calculus would be undermined by any kind of binding climate commitment. The World Development Movement (WDM) has released a report with the New Economics Foundation (NEF), investigating the impact that halting growth in UK aviation would have on tourism in developing countries. It was noted that the lion's share of global tourism takes place between developed countries. About 60 percent of all international tourist arrivals can be attributed to the group of Highly Developed Countries, whereas only ten percent of tourists travel to developing countries. Initially halting growth in aviation can be achieved by focusing on short haul flights, which needs the carrot of better rail services and the stick of higher taxes on aviation as well as an end to massive airport expansion. Such measures would not affect developing countries.

The group of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) receives only 1.2 percent of global tourism arrivals. If growth in UK outbound tourism to developing countries were to be curbed, this would have only a minor impact on the economic growth of countries that receive a proportionally large number of UK tourists. If outbound long haul travel from the UK were limited, the economies of Kenya, Thailand and the Dominican Republic would lose between 0.1 and 0.4 percent of GDP growth by 2020 (WDM and NEF, 2008). Therefore measures might be needed to compensate such countries or exclude them from measures to reduce growth in long haul travel.



The report of the UN Secretary-General's High-level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing foresees measures might impact air travel by increased costs of around two to three percent (AGF, 2010). Research indicates that any such negotiated taxation will negligibly reduce demand, especially for long-haul travel, which is less elastic than short-haul travel due to a lack of good substitutes for long journeys as compared to short journeys that can be undertaken by car, train, or boat (IIED, 2011).

It must also be questioned how much of the income generated from tourism eventually reaches the poor. Various studies show that as much as 85 percent of tourism revenues "leak" out of developing countries (cited in Bolwell and Weinz, 2008), due to various factors, most notably the power of international tour operators (Broham, 1996), foreign ownership and the high import propensity of tourism (Jules, 2005). Moreover, the share of tourism revenue that stays in the national economy does not automatically benefit poor people. As many examples show, tourism investments in developing countries often narrowly benefit the small elites, leaving the local population without access to the tourism market or to decent jobs.

There are examples where tourism development creates or reinforces poverty by depriving local communities of their economic base. Poor households and communities tend to be less resilient against the negative socioeconomic, cultural and/or environmental impacts of

tourism compared to those that directly benefit from the sector through employment or the supply of goods and services.

There are countless examples of the ways in which unplanned or forced tourism development results in environmental degradation, social exploitation and human rights violations. The impacts of climate change will exacerbate these impacts and amplify conflicts over water, energy and other resources.

A starting point for resolving the climate and poverty challenge for the tourism sector could be the AGF's recommendation to ensure "no net incidence" for developing countries resulting from any measures that might generate funding for mitigation and adaptation from international transport. Within this concept of "no net incidence" it would be possible to provide an annual rebate for developing countries to neutralize any economic burden resulting from a decline in tourism arrivals. The remaining revenue, mainly from developed countries, would be earmarked for climate change action in developing countries. Further, to minimize the potential negative consequences on the most vulnerable developing countries, the approach of the "de minimis thresholds" should be applied. The effect of these thresholds should be to exempt traffic to and/or from Small Island Development States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDC). States with less than one percent of global aviation activity would also be exempt from market-based measures. This would mean that while regulative measures would apply only to an estimated 22 states, they would capture about 80 percent of the emissions from international aviation.

The European Union's Emission Trading Scheme (ETS)

The European Union has moved forward in including aviation into their emission trading scheme (ETS). After years of unsuccessful negotiations under the UNFCCC, the EU is the first region to tackle emissions caused by aviation in a binding regime. There is still a need to improve the scheme, but it is a first step in the right direction towards carbon inventory and reduction which will hopefully lead to a global sectoral approach to mitigate emissions caused by global aviation. Even though the level of ambition is very low, the EU's unilateral move to include aviation into the ETS has met with fierce resistance from a large number of countries, including many developing ones. With effect from 1st January 2012, airlines flying into and out of Europe are included in the ETS. 85 percent of the emission permits will be provided free of charge, 15 percent will be put up for auction. The targets of the EU are not very ambitious though, and at the same time countries such as the United States, China, and India are strongly against the EU's "unilateral barriers to trade". The costs, however, are likely to be passed on to the passengers anyway.

The private sector

The tourism industry is aware of the dangerous link between tourism and climate change. Well-meant initiatives are started not only to adapt tourism businesses to the changing climate in order to protect their business interests, but also to reduce emissions. But on the mitigation side, the initiatives are overrun by the massive growth in emissions caused by aviation. Voluntary measures by the private sector have failed and global warming does not leave more time for us to raise awareness and motivate the private sector to reduce their emissions. Binding measures are urgent.

How to move forward

The conflict between tourism, climate change and development can be handled if all stakeholders acknowledge that climate regulations must not conflict with development goals and disadvantage people in the South economically. The Conference of the Parties must

develop strong guidelines for ICAO including an ambitious emission reduction target linked to clear timeframes to create a framework aimed at quickly reducing greenhouse gas emissions from international aviation. At the same time, the aviation sector must contribute a fair share to the funding of mitigation and adaptation measures in developing countries while ensuring no net incidence of impacts from climate protection measures on poor people.

The UNWTO must play a constructive role in the UNFCCC process, characterised by serious in-depth debate with its members on minimizing economic burdens that may accrue to developing countries. The proposed concept of “no net incidence” may help to find solutions that will actually benefit the poor. Applying the “de minimis threshold” will exempt the most vulnerable countries.

Tourism industry interest groups must change the undifferentiated and irresponsible manner in which they bring forward these complexities in the UNFCCC. They must strive to find real solutions that will benefit the Global South. Global Tourism must undergo a fundamental transformation to create fair, just, sustainable and participatory models for business and development that will respect human rights.

References

Baker (2011): How can air travel contribute to the costs of adapting to climate change? The feasibility of the International Air Passenger Adaptation Levy (IAPAL) as a market governance mechanism. International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Bolwell and Weinz (2008): Guide for Social Dialogue in the Tourism Industry. Working Paper of the International Labour Organization, WP.265

Broham (1996): New directions in tourism for Third World development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 48-70.

Jules (2005): Sustainable Tourism in St. Lucia: A Sustainability Assessment of Trade and Liberalization in Tourism-services. The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD).

Lee et al. (2009): Aviation and global climate change in the 21st century. *Atmospheric environment*. 43 (22-23). pp. 3520-3537

AGF (2010): Report of the Secretary-General’s High-level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing: Available online at www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/climatechange/shared/Documents/AGF_reports/AGF_Final_Report.pdf

Scott, Peeters, Gössling (2009): Can tourism ‘Seal the deal’ of its mitigation commitments?: The challenge of achieving ‘aspirational’ emission reduction targets. Background study for the symposium ‘tourism & travel in the green economy’, 14th to 15th September, 2009, Gothenburg.

UNWTO (2008): Climate Change and Tourism – responding to global challenges. Report on “Second international conference on climate change and tourism“ from 1st to 3rd October, 2007, in Davos. Available online at www.unwto.org/sdt/news/en/pdf/climate2008.pdf

WDM and NEF (2008): Plane truths: Do the economic arguments for aviation growth really fly? World Development Movement and New Economics Foundation, London.

Sabine Minninger works on behalf of EED Tourism Watch on issues related to climate change, tourism and development. She has been following the UNFCCC process for four years, observing the negotiations on emissions caused by aviation and shipping and the role of tourism in the negotiations.

The "Saharisation" of the Mediterranean: For a Shared Agenda on Climate Justice

By Joan Buades

According to all reliable scientific scenarios, the Mediterranean is one of the world's regions where the effect of climate change will be most pronounced, together with Central America, the Caribbean and large areas of the Indian and Pacific Oceans. Temperatures have already started to increase, and will rise even more steeply from the second half of the century onwards, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean. Overall, the dynamic picture drawn by current science regarding the future of the Mediterranean in the short term depicts a Basin which is much hotter than the global average, presenting a degree of change equivalent to that of the last million years, with no major differences in degree between the North, South and East but with a strong seasonal imbalance and the gradual advance of desertification towards the Northern Mediterranean.



"Business as usual" would result in an average maximum increase of +3.4°C for the planet as a whole. However, in the case of the Mediterranean this could reach two degrees more, up to 5.4°C. At best (according to the "intermediate" scenario that assumes the development of clean energies and improved technologies) it is well above, more than double, the maximum temperature increase ceiling of +2°C which the large industrial nations agreed on in the Copenhagen Accord³¹ as a basis for stabilising the climate between now and the 22nd century.

Rainfall, on the other hand, will become increasingly scarce, especially in the Southern Mediterranean, giving rise to severe problems as regards water, forest fires and the fertility of agricultural soil. In 2000, more than one third of the Mediterranean population (35.2 percent) already suffered water stress, i.e., had less than 1,000 m³ per person per year. The process of desertification will continue to progress steadily in North Africa and the Levant, regions which are already strongly affected today. The continental climate will disappear almost completely from North Africa and the Levant (for example, in Kabylia and in much of the Moroccan Atlas region, as well as in Lebanon). All this will lead to an extremely high risk of water shortages for agriculture, human consumption and for the natural ecosystems themselves (Gao & Giorgi, 2008, p. 202-208).

Sea levels will continue to rise, and at ever-increasing rates as the century progresses, depending on what happens to the Arctic ice cap. However small the rise in sea level, about which much still remains uncertain, it will nevertheless decisively affect the tourist economy on the coast and could cause large-scale human displacement in highly populated areas near the deltas of important rivers. Finally, the threat arising from the combined effects of climate

³¹ Source: http://unfccc.int/documentation/documents/advanced_search/items/3594.php?rec=j&preref=600005735 # beg

change and natural disasters due to external causes, such as earthquakes, tsunamis and hurricanes should be mentioned.

Regional responsibility for the climate corresponds roughly to demographic weight: about 7.4 percent of GHGs originated in the Mediterranean in 2007, for a population representing 6.7 percent of our species. However, the differences between the South and East of the Basin compared to the North are as marked as they are for the planet as a whole. Paradoxically, the most vulnerable areas (the Levant and especially North Africa) are those which have contributed least to GHG emissions in the Basin.

Demographic and social changes

One third of the population in Mediterranean states lives in coastal areas. A first indicator of the extreme vulnerability of societies in the Basin is what is called the "low elevation coastal zone" (LECZ), i.e., coastal terrain lying less than ten metres above sea level. Globally, this zone occupies only two percent of the Earth's land surface but holds ten percent of the total world population (or 13 percent of the urban population). In total, about 60 million people may be living in coastal areas in the Southern Mediterranean and Levant, and this number could rise to 100 million by 2030. Unfortunately, this region would be the second most vulnerable on the entire planet in terms of natural disasters associated with climate change.

The population is growing and regenerating at a dizzying pace in the South and the Levant, whereas in the North it is stagnant and ageing. Far and wide, coastal areas are being engulfed by urbanisation and human occupation. Despite the existence of important mineral resources, mainly oil and natural gas, in the South, the income gap and, above all the social inequalities between rich and poor in Mediterranean societies are increasing within and between the North and South. The impact of climate change will also depend to a large extent on the capacity for social cohesion and the welfare of different societies. In any emergency, the rich and those social classes with access to a public safety net will be better positioned to face the situation. The poor and those with least access to public health and social protection mechanisms will suffer more and will become innate candidates for a migratory exodus in the most precarious of conditions (Klein, 2007).

As climate change brings about the desertification of Sub-Saharan Africa, there is an unseen but enormous influx of environmental refugees at the gates of North Africa who are intent, at whatever cost, on reaching the Eden of Europe. The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) warned that by the middle of the 21st century there could be approximately one billion climate refugees around the Earth. In other words, this means one in every nine humans (IOM, 2009). In 2006, the African continent was home to 924 million people it is expected that by the middle of the 21st century this population may have more than doubled, reaching almost two billion inhabitants.

Among the eight states whose populations will triple, four (Niger, Mali, Chad, and Guinea Bissau) form part of Sub-Saharan Africa, which is the most vulnerable region on the continent in terms of climate and natural resources such as water and agricultural land. Without a technological, economic and social revolution in the near future, many of these new Africans will have no choice but to migrate north across the Maghreb and the Mediterranean, significantly increasing the risk of military involvement in maintaining security in the Basin. In terms of geostrategic security, the Mediterranean is not a minor peripheral region. On the contrary, it represents one of the most extensive and dangerous security borders between North and South.

What will happen to tourism?

Economically, tourism has become the dominant economic activity throughout virtually the entire region which receives 32 percent of all international tourist traffic (Hallegatet, Somot, & Nassopoulos, 2009). The Mediterranean received around 300 million tourists in 2008, with 100 million more predicted for 2025. 80 percent of this tourism is based on sun, sand and beach resorts, and the trend is stable. In fact, the Mediterranean is the great swimming pool of the world, and has ranked as the first international tourist destination for decades. However, with rising temperatures the states sending the largest numbers of tourists to the region, the Central and Northern EU countries, which supply 90 percent of visitors to the Basin's beaches, will witness a marked reduction in the desire to travel due to global warming, as they will enjoy neo-Mediterranean temperatures at home. The days of coastal tourism reliant on low-cost airlines may be numbered.

International tourism in the Mediterranean (2010)

States and territories	Millions of tourists
France	76.8
Spain	52.6
Italy	43.6
Turkey	27.0
Greece	15.0
Egypt	14.0
Croatia	9.3 [2009]
Morocco	9.2
Syria	8.5
Tunisia	6.9
Israel	2.8
Cyprus	2.1
Lebanon	2.1
Algeria	1.9 [2009]
Malta	1.3
Palestine	0.5

At the same time, merchandise logistics in large port areas throughout the region and export agriculture in the South and the Levant constitute the other two major strategic alternatives for the present regional economy. Climate change, however, increasingly threatens the future of these three economic activities.

This direct threat to the region's stake in tourism should clearly be placed in the context of the tourism sector's own responsibility for the climate. Traditionally, it has been estimated that

the tourism industry (not only hotels, but also transport, food, materials, and destination services) generates between four and ten percent of total GHG emissions. Much of tourism's climate footprint is related to air transport, which generates up to 75 percent of the sector's emissions. The United Nations, in a sector-specific study, concluded that tourism held up to 14 percent of global responsibility (Simpson et al, 2008, p. 66). According to the United Nations, in an unsustainable climate scenario (a rise of between +3°C and +5°C in temperature), the tourism sector's share of responsibility would be between ten percent and 20 percent by 2050. If rapid progress were made to ensure a minimum climate scenario (limiting the increase in global temperatures over the same period to +2°C), the impact of tourism would be more than 50 percent (UNEP/MAP/BLUE PLAN, 2008, p. 62).

For a shared Mediterranean agenda on climate justice

On the eve of the end of the term of the Kyoto Treaty, Mediterranean societies are facing an uncertain and dangerous future with neither institutions nor collaborative tools that would help to promote a social and climatic transition aimed at ensuring humane, democratic and healthy living conditions for coastal societies. Neither a purely nominal Mediterranean Union nor the United Nations' historic and well-meaning, but solely mechanical Blue Plan³² will be sufficient, and the lack of full cooperation between Northern NGOs and North African communities represents a further stumbling block.

Without forgetting that it is urgent that we devote every effort to devising and carrying out mitigation proposals (for example for a significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in aviation and tourism) and adaptation plans (to protect the most fragile and vulnerable Mediterranean communities, especially along the coastal strip of North Africa and Egypt), the vital question should not be "what can we do to stop climate change?" in the region but rather: "How do we want to live here?"

The sense of a shared sea was lost during the second half of the 20th century, and it has become imperative to restore the idea of the Mediterranean as a shared living space. In this unique context, which demands new forms of resistance and resolution, the priority of social and environmental activists should be democratic empowerment of Mediterranean societies in terms of:



Understanding in detail and in relation to the region as a whole, the nature of the climate scenarios that will have a direct effect, in what might be called a campaign for citizen "climate literacy."

Strengthening protective measures for the most vulnerable local communities in the most sensitive areas.

Creating mutual support networks for social and institutional initiatives in the North and South of the Basin capable of putting projects and emission reduction targets in place and greening consumption, in order to ensure rapid and free technology transfer of clean technologies from the North to the South of the Basin.

³² www.planbleu.org/indexUK.html

Practicing Mediterranean citizenship based on the idea of a new global citizenship, which would enable our presence to be felt through a unified voice at global forums where the future climate of the planet is decided (Buades, 2010).

References

Buades, J. (2010): El llegat de Copenhagen: l'emergència d'una nova ciutadania planetària. Managua: Albasud.

Gao, X., & Giorgi, F. (2008): Increased aridity in the Mediterranean region under greenhouse gas forcing estimated from high resolution simulations with a regional climate model. *Global and Planetary Change*, 62 (3-4), 195-209.

Hallegatet, S., Somot, S., & Nassopoulos, H. (2009): Région méditerranéenne & changement climatique. Une nécessaire anticipation. Paris: Institut de prospective Économique du Monde Méditerranéen.

IOM. (2009). *Migration, Environment and Climate Change: Assessing the Evidence*. Ginebra: IOM.

Klein, N. (2007). *La doctrina del xoc. L'ascens del capitalisme del desastre*. Barcelona: Empúries.

Simpson, M. C., Gössling, S., Scott, D., Hall, C. M., & Gladin, E. (2008): *Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the Tourism Sector: Frameworks, Tools and Practices*. Paris: UNEP, University of Oxford, UNWTO, WMO.

UNEP/MAP/BUE PLAN. (2008): *Promoting sustainable tourism in the Mediterranean: Proceedings of the regional workshop: Sophia-Antipolis, France: UNEP/MAP/BUE PLAN*.

Joan Buades is a critical researcher in tourism, environment and globalisation and member of the ALBA SUD research team. He also works with the Research Group on Sustainability and Territory (GIST) at the University of the Balearic Islands (UIB) and with other social organisations.

Adapted from "The Mediterranean: Caught in the Carbon Microwave: Severe Climate Threat, More Inequality and the end of Coastal Tourism. An overview of global risks in the Mediterranean in the 21st century. By Joan Buades. AlbaSud, January 2012.

English translation: Centro Superior de Idiomas de la Universidad de Alicante, S.A.U.

Part 2: The Challenge of Good Governance: Institutional Frameworks for Tourism and Sustainable Development

Regulator or Facilitator? Redefining the Role of Governments

By Sumesh Mangalassery

In the globalised world, tourism has come to represent a considerable attraction and a universal remedy for many of the developmental problems. It has been widely promoted both within the Third World and by First World "experts" as a means of economic development, poverty alleviation and to generate foreign exchange. These experts along with other interests have almost made tourism an unquestionable development option especially for developing countries.

Many developing countries, under serious indebtedness and with their economies adversely affected by the world trade order, have also turned to tourism promotion. In the urge to get market share for tourism, many of the inherent negative impacts associated with it are given no room in current discourse. A crucial and critical understanding of tourism and its complexities is yet to emerge. The relations between tourism, the world trade order, the political economy, power imbalances and negative impacts are still widely ignored.

Tourism governance and the roles of governments



Tourism is an activity shaped by different forces and factors. Tourism is comprised of industries and activities that stretch not only across nations and regions, but across traditional lines of business and industry as well. Thus, governance in tourism is always very complex and an important concern. But the intensive process of liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation witnessed in the last few decades has redefined the governance system in tourism. The role of industry, corporations and supranational institutions in tourism governance has

increased considerably. A concept of "minimal state" has been widely promoted, arguing that the traditional state functions are ineffective and lack high level skills. This is mainly reflected in the arena of policy making and public investment. Many basic services have been opened up for private companies.

In such a political and economic environment, the functions of government and democratic governance in tourism have been transformed from their traditional role of implementing government policy to a more corporate-driven model, catering to the interests of the industry rather than the interests of the public. A careful analysis of various governments' tourism policies would reveal that the role of governments has changed from regulator to facilitator or catalyst to bring in more tourists and investment. The role of tourism ministries urgently

needs to be redefined from an industry promoter to a people and development-oriented regulator. The primary responsibility of governments, including tourism ministries, is good governance, protecting the well-being of the people, rather than acting merely as a tourism promotion agency.

Government actions at the behest of industry lobbies have led to unsustainable tourism development in many destinations. The main victims of this biased development are the communities who are marginalised. Their concerns are ignored, thus violating their fundamental human rights in the process.

In India, the relaxation and deregulation of certain legislations for tourism development caused unregulated tourism and land speculation. Traditional communities like fisherfolk were displaced from the coast in a process of market-induced displacement. Fragile environments and natural resources of the coast were adversely affected. None of these serious concerns has been adequately addressed in the tourism and other related policies, mainly because of the increased influence of the industry. The tourism industry is lobbying for more relaxations and their interests are reflected in many recent policy reforms. Tourism is getting exemptions from many of the environmental and other legislations (for example the Environment Assessment Notification 2006 and the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification). The Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Government of India, which is supposed to protect the interests of the Indian people and must ensure proper governance in tourism merely acts as a tourism promotion agency for big industry players, using Indian tax payers' money. In 2012, the Indian government's budget allocation for overseas tourism promotion and publicity including market development assistance is 2.75 billion Indian rupees.³³



On the one hand, the industry is lobbying for "minimal state" intervention in regulation which allows them to develop tourism in a much-liberalised manner. On the other hand, industry interest groups seek to have government policy developed in their favour, including government funding for promotion, subsidies, incentives, and infrastructure development. In addition, these interest groups often lobby to avoid certain regulations which are against their business interests. These industry pressure groups make their voices heard in policy formulation processes. These influences

often lead to outcomes that adversely affect the environment and interests of communities, and undermine sustainability.

³³ Ministry of Tourism & Culture, Government of India: Outcome Budget (2011-12). <http://tourism.gov.in/writereaddata/Uploaded/Finance/051620110344234.pdf>, retrieved on 29/5/2012

The South Indian state of Kerala adopted tourism as a main sector for its economic development, declaring that the state is following a private sector led tourism development. It further stated that in the first tourism policy in 1995 and thereafter, the government has closely embraced the private sector in all its planning and decision making efforts. The involvement of the private sector is ensured through its presence in all committees and decision-making bodies. A closer look at the tourism and related policies of the state reveals the influence of the private sector in designing tourism policies and legislation in their favour.

A proposed Tourism Trade Act, which was a comprehensive Act outlining several control measures on the trade, was amended by the Government of Kerala after due consultation with the private sector, which advised against too much control as it was considered adverse for tourism development.³⁴

At the same time, civil society groups in the state strongly protested against another act called Kerala Tourism Conservation and Preservation Act, which curtails the powers of Panchayati Raj institutions (local self governments) and is against the spirit of decentralisation of governance. This act also proposes a top to bottom approach. But the government passed this act without any consultation with civil society organisations, whose voices are not adequately heard in policy formulation processes.

UNWTO: Global governance for whom?

The industry interests and biases also influence international governance and decision-making at the level of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). Policy formulation processes at UNWTO happen in a very non-participatory manner, in stark contradiction to UNWTO's statements on sustainable tourism and governance. According to UNWTO, "Governance is a system and process to define strategies and implement them to achieve competitiveness and sustainable development of the tourism destination." They added that a good governance system should involve public and private sectors but also the civil society, who need to work together within a set of values and principles: openness, participation, consultation, dialogue, innovation, coordination, strong leadership, coherence, effectiveness, accountability, etc.³⁵

But in practice this UN agency is taking industry into confidence rather than civil society and their concerns. UNWTO's activities at the Copenhagen climate conference in 2009 were testimony to this. UNWTO organised an event with the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC) without any civil society participation. However, UNWTO and WTTC are part of the game of adopting jargon such as eco-tourism, sustainable tourism and responsible tourism without changing much on the ground. These concepts have been co-opted and distorted by official agencies and corporations for profit making. It is high time to restructure the UNWTO as a UN agency to make it more accountable and transparent. As a UN agency, its responsibility is much more than echoing industry interests.

WTTC: Rolling out the red carpet

Apart from governments and supranational institutions, industry organisations like the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC) are influencing governance and policies at various levels. WTTC was established in 1990. It is a coalition of 70 chief executives from all sectors of the travel and tourism industry. They work and lobby very closely with UNWTO and

³⁴ Ministry of Tourism & Culture, Government of India: Kerala's Approach to Tourism Development: A Case Study. <http://tourism.gov.in/CMSPagePicture/file/marketresearch/studyreports/07%20KeralaCaseStudy.pdf>, retrieved on 29/5/2012

³⁵ UNWTO Algarve Forum Tourism and Science: Bridging Theory and Practice Governance for Sustainable Tourism Development

governments in order to implement their agenda. In 1995, the World Tourism Organization, jointly with the World Travel & Tourism Council and the Earth Council, defined contains priority areas for action in the tourism sector. They were published in the report, "Agenda 21 for the Travel & Tourism Industry. Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development"³⁶, which analyses the strategic and economic importance of the sector and demonstrates the enormous benefits in making the whole industry sustainable.³⁷

The "Millennium Vision" document on travel and tourism by WTTC recommends to governments to accept tourism as an economic development and employment priority. They also call for a move towards open and competitive markets by supporting the implementation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), liberalise air transport and deregulate telecommunications in international markets.³⁸

They also encourage and support market-based mechanisms like the "Green Globe" certification with UNWTO. In 1997, the WTTC successfully opposed a UN proposal to tax air travel to fund environmental protection, preferring instead to focus on the industry's self-improvement incentives and light-handed regulation as its millennium vision for the environmental policy agenda in tourism.³⁹

A 2000 survey by WWF claimed that "Green Globe", the WTTC-backed environmental certification scheme, allowed 500 companies to use its logo, although only about 60 of these actually met the criteria involved. In 1995, a fake travel business set up by a TV company (World Television News) was given the right to display a Green Globe symbol for US\$200, simply by sending in an application form.⁴⁰

Their programmes are very much industry and market centric, further reflecting the inequalities between countries (especially between tourist sending and receiving countries).

International Financial Institutions

Other supranational organisations like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) have been imposing so called Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) upon Third World countries. They often propagate the idea of a "trickle down" effect of tourism as an argument to justify projects supported by them. Beyond these institutions, there are the World Trade Organization (WTO) and regional trade agreements also curtailing the independence and sovereignty of Third World countries. The concept of sovereign states is also fading with mechanisms such as North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) or the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). These arrangements can reinforce disparities between countries and regions and, in effect, impose certain "choices" upon weaker countries both within and outside the agreement.

³⁶ Agenda 21 for the Travel & Tourism Industry: Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development (1996) World Travel and Tourism Council, World Tourism Organization and the Earth Council.

³⁷ UNWTO background note, Annex: Source: www.unctad.org/rio20/content/documents/448Annex_unwto_cln.pdf, retrieved on 26/5/2012

³⁸ Third World Network :Tourism, globalisation and sustainable development, www.twinside.org.sg/title/anita-cn.htm, retrieved on 24/5/2012

³⁹ Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPR) Discussion Paper No. 19 November 2002) Impact of Tourism on Environment in Kenya: Status and Policy, www.kippra.org/docs/DP19.pdf, retrieved on 22/5/2012

⁴⁰ Sustainable tourism and eco tourism, compiled by Mark Mann, posted on 6th September 2004. <http://www.peopleandplanet.net/?lid=26785§ion=47&topic=26>, retrieved on 20/5/2012

It is interesting to note that along with the political relationships and economic actions these institutions increasingly use the language of sustainability in their policies. They use this language to co-opt celebrities and the international community to further influence the agenda of the discourse. Many international, national and regional NGOs are also co-opted by these agencies or respective governments. Most of these NGOs represent middle class or upper middle class interests. As an end result, they protect the interests of industry. It is necessary to examine the combination of these groups and to find out for whom they speak, whom they represent, and who controls them.

Tourism as a development model?

Before getting into a development debate, we need to examine the power relations within the tourism industry. International donors like the World Bank, the IMF and other International Financial Institutions (IFIs) define the dictated development path through pre-conditioned guidelines for their finance. They often ask for further liberalisation, competitiveness, etc. which results in uneven and unequal tourism development.

Tourism today is an extension of this uneven and unequal development paradigm. Also, tourism in Third World countries is often an expansion of colonialism because it structurally benefits companies in the north or elites in the destinations. Even countries that pursue socialist strategies and ideologies follow the same model: Tourism is seen just as a "cash crop".

In some developing countries, more than two thirds of the revenue from international tourism never reaches the local economy because of high economic leakages. In this free trade and liberalised investment era, the situation may even be worse because profits and other income from tourism are repatriated by foreign companies.



Any destructive model of development today is easily justified by pointing to its contribution to GDP. For most governments around the world and for agencies like UNWTO, the rate of increase in GDP represents growth and development. The real question is whose growth does this represent? The rich are getting richer at the cost of the poor who are getting poorer and poorer. Tourism is no exception. The contribution of tourism is calculated based on indicators such as GDP, tourist arrivals and foreign exchange earnings. Other larger development indicators and tourism's contribution to sustainable development are just ignored and nowhere in the discussion. This applies, for example, to development indicators developed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for the Human Development Report (HDR). As a UN agency, UNWTO would be well-advised to cooperate with UNDP to get a better understanding of human development and

to answer the core questions: Who benefits from tourism? Who bears the costs?

Why good governance in tourism?

Governance in tourism is a very important issue which needs more attention in the current developmental debate. The participation of stakeholders and rights holders in the tourism governance process is vital for achieving the goal of sustainable tourism development. Promoting decentralization and strengthening local governance can allow greater representation and participation of all stakeholders in the decision-making process, as well as closer involvement of citizens in the policy making process. In fact, there is a growing

consensus that decentralization is not only an important condition to achieve sustainable socio-economic development, but also a fundamental ingredient for good governance.

The principles of good governance, however, are not new. Good governance means that authorities and their institutions are participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follow the rule of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society.⁴¹

Good governance can also be instrumental in providing services that respond more closely to the needs of the local population. In brief, decentralization, which has come to occupy a prominent role in the debate on sustainable human development, is viewed as an important means to achieve a more democratic and participatory approach to governance.

There is a myth that tourism is one of the sectors that need high level investment, skills and professionalism. So there is a claim that there has to be a better system of governance which should include the private sector (industry) that ensures the effectiveness and high level skills in tourism. But in reality the implications of this biased governance badly affect the destination communities. This lack of proper governance in tourism undermines progress towards sustainability. Democratic governance and proper regulations in tourism are indispensable in order to protect the interests of local people, their resources and their livelihoods in the destinations.

Sumesh Mangalassery is a tourism researcher and social activist from India. He is one of the founding members of Kabani – the other direction, a research, networking and campaign organisation working on tourism issues in India.

The Role of Tourism Corporations: The Neoliberal Attack on Local and Global Democracy

By Joan Buades

As from the mid-80s, the boom in the global hotel industry has occurred in parallel with an unprecedented expansion of financial capitalism. The point of connection, or synergy, between the two has been the creation of a huge tourism offer in the form of business clusters which have added a wide range of incentives to the traditional hotel model (from condo hotels to golf courses, marinas and casinos). For those controlling the speculative investment funds that characterised turbo-capitalism until the crisis of autumn 2008, the positive social image of tourism as an "industry without chimneys" and a "passport to development" – especially in the case of multipurpose resorts with a variety of residential options – has permitted the murky source of much of their capital to be laundered whilst at the same time yielding quick profits.

⁴¹ www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp, retrieved on 29/5/2012

Black holes of the international economy

By participating in strategic alliances and employing all kinds of financial investment tactics, the less scrupulous hotel industry TNCs have acquired extraordinary investment liquidity which has helped to boost growth in the scale of their operations on a level that would have been unimaginable just a few years ago (Buades, 2006, p. 41-58). These mutual benefits, or "win-win strategies" in the neo-liberal jargon, have focused on routing much of the flow of capital and finance through a dense network of tax havens (from the City of London to the Cayman Islands via the New York Stock Exchange) which function as a slush fund for the world-domineering TNCs, over and above governments, laws and borders. In fact, there is no hotel industry TNC (or TNC in any other important economic sector) in existence that does not have multiple ghost societies domiciled in these black holes of the international economy, since they are beyond the reach of public control and transparency (Chavagneux & Palan, 2007; Palan, Murphy & Chavagneux, 2010; www.lemonde.fr, July 9, 2008).

A further characteristic of tourism TNCs is their indifference to the democratic or dictatorial nature of political regimes when deciding their locations. As an extraordinarily unregulated industry, it can indulge its preference for investing in states which do not prompt "regime uncertainty", such as the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Indonesia and Morocco, rather than in "classical" democratic systems. As was the case with the Balearic Islands and Spain, which were used as a testing ground from 1955 to the late 70s, the modus operandi is to manipulate a powerful network of local "friends" in order to ensure a safe scenario for investment opportunities and the repatriation of profits abroad, a scenario which includes low wages in unskilled jobs and public sector support in order to obtain improved transport infrastructures (mainly airports, ports and motorways) and electricity, water and waste services. The goal is to create large-scale business clusters aimed at constant quantitative growth. Partnerships with local elites generate corruption and enable the wealth generated by tourism to be diverted abroad unhindered (Buades, 2009).

Public money to benefit TNCs

TNCs want the state to act as the facilitator of their projects, allocating the maximum possible amount of public money to infrastructures in order to sustain constant expansion in terms of accommodation, and taking an active role in marketing their products through multi-million international publicity campaigns. Naturally, the use of staggering sums of public money to further the interests of TNCs is detrimental to investment in human development in the societies which theoretically benefit. Wherever airports and motorways spring up, water treatment plants and incinerators appear and fabulous sums are squandered on promoting holidays organised by private companies, investment in basic and university education, health and social welfare usually decreases or simply disappears altogether, as is the case of social housing (Buades, 2006, p. 67-119).

This lack of structural transparency is closely related to the acceptance of the so-called neoliberal "Washington Consensus" and, above all, to the use of tax havens to facilitate financial machinations. In January 2000, the 140 member states of the World Trade Organization produced the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). This agreement created a new framework which supplants national economic, environmental or social laws and regulations and is entirely favourable to TNC investments of any kind in any country. The most striking aspect is that key concepts such as "environmental sustainability", "distribution of wealth", "fiscal transparency," "environmental conservation" or "participation of local communities" do not enter the agreement's lexicon at any point. The impact of the GATS on such an internationalised sector as tourism has been devastating, as it converts the TNCs into competitors with the same rights as any local company or initiative. Consequently, these

inequalities in power and resources have created the market conditions necessary for the rapid proliferation of tourism and property developments in extensive areas worldwide. All the major tourist development areas are located in states that have ratified the GATS, and those states which aspire to become promising new "destinations" are likewise rushing to ratify it.

Moreover, as has been the case in Spain, the official loans for foreign aid and development are in fact used by the TNCs themselves to "open markets" in new tourist "destinations", with the enthusiastic collaboration of the supposedly "donor" states (Castellano, 2009). As a result, local economies are obliged to participate in downward competition in terms of taxation, social and labour rights and environmental protection in order to attract the attention of TNCs. The first victims include small and medium local businesses, whose income statements are immediately affected by their exclusion from the all inclusive business clusters gathered around the resorts and fuelled almost exclusively by imported materials and services. The poorer the country, the more drastic the dismantling of all planning regulations and democratic administration of the territory, economy and environment, and the more far-reaching the subsequent privatisation of common goods such as water or land.

Beyond the reach of public control

This ultra-liberal framework reaches fever pitch with the tourism TNC practice of routing finances through tax havens.⁴² There is no Spanish-owned transnational tourism corporation in existence that does not route a large part of its accounts through this staggeringly unregulated network of black holes that conceal massive flows of capital beyond the reach of international public control. Thus, with their impunity protected by the neoliberal order, TNCs manage to shield their true profit and income statements from the scrutiny of the communities where they operate as hotel and property businesses (Buades, 2006, p. 66-87). Failure to declare this money particularly affects countries in the South. According to Oxfam, global tax fraud by individuals who should pay taxes in the South amounts to 124 billion dollars a year. If the proportional part of the more than additional 200 billion that the TNCs hide from the attention of the tax authorities in the South were to be added to this sum, poor countries would have access to at least twice the money they receive in development aid (some 103 billion dollars per year).⁴³

With the eruption of the current global financial crisis, the need to eliminate or at least limit the scope for action of these tax havens has become the official priority, from the G20 itself at the summit in London to the President of the USA.⁴⁴ Obviously, achieving any real progress towards the end or limitation of these offshore centres would entail significant changes in the business model of TNCs. As with the rest of the economy, the weight of financial speculation must be drastically reduced in favour of productive investments. Nevertheless, the truth is that three years after the fall of Lehman Brothers, this laudable and necessary goal remains mere wishful thinking and has not yet produced any practical result.

Blackmail to obtain advantageous conditions

Lastly, it should be highlighted that to date, the relationship between TNCs and the countries that could host their projects has been based on blackmail. The large Spanish transnationals

⁴² See <http://taxjustice.blogspot.com>

⁴³ See www.oxfam.org/es/pressroom/pressrelease/2009-03-13/control-paraisosfiscales-liberar-millones-dolares

⁴⁴ See the statement of April 2, 2009, made by the OECD with the official list of tax havens to be eliminated or controlled through new transparency mechanisms in: www.oecd.org

have not wasted any time in establishing a lobby through the platform provided by Inverotel (the Spanish association of investors in the international hotel industry) in order to obtain even more advantageous conditions for their increasingly larger-scale projects from the governments of countries such as Costa Rica, Jamaica, the Dominican Republic and Mexico.⁴⁵ In Jamaica, for example, when faced with the first signs of public and governmental pressure to comply with the law, they opted to withdraw from new developments or put them on hold as a means of applying counter-pressure, rather than respecting the decisions made by the institutions of the republic.⁴⁶ The most serious aspect however, is the strategic direction taken to accomplish the tourism TNC mission: their aim is to conduct business in safe places and the best means to achieve this is to create opportunities for crises which can be exploited to force the hand of the communities they wish to host their projects (Klein, 2007, p. 385-405). Viewed thus, "touristification" reveals itself as a radical mutation of the societies concerned, which enter into the logic of neo-liberalism, consumerism and "modernisation" without achieving any significant improvements in well-being or human development in the process (Cañada, 2009).

Tourism's huge direct and indirect influence on the global economy, the expectations of indefinite growth on an environmentally precarious planet, the hegemony of the TNCs and their synergy with a financial capitalism blinded by quick private profits, together with a failure to improve human development in the countries concerned, all contribute to making the mass tourism industry a serious obstacle in the task of creating an ecological world with a future, where communities count and democracy is a daily reality.

Joan Buades is a critical researcher in tourism, environment and globalisation and member of the ALBA SUD research team. He also works with the Research Group on Sustainability and Territory (GIST) at the University of the Balearic Islands (UIB) and with other social organisations.

This article is an excerpt from "Turismo y bien común: De la Irresponsabilidad Corporativa a la Responsabilidad Comunitaria", by Joan Buades. Alba Sud, September 2010.

English translation: Centro Superior de Idiomas de la Universidad de Alicante, S.A.U.

⁴⁵ www.caribepreferente.com, 28/4/2008

⁴⁶ www.jamaica-gleaner.com, 14/5/2008

Sustainable Consumption and Production in Tourism – Quo Vadis? Private Sector Initiatives and Corporate Social Responsibility

By Jennifer Seif

Sustainable consumption and production (SCP) is a cornerstone of the Rio+20 process and ongoing efforts to promote a more equitable and greener global economy (UN, 2012). Successes achieved in a wide range of sectors – notably agriculture, forestry and marine products, textiles and other forms of manufacturing – are based on a range of policy instruments including voluntary standards, corporate social responsibility (CSR) tools, sustainable/ethical supply chain management practices and sustainability labels. Some instruments are targeted at the private sector (B2B) while others aim to encourage more informed decision-making by consumers when purchasing goods and services.

Efforts to stimulate SCP in travel and tourism follow similar trajectories. Despite notable success stories at firm and destination levels, the net impact of tourism initiatives remains limited. Less than one percent of all beds in Europe carry any type of sustainability label (Goodwin, 2007), and the percentage of international arrivals that can be categorised as “responsible travel” is much less (TripAdvisor, 2009).

The value-action gap in sustainable tourism (the difference between what travellers aspire to and how they actually spend their money) is not yet well understood empirically, and more detailed market segmentation and consumer insight is needed. Competition between hundreds of sustainable tourism standards, certification schemes and voluntary codes of conduct risks industry fatigue, consumer confusion and ultimately dilution of market and development impact. Strong emphasis on the “green” aspects of tourism over the past decade or so must be balanced with equal attention to labour standards, human rights and trade and climate justice.

This article focuses on sustainability standards and labels as tools to promote SCP in travel and tourism and argues for improved coordination, not only between standards-setting and certification organisations but between the growing numbers of accreditation systems currently being designed to professionalise and harmonise the sustainable tourism certification services sector. Accreditation is evolving into the “next big thing” in tourism certification and its implementation must avoid rather than repeat the problems it aims to address.

Tourism sustainability standards and labels – current state of play

There are currently some 150+ sustainability standards and certificates targeting the travel and tourism industry (Bien, 2011). Some schemes are international or regional in scope while the majority operate nationally, targeting accommodation, tour operators and other businesses in destinations. Most systems are owned and operated privately, often by NGOs, which is a result of the low barriers to entry that have pertained in the sector over the past decades.

In addition to low barriers to entry, destination-specific imperatives coupled with a “do it ourselves” mentality have resulted in a proliferation of schemes across the globe, operating largely in isolation from one another. Most if not all schemes struggle with the same challenges: financial sustainability, low market penetration and a lack of evidence to illustrate the business and development cases for certification. Moreover, many schemes are characterised by weak governance procedures and there is a tendency to combine certification

with other services, for example training and consultancy, which results in potential conflict of interest and is contrary to the principles of good practice in certifying goods and services as defined by ISO65.

Sustainability in tourism - A guide through the label jungle⁴⁷



To date, the content of the standards on offer in travel and tourism has been strongly focused on the environmental dimensions of tourism and the majority of tourism certificates may be classified as “green” or “eco” labels. To some extent, this tendency derives from the fact that the business case for improved environmental management is relatively easy to sell to the private sector as it leads to cost savings and other efficiencies (e.g. reduced consumption of energy and water), while environmental indicators and impacts are also more easily measured than their social and cultural counterparts. However the focus on “green” labels has also been shaped by a strong policy and donor focus on ecotourism, rooted in the outcomes of the 1992 Rio summit and the 2002 Quebec Declaration (World Ecotourism Summit, 2002).

Post Johannesburg 2002, sustainability in tourism has been defined much more holistically, regardless of the terminology used from one destination to the next. In addition, national governments like Brazil and South Africa have become more strongly involved in designing standards that embrace the triple bottom line. Brazil adopted a comprehensive national standard for sustainable tourism in 2002 (Eco Brazil, 2012) and a national minimum standard for responsible tourism was published in South Africa in 2011 (SANS 1162, 2011). In both cases, national standard-setting mechanisms were used, which creates a precedent to drive future standards-setting as well as accreditation of standards and certification schemes through ISO mechanisms and the International Accreditation Forum. This in turn will give greater credibility to sustainability standards both nationally and internationally, while also creating strong national policy mandates to drive SCP through fiscal and other incentives as well as industry voluntary initiatives including but not limited to certification.

⁴⁷ http://tourism-watch.de/files/labelguide_en_web.pdf

In response to the proliferation of sustainability standards and labels in tourism, the Sustainable Tourism Stewardship Council (STSC) was launched as a UN Type II partnership in 2009. The STSC was modelled on similar councils in other sectors, most notably forestry and marine products, with the aim of harmonising the sustainable tourism certification sector. The STSC was endorsed by certifiers from around the world as it aimed to create a more enabling environment for their work based firstly on third-party accreditation of certificates to create a common playing field and secondly on improved market penetration and public awareness raising about the benefits of travelling more responsibly.

In parallel to the establishment of the STSC, a broad range of sustainable tourism stakeholders were engaged in publishing a common definition for sustainable tourism: the Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GST-Criteria) in 2007. The GST-Criteria is a holistic definition of sustainability in tourism comprised of four sets of statements focusing on sustainable management systems; socioeconomic impacts; cultural impacts; and environmental impacts (GSTC, 2012).

In 2009, the GSTC and STSC were united into a single institution, known briefly as the Tourism Sustainability Council (TSC) and since 2010 the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GST-Council). The GST-Council is currently in the process of becoming a member of the Global Association for Sustainability Standards (ISEAL Alliance). The GST-Council offers services to standards-setters and certifiers as well as directly to the travel and tourism industry, and operates as a membership organisation. While the GST-Council's membership base continues to grow, the strong multi-stakeholder emphasis and governance of the STSC has to some degree been lost. The strategic focus of the GST-Council has also become broader, as the organisation has taken on a broader range of programmes in addition to the accreditation mandate of the former STSC.

Regardless, the multi-stakeholder focus and consensus-based governance of the STSC has been diluted, and the much needed international accreditation framework for sustainable tourism certification is not yet fully operational. Granted, this framework is in process, however the GST-Council currently lacks capacity and resources to deliver on its expending programme of work.

A sister initiative, the Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism (GPST) was formed in 2011 bringing together UN agencies, donors and development institutions, national governments, civil society and to some degree the tourism private sector in an effort to improve the sustainable development impact of tourism policies, projects and programmes. UNEP is the Secretariat of the GPST, and the strengthening of UNEP post Rio+20 must be leveraged to drive SCP in the travel and tourism industry more broadly and effectively. The GPST will be an important mechanism to ensure that the sector receives sufficient attention from donors and development agencies and that sustainability standards and labels in tourism draw lessons from experience in other sectors.

The GST-Council and GPST acknowledge the need to define better their respective roles and responsibilities, not only in relationship to one another but also regarding the mandate of the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO). Other internationally orientated programmes must be part of this dialogue, including the Code International (owner and operator of the Tourism Child-Protection Code of Conduct), the Tour Operators Initiative (TOI) and other industry-led initiatives. There is some degree of coordination in place, however the existence (and proliferation) of potentially competing programmes begs the question of whether the pitfalls that have characterised SCP in travel and tourism to date, primarily within and between destination-based initiatives, are not now being replicated globally. Clearer delineation of mandates, improved coordination and more effective

governance procedures are needed, and the question of target audiences must be better addressed to avoid industry fatigue. All these initiatives share a common end-goal: to influence private sector and consumer behaviour in a manner that improves the quality of life of people living in destinations, in particular the economically poor and the socially vulnerable. This common goal must not be displaced by competition for members, funding, status and other resources.

Likewise, improved coordination between international and national certification systems is needed, and the post Rio+ context is likely to be characterised by the consolidation of schemes based on mutual recognition, licensing, dual certification and other forms of cooperation. The GST-Council is an important vehicle for achieving this, as GSTC-recognised standards and GSTC-accredited certificates will have a level playing field for working together. The International Trade Centre (ITC), a programme of the World Trade Organization (WTO), operates a sustainability standards map and database that can compare sustainable tourism standards with each other, with the GST-criteria and with standards in other sectors including agriculture, mining, forestry and marine products. The ITC database also has capacity to compare governance systems and the tourism certification and accreditation sectors should make better use of this resource, as an independent sounding board as well as a mechanism to reduce the costs of accreditation.

The larger certification schemes like Travelife and verification programmes like that operated by the Rainforest Alliance must take a lead in cooperating with national systems. Standards and certificates developed locally are well positioned to grow the numbers of certified businesses within destinations, and it should be easier for businesses certified locally to enter value chains controlled by international tour operators. Schemes have begun talking with one another about improved coordination, however the financial mechanisms that will underpin mutual recognition, licensing and dual certification have not yet been tested. Certification is expensive particularly for small businesses and the costs of accreditation and cooperation between certifiers must not become a burden for the tourism private sector.

Regionalisation: opportunities and threats

The post Johannesburg environment has also been characterised by the regionalisation of sustainable tourism initiatives, often in support of global processes. Commencing in 2003, the Rainforest Alliance led the establishment of the Sustainable Tourism Certification Network of the Americas, in an attempt to harmonise sustainable tourism standards and certification systems throughout Latin America. The Network of the Americas brought together 150 organizations operating in 23 countries and created new capacity amongst its members to align their systems with the GSTC, in anticipation of accreditation. The Rainforest Alliance stepped out of the technical secretariat in 2010 and the leadership was handed to a steering committee of founding members. Since then, the Network has become inactive to some extent because it had achieved its initial objectives but also in the absence of a strong secretariat; however the legacies of improved trust and coordination must not be underestimated. Most members developed partnerships among each other, which continue to grow and a significant number became part of the GSTC.

The Voluntary Initiatives for Sustainability in Tourism (VISIT) association was established in Europe during 2001-2004, with financial support from the European Union. VISIT created a platform for leading European sustainable tourism certificates to share best practice and improve coordination. The seven founding certificates are based in the Netherlands, Italy, Denmark, Latvia, UK, Switzerland and Luxembourg and together represented over 3,200 certified tourism enterprises. VISIT became less active after 2008 following the establishment of the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (VISIT, 2012).

Building on these success stories, the Sustainable Tourism Network of Southern Africa (STNSA) was established in 2007 to create a platform for improved coordination between sustainable tourism stakeholders located in the Southern African Development Community (SADC). The STNSA operated informally, bringing together tourism boards and ministries, certification programmes and NGOs to share best practice and respond to trends in the external environment. The STNSA served as a focal point for its members to engage with the TSC/GST-Council, particularly with regard to the design of the GSTC accreditation system. The STNSA became inactive in 2010, due to a lack of resources as well as a lack of consensus as to what should be the strategic focus of the Network. However, the Network was re-launched in May 2012 as the Sustainable Tourism Certification Alliance Africa (STCAA), with clearer membership criteria and a new strategic focus on the SCP enabling environment.

These three examples of regional networks in Latin America, Europe and Africa demonstrate the value of cross-border collaboration for the tourism certification sector. The weaknesses of networking as a strategy for collaboration include over-dependence on one or more organisations to drive activities (usually the Secretariat) and dependence on external funding. Networks only “work” when members get value from them.

Lessons from Fairtrade

Fairtrade is a worldwide trading partnership comprised of producers in developing countries; traders and retailers; and national licensing initiatives whose role is develop demand for sixteen categories of fairly traded products including coffee, tea, sugar, cocoa and composite products like confectionaries. The first Labelling organization was Max Havelaar in Holland, launched in November 1988. Nine years later the Fairtrade Labelling Organization (FLO) established in 1997. Fairtrade is managed globally under the auspices of the Fairtrade Labelling Organisations (FLO), also known as Fairtrade International.

Global sales of Fairtrade products were measured at €4.36 billion in 2010, up by 28% on the previous year, demonstrating resilience even in difficult economic times. Impressively, the international Fairtrade mark is recognized by 96% of British, 90% of Swiss, 75% of Dutch and 69% of German consumers (Globescan 2011).

Harriet Lamb, Director of the very successful UK Fairtrade Foundation, opened World 2011 Responsible Tourism Day in London, and challenged the travel and tourism industry to seek inspiration from Fairtrade (Lamb, 2011). Lamb spoke passionately about the power of Fairtrade to transform the ordinary act of doing the household shopping into extraordinary benefits for producers in the Global South. These benefits are manifest in fairer trading conditions, long-term trading partnerships and the creation of new resources for sustainable development through the Fairtrade premium, a portion of the price paid to producers that is reserved for Fairtrade beneficiaries (workers and communities) to invest in education, community health and other types of social infrastructure and in the case of cooperatives, business development.

There are obviously many parallels between Fairtrade and sustainability standards and labels in tourism as well as the trend towards traveller’s philanthropy. A critical success factor of Fairtrade lies in strong coordination between national labelling initiatives including new ones in the South, most notably Fairtrade Label South Africa (FLSA). Another hallmark of Fairtrade’s success is the creation of a single, well known and highly trusted label. This success has been underpinned by professionalization of Fairtrade based on the principles of ISO65, so that certification is divorced from market development to avoid conflict of interest.

During 2006-2009, Fairtrade International conducted feasibility research that demonstrated strong potential demand for Fairtrade travel (Zonneveld, 2008). That tens of millions of loyal

consumers of Fairtrade products reside in Europe and North America is food for thought for developing countries that depend on these markets for international tourism arrivals. The fact that citizens residing in emerging markets like South Africa are gaining easier access to Fairtrade products also creates opportunities to grow domestic and regional tourism more equitably and sustainably.

Since 2003, Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) has operated a national certification programme based on the principles and modalities of Fairtrade. FTTSA and its many partners around the world believe that tourism is a Fairtrade problem; that tourism can learn from Fairtrade, and vice versa; and that concept and principles of Fair Trade must become more firmly entrenched in the sustainable tourism lexicon.

Tourism growth and development, especially rapid growth, carries social and environmental costs to people living in destinations. Travel and tourism is natural, cultural and human resource-dependent and in addition to its environmental impacts, tourism can create social and other problems that damage destinations and communities, to the detriment of the economically poor. Research by advocacy organizations shows that labour standards in tourism are amongst the worst in the world, and that human rights challenges are on the rise, linked for example to competition over land, water, energy and other resources.

Moreover, sustainability standards and labels in tourism have yet to address the trade in tourism services, which tends to disadvantage suppliers in destinations, especially small businesses. The business of tourism negatively impacts wages in destinations and results in often high levels of economic leakage to the detriment of local economic development. Sustainability in tourism urgently requires attention to the commercial relationships between suppliers, traders and retailers. If not, certified hotels and other tourism products will continue to be sold to consumers in a manner that reinforces rather than transforms structural imbalances in the worldwide trade in tourism services. If trade justice is not pursued, the real costs of sustainability will not be equitably distributed throughout tourism value chains and will rest squarely on the shoulders of local destination stakeholders and consumers who are told they must pay more for travelling responsibly.

Having taken part in the Fairtrade tourism feasibility study, FTTSA set about developing a system to monitor, assess and certify the full tourism value chain. Pilot-testing during 2009-2010 resulted in the establishment of a new mechanism to bring Fair Trade tourism products to market: the concept of a "Fair Trade holiday", which assembles certified products into a single offering. Holidays are certified by FTTSA based on a trade standard that ensures fair pricing, pre-payment, transparency and commitment to sustainable trade.

Fair Trade Tourism Standard	
Product Standard	Trade Standard
 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fair wages and working conditions ▪ Equitable distribution of benefits ▪ Ethical business practice ▪ Respect for human rights, culture and environment ▪ Investment in staff and community development ▪ Participatory workplace culture ▪ Transparent ownership structures ▪ Safe working environment and measures to assure security of visitors ▪ Implementation of HIV/AIDS prevention initiatives and assistance to people affected by the pandemic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepayment to tourism suppliers in the destination ▪ Fair contracting and discounting practices by the tour operator/s ▪ Ethical business practice ▪ Commitment to sustainable trade ▪ Prevention of commercial sexual exploitation ▪ Contribution to Fair Trade Tourism Development Fund, which invests in skills development, decent work and job creation in destinations. Currently the average contribution per arrival is in the range of €60. <p style="text-align: right;">(FTTSA, 2012)</p>

Growth in the supply of Fair Trade holidays will be based on mutual recognition and dual certification strategies with other certification systems and on certification modalities borrowed from other sectors, for example group certification and combined product certification, which will make Fair Trade Tourism more accessible and affordable to the industry. Certification will be out-sourced to an ISO65 accredited certification body, in line with global best practice and thereby enabling FTTSA to support businesses to become and remain certified, without conflict of interest.

Growth in demand will be driven through partnerships with tourism advocacy organisations and Fairtrade organisations in source markets and through joint marketing agreements with tourist boards like South African Tourism. Sales of Fair Trade holidays can be measured, and outbound tour operators make a mandatory contribution per arrival to a special fund that supports job creation, skills development and decent work in destinations. There are currently 13 holidays for sale in Europe (FTTSA, 2012) and to date development contributions and certification costs incurred by tour operators are not being passed on to consumers, meaning Fair Trade holidays are not, by definition, more expensive than their conventional counterparts.

While Fairtrade is good for tourism to think with, FTSA also believes that tourism can generate many lessons for Fairtrade. That Fair Trade Tourism is led from southern Africa by local organisations seeking high levels of coordination is historically and politically significant both for the Fairtrade movement and for sustainable tourism certification more generally. Any future marriage between Fairtrade and tourism must be based on a cooperative approach that respects international good practice while speaking to the needs and expectations of local destination stakeholders.

Conclusions

Since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, the sustainable tourism certification sector has grown considerably, with a number of notable success stories. However the proliferation of sustainability standards, schemes and labels in tourism has been accompanied by different management approaches and governance procedures, which need to be harmonized and professionalised. This will require leadership not only by the institutions being created to drive accreditation in sustainable tourism but also by certifiers themselves. In the next decade the hallmarks of success in tourism certification will be cooperation, integration and impact assessment, all in support of improved market penetration. Schemes that cooperate are poised for growth, while those that continue to operate in isolation are likely to become increasingly irrelevant in the market.

References

- Bien, A, 2011. *Personal Communication to J. Seif* [30 June 2011].
- CST, 2012. Available from <http://www.turismo-sostenible.co.cr/en> (Accessed on 29 May 2012).
- Eco Brazil, 2012. *Brazil has done its homework*, available from http://www.ecobrasil.org.br/publique/cgi/cgilua.exe/sys/start.htm?UserActiveTemplate=ecobrasil_eng&infolid=231&sid=38# (Accessed 28 May 2012).
- Fairtrade International, 2011. *Monitoring the scope and benefits of fairtrade* third edition, 2011, available from http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2009/resources/Monitoring_the_scope_and_benefits_of_Fairtrade_2011.pdf (Accessed on 28 May 2012).
- FLSA, Fairtrade Label South Africa, 2012. *Report Highlights Fairtrade Impact for Producers*. Available from <http://fairradelabel.org.za/news/report-highlights-fairtrade-impact-for-producers.108.html> (Accessed on 30 May 2012).
- FTSA (Fair trade in Tourism South Africa), 2011. *Fair Trade Travel Standards, Trade and Company Standards*. Available from http://www.fairtourismsa.org.za/fairtradetravel/ProjectInformation/FTT_Standards.pdf (Accessed on May 30 2012).
- FTSA (Fair trade in Tourism South Africa), 2012. *Fair Trade Travel- Packages*. Available from http://www.fairtourismsa.org.za/fairtradetravel_packages.html (Accessed on May 31 2012).
- Goodwin, H. 2007. *Advances in Responsible Tourism* ICRT Occasional Paper No. 8, Leeds Metropolitan University, available from <http://www.artyforum.info/RTD/OP08.pdf> (Accessed on 28 May 2012).
- GSTC, 2012. *Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC Criteria)* available from <http://new.gstcouncil.org/page/adopt-the-criteria> (Accessed on 28 May 2012).
- Lamb, Harriet, 2011. *Leading Fair Trade Campaigner to Open WTM World Responsible Tourism Day 2011*. available from

<http://www.wtmlondon.com/page.cfm/Action=press/libID=1/listID=1/libEntryID=303> (Accessed on 29 May 2012).

TripAdvisor, 2009. *TripAdvisor Releases Travel Trends for 2009*. available from http://www.tripadvisor.com/ShowTopic-g150807-i8-k2326782-TripAdvisor_Releases_Travel_Trends_for_2009-Cancun_Yucatan_Peninsula.html (Accessed on 29 May 2012).

SANS 1162:2011 South African National Standard, 2011. *Responsible tourism – Requirements*. Available from <http://eventgreening.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/SANS1162-Final-31-03-11.pdf> (Accessed on 29 May 2012).

UN, 2002. *The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation*. Available from http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD_POI_PD/English/WSSD_PlanImpl.pdf (Accessed on 30 May 2012).

UN, 2012. *Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) initiatives*. Available from <http://webapps01.un.org/dsd/scp/public/Welcome.do> (Accessed on 29 May 2012).

VISIT, 2012. Available from www.yourvisit.info (Accessed at 30 June 2012).

World Ecotourism Summit, 2002. *Quebec Declaration on Ecotourism*, available from <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/eco-tour/quebec-declaration.pdf> (accessed on 29 May 2012).

Zonneveld, Luuk (2008) *Fairtrade Labelled Tourism: Rationale, concept, outline of business plan*. Cologne pp.25-27.

Tourism as a Field of Development Cooperation: The Conceptualisation of Poverty in Pro-Poor Tourism Discourse

By Jordi Gascón

Within the field of development cooperation, approaches to the phenomenon of tourism are diverse. On the one hand, certain organisations and social platforms criticise tourism models which have a negative impact on local ecosystems, economies and populations, condemn the business sector for benefitting from these models, and strongly disapprove of the support that the tourism sector receives from public institutions and multilateral organisations.



On the other hand, a more conservative and uncritical discourse exists in which tourism is seen as a means to obtain additional resources for the marginalised population of the South, without questioning the validity of the model or addressing the causes of structural poverty.

Within this second type of approach to the tourism-development nexus, the most widespread intervention strategy in development cooperation is pro-poor tourism (PPT). Conceived in the 1990s by British cooperation agencies, it has been adopted by development NGOs and government agencies throughout the world, as well as by the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2003). Even the platform for transnational companies, the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), recommends adopting the PPT strategy in the euphemistically named emerging countries (WTTC, 2004). The popularity of PPT in conservative spheres such as the UNWTO and the WTTC is due to its uncritical vision. In fact, PPT raises the possibility of presenting the principal beneficiary of the dominant model, transnational tourism capital, as an agent of development cooperation.

In recent years, PPT has become the subject of debate in academic circles. Several scientific papers have already highlighted its conservative nature and its relationship with transnational capital⁴⁸. To explore this criticism further, one specific aspect of the PPT agenda needs to be examined: the conceptualisation of poverty.

The main goal of PPT is to increase the income of the most disadvantaged sections of the population, even though these benefits are marginal and it is others who monopolise most of the profits generated by tourism. The PPT rationale is that although the profits from tourism which filter down to the poorest sectors of society may seem paltry on a macro level, they are nevertheless significant in limited domestic economies, and could be important for development. This discourse is explicitly stated in its founding documents:

⁴⁸ A summary of the criticisms of PPT is given in Hall, 2007.

"The definition says nothing about the relative distribution of the benefits of the tourism. Therefore, as long as poor people reap net benefits, tourism can be classified as 'pro-poor' (even if richer people benefit more than poorer people)" (Ashley/Roe/Goodwin, 2001, p. 2).

"Doing business differently will only ever involve change at the margin – tourism business remains a business. But marginal change in a massive sector can be significant for development" (Ashley/Haysom, 2005).

According to proponents of PPT, this objective can be achieved regardless of the tourism model in question.

"Pro-poor principles apply to any tourism segment, though specific strategies will vary between, for example, mass tourism and wildlife tourism"⁴⁹

The logical conclusion is that bad models do not exist. Enclave or minority tourism models operated by foreigners can be considered appropriate and valid in the fight against poverty if they increase the income of the most disadvantaged members of the population, even if these obtain only marginal benefits from the activity.

Consequently, according to PPT, the impact of tourism activity is assessed on the basis of its ability to increase the net income of the poor. Any tourism model that achieves this is a valid model, whether or not one of its objectives is the fight against poverty, whether or not this objective is implicit or explicit, a priority or a secondary goal. Other factors, such as the potential increase in socio-economic differences or inequities in the distribution of profits, are considered secondary issues. In fact, the PPT discourse not only accepts that the model does not promote equality, but that it can even create problems for some sectors of the population;

"Do not expect all the poor to benefit equally, particularly the poorest 20 per cent. Some will lose."⁵⁰

All that matters is that average poverty rates decline.⁵¹

This objective is based on a limited conceptualisation of poverty: a conceptualisation that considers poverty in absolute terms, based on the amount of money available to an individual.



However, researchers and experts have been defining poverty in relative terms for decades: it is not the amount of income earned which defines poverty and marginality so much as the position of the individual within the social structure (Sen, 1981). Thus, an increase in socio-economic differences (such as those generated by the inequitable distribution of tourism profits) will always entail impoverishment, although in the process the poorest may increase their income. Meanwhile, whoever obtains the most benefits will increase their economic

⁴⁹ Key principles and strategies for pro-poor tourism. www.propoortourism.org.uk/ppt_principles.html

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ For more information on the principles of PPT, see the documentation available on its website (www.propoortourism.org.uk).

power (greater access to resources) and political influence (greater role in decision-making processes).

The case of inflation generated by tourism exemplifies the need to conceptualise poverty in relative terms. The mass arrival of visitors to a destination influences the price of local products and services. This has happened in Cancun, where the basic shopping basket is one of the most expensive in Mexico (Mercer, 2007), and in Catalonia, where tourism has been the main external cause of rocketing inflation (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005). In real terms, inflation means impoverishment for those sectors of the population whose income does not increase in line with the Consumer Price Index, as is frequently the case. The Nicaraguan coast provides a good example. The development of residential tourism in the municipality of Tola caused the price of land to shoot up: within fifteen years, the price of a parcel of land known as a manzana (approximately 0.7 hectares) had shot from US\$300 to US\$280,000. The result was the concentration of land in the hands of a small number of investors and the displacement of local people, unable to contend with the increase in land prices (Bonilla/Mortd, 2010, p. 137-169).

The PPT conceptualisation of poverty is blind to this reality. This lack of insight means that, within a PPT strategy, it is acceptable to seek the collaboration of large hotel companies, the main cause and beneficiaries of the enclave tourism models that lead to processes such as those described above.

PPT proponents do not deny that the dominant tourism models generate distortions (unsustainability, impoverishment), but assume that the problem resides not in the model as such, but in its management. By establishing the appropriate corrective mechanisms, the dominant tourism models and transnational corporations that control them no longer appear as part of the problem, but are presented as allies in the fight against poverty. Through this discourse, PPT legitimises political and corporate interests that have serious consequences for societies, economies and ecosystems. As Chok et al. have stated,

"Currently, the PPT agenda appears to be heavily dictated by corporate and bureaucratic interests whose focus is garnering political support for tourism as a policy priority" (Chok/Macbeth/Warren, 2007, p. 50).

PPT is actually an orthodox neoliberal proposition, according to which economic development is essential to alleviate poverty (Mowforth/Munt, 2003; Scheyvens, 2007), and the participation of transnational capital is crucial. PPT proponents even go so far as to advise governments in the South to provide financial support to tourism sector transnationals so that they implement "pro-poor policies", considering that although such policies may generate long-term profits for the companies, in the short to medium term they require an investment which these governments should help to finance with public funds (Ashley/Ashton, 2006). This is a neoliberal strategy, according to which the best way to benefit all of society is through an indirect approach, namely, by establishing economic policies that favour the business sector, or even providing subsidies directly from public funds, and trusting that some of the benefits will trickle down from the apex of the pyramid to the base, where the most disadvantaged are located. This strategy is even known as the trickle down approach.

Poverty and environmental degradation: Two sides of the same coin

Other, more specific PPT propositions also reveal a narrow conception of poverty and marginalisation. For example, proponents of PPT consider that this approach differs from sustainable tourism, since the latter emphasises environmental impact. Whilst acknowledging that ecological sustainability is very important, the main goal of PPT is held to be the fight against poverty.

"PPT aims to deliver net benefits to the poor as a goal in itself. Environmental concerns are just one part of the picture." (Ashley/Roe/Goodwin, 2001, p. 3)

However, disciplines such as ecological economics have shown that poverty and environmental degradation are two sides of the same coin: the application of economic models of growth which make unsustainable use of natural resources. Even if far from radical proposals, such as that advanced by the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), it is acknowledged that the one phenomenon cannot be separated from the other.

When faced with the choice between growth in the sector or the equitable distribution of associated profits, PPT clearly opts for the former. No consideration is given to the risks entailed for local economies and ecosystems of the growth of an industry that requires substantial human, financial, and natural resources. The higher the number of hotels, second homes or spaces devoted to tourism, the more "fringe benefits" will trickle down to the local population. Factors generated by tourism development, such as increased socio-economic differences, migration, unfair working conditions, the



destruction of ecosystems or the inequitable distribution of profits, are all considered by proponents of PPT to be unimportant consequences compared to the alleged possibility offered by tourism of generating a meagre income through low wages, tips, or the sale of handicraft. An income which, as we have seen, is often swallowed up by the inflationary effect of tourism, but which also disappears as the result of other phenomena such as the way in which tourism comes to replace other economic sectors such as agriculture.

In short, according to the PPT discourse, any tourism model is acceptable, provided that it generates marginal benefits for the poor. The problem is that many of these models are by their very nature unsustainable, lead to the concentration of wealth in the hands of a privileged few and divert necessary resources away from the development of key economic sectors. The conceptualisation of poverty in PPT discourse renders its proponents blind to this reality.

References

- Ashley, C., Ashton, J. (2006): Can the private sector mainstream pro-poor tourism? *id21 insights* 62
- Ashley, C.; Haysom, G. (2005): From philanthropy to a different way of doing business: strategies and challenges in integrating pro-poor approaches into tourism business. Submission to ATLAS Africa Conference. www.odi.org.uk/tourism/RESOURCES/longerpapers/0501_pptpilots_ATLASpaper.pdf.
- Ashley, C., Roe, D., Goodwin, H. (2001): *Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work for the Poor. A review of experience*. Nottingham: ODI&IIED&CRT.
- Bonilla, A.; Mortd, M. (2010): Turismo en el municipio de Tola, Nicaragua: Exclusión y resistencia local, in Cañada, E. (coord.) *Turismo en Centroamérica: Nuevo escenario de conflictividad*. Managua: Luciérnaga.
- Chok, S.; J. Macbeth; Warren, C. (2007): Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of pro-poor tourism and implications for sustainability, in Hall, C. M. (ed.) *op. cit.*

- Generalitat de Catalunya (2005): Evolució de la inflació a Catalunya i a Espanya 1995-2004. Barcelona: Direcció de Programació Econòmica
- Hall, C.M., ed. (2007): Pro-Poor Tourism: Who Benefits? Clarendon/Buffalo/Toronto: Channel View Publications.
- Mercer (2007): Costo de Vida Nacional 2007-2008. México
- Mowforth, M., Munt, I. (2003): Tourism and Sustainability: Development and New Tourism in the Third World. London & New York: Routledge.
- UNWTO (2003): Turismo y atenuación de la pobreza. World Tourism Organization. Madrid.
- UNWTO (2004): Turismo y atenuación de la pobreza: Recomendaciones para la acción. World Tourism Organization. Madrid
- Scheyvens, R. (2007): Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus, *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (2&3): 231-254.
- Sen, A. (1981): Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Townsend, P., Gordon, D., eds. (2002): World Poverty: New Policies to Defeat an Old Enemy. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- WTTC (2004): Namibia: The impact of travel & tourism on jobs and the economy. London.
- WTTC (2006): China, China Hong Kong SAR and China Macau SAR: The impact of travel & tourism on jobs and the economy. London.
- Jordi Gascón is a member of Xarxa de Consum Solidari – Responsible Tourism Forum.
- English translation: Centro Superior de Idiomas de la Universidad de Alicante, S.A.U.

Environmental Stewardship: Governance Incorporating Local Communities in Brazil

By René Schärer

Coastal communities and others in ecologically important areas are primary stakeholders of the eco-system. Mangroves, rain forests, and riparian forests are being destroyed at alarming rates. Unless the local communities are partners in the protection and conservation of these areas, eco-systems risk losing their vital functions including the ability to absorb large quantities of CO₂ as a buffer to climate change.

The legacy of Chico Mendes

Brazilian folk hero Chico Mendes left at least one important legacy for mankind, which deserves to be replicated the world over – the law creating reserves for sustainable use. They are called "reservas extrativistas" in Portuguese (extractive reserves or RESEX). Mendes led the Rubber Tappers Union in resisting the pressures of wealthy farmers who were using government land for cattle grazing. Chico and his companions were defending the thesis that the rainforest is worth more standing up than lying down; that extracting the richness from

the forest without destroying it is equal to sustainable development. Mendes was assassinated by land grabbers in December 1988 at his house in Xapuri, in the state of Acre.⁵²

Extractive Reserves are part of the Brazilian national system of protected areas (Kalikoski/Vasconcellos, 2012). The National System for Conservation Units (SNUC) defines them as a "Protected Area for Sustainable Use by Traditional Populations". The government decree 98.897 of January 30, 1990 signed by President Collor (later impeached) and Environment Minister José Antonio Lutzenberger is the legal basis for extractive reserves and defines RESEX as "territorial space destined to self-sustainable exploration and conservation of renewable natural resources" and establishes that the executive power shall create those reservations in territorial spaces considered of ecologic and social interest.

Ownership vs. stewardship for sustainable use

Traditional populations living in forests, along rivers or coasts can apply to the Instituto Chico Mendes for Conservation of Biodiversity (ICMBio), the government agency responsible for protected areas and conservation of biodiversity, for the creation of a RESEX. After an extensive review of the legitimacy of the community, land or sea rights and their extractive practices, the request is reviewed by government agencies, state governments and is subjected to public hearings in the community before it is submitted to the President of the Republic for signature of the decree. The government cedes the rights of use of land and sea and the population receives a collective title for land use. This impedes the sale of the land which is federal property, federal laws apply, and law enforcement is of federal nature. The concession guarantees access to land and sea for the future generations of the local community.

Governance: Utilization and legislation

The next step after the decree creating the RESEX is the orientation of the local community and the creation of groups representing all the community's segments – fisherfolk, women, youth, farmers, tourism service providers, commerce, and so on. The groups choose a representative and a substitute to participate in the deliberative council. This deliberative council is the governing body of the RESEX and the majority (51 percent) of votes belongs to community groups, with external groups from local and state government, NGOs, academia, and neighbouring communities completing the council. Resolutions passed by the deliberative council and sanctioned by the Government become federal law. The manager of the RESEX representing the Federal Government (ICMBio) is the president of the deliberative council.

Once the RESEX is established and ratified, a management plan must be developed for the sustainable use of the RESEX. Enforcement in the RESEX is the responsibility of the Federal Government with community participation. The management plan elaborated by the RESEX community with help from members of the deliberative council and government should be in place within five years from the date of designation, although this has not always been the case.

Carbon credit and payment for environmental services

Carbon credit programs should provide funds to compensate local communities for the environmental services of their RESEX. This adds income from tourism and other traditional productive activities like fishing, hunting, agriculture and arts and handicraft. Brazil already has legislation which regulates payments for environmental services in RESEX, with the first

⁵² www.edf.org/climate/chico-mendes-legacy

projects still in experimental phases in the state of Amazonas. Brazil has great potential for carbon credit programs to benefit local communities, contribute to poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation as well as help mitigate climate change.

Prainha do Canto Verde as a model of sustainable development

This fishing community in the state of Ceará (Northeast Brazil) has become a classic example of resistance against real estate speculation defeating land grabbers in a 25 year battle in the field and in the judicial system, leading to the Superior Tribunal of Justice ruling in favour of the community. With local and international support and networks Prainha do Canto Verde has developed projects for sustainable fisheries, community-based tourism, organic farming, and other sustainable economic activities. In 2009, the President of the Republic, "Lula" Luis Inácio da Silva, signed the presidential decree creating the RESEX of Prainha do Canto Verde, thus guaranteeing human rights for the community residents. The RESEX of Canto Verde covers 252 km², of which 610 hectares are terrestrial and the rest is marine. Community residents have begun legislating for sustainable use. For example, before 2009 the regulations for new constructions were voluntary village agreements without any legal basis. In 2011, a modified version of this voluntary agreement was approved by the deliberative council and sanctioned by the government to become federal law, with the Federal Police responsible for its enforcement.

This caused a conflict for land with a member of a wealthy family of the elite of Ceará and owner of a conglomerate of private schools who claims to own over 50 percent of the RESEX territory and is using his political clout to fight the RESEX. He has initiated several law suits against the RESEX and is dividing the community through subversive activities. To no avail – the presence of Mr. Tales Montano Sá Cavalcante in the RESEX is under scrutiny and the Federal Government will appropriate his mansion constructed illegally 20 years ago.

In focus groups and hearings of fishers of the community and neighbouring communities, fishing regulations within the RESEX are currently being negotiated (April 2012). Once consensus is reached the resolution will be voted by the deliberative council and become federal fisheries and conservation law for the RESEX. The proposal for this RESEX initially excludes motor vessels as a precautionary measure to safeguard marine stocks until stock assessments are available and scientific data is made available to support management decisions. Neighbouring communities using sail craft and sustainable fishing gear will be granted special fishing permits. Fishers are criticizing the lack of enforcement at sea against poachers of the valuable lobster resource. The community is ready to participate in a UNEP project for sustainable production and consumption which will lead to the certification of the lobster catches from the RESEX. Prainha do Canto Verde has been a pioneer in fisheries certification since a pre-assessment along the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) principles and certification criteria was carried out in 2000.

The RESEX has already brought many advantages to the local population and helps them guarantee human rights of access to land and marine resources and self-determination. Special credit lines and projects for economic development are available to local residents. Fishers ask for more efficient management and enforcement of the RESEX by the responsible government agency. This is needed to accelerate the implementation of the RESEX and to complete the management plan by June 2014 – the year of the FIFA Soccer World Cup in Brazil.

Flaws in Brazil's RESEX and lack of leadership by President Dilma Rousseff

The use of protected areas, be it for integral protection or for sustainable use, is one of the keys to sustainable development. Countries have been slow in living up to their commitments from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg ten years ago. Brazil, even though with an exemplary legislation and reserves for sustainable use, needs to do more to expand the number of RESEX and other marine protected areas to protect an area of ten percent of the marine territory as established in the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), and make sure they are properly implemented, with management plans in place to avoid a system of "paper parks". There is a need to accelerate the implementation of protected areas with resilience towards climate change with plans for mitigation and tools for local economic development. The ICMBio is in dire need of institutional strengthening, qualified human resources and sufficient financial resources to operate. The implementation of many reserves is lagging due to lack of managers with a socio-economic science background and lack of skills for conflict resolution (Gerhardinger, 2011).

The upcoming conference on sustainable development Rio+20 would have been a great opportunity to present RESEX as a solution to sustainable forms of governance for replication around the world, but President Dilma Rousseff has shown a lack of environmental stewardship and leadership. Since she took office in January 2011, no new RESEX have been created and even worse; existing protected areas, especially in the Amazon, have been reduced in size to please local politicians and agribusinesses. Environmental legislation is constantly being weakened by executive orders and parliamentary initiatives to favour short-term economic benefits over sustainability. This leaves us with a bleak outlook for the "green economy" that should come out of Rio+20.



RESEX in other parts of the world: UNESCO Biosphere Reserves

One model for sustainable use reserves in other countries are the UNESCO Biosphere Reserves. Biosphere reserves are sites established by countries and recognized under UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme to promote sustainable development based on local community efforts and sound science. As places that seek to reconcile conservation of biological and cultural diversity and economic and social development through partnerships between people and nature, they are ideal to test and demonstrate innovative approaches to sustainable development from local to international scales.

Biosphere reserves are thus globally considered as:

- sites of excellence where new and optimal practices to manage nature and human activities are tested and demonstrated;
- tools to help countries implement the results of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and, in particular, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its ecosystem approach;
- learning sites for the UN Decade on Education for Sustainable Development.

After their designation, biosphere reserves remain under national sovereign jurisdiction, yet they share their experience and ideas nationally, regionally, and internationally within the World Network of Biosphere Reserves (WNBR). There are currently 580 sites in 114 countries.

www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves

Example of the Swiss Biosphere Reserve in Entlebuch: www.biosphaere.ch/de/welcome.cfm

References:

Kalikoski D., Vasconellos M. (2012): Marine protected areas, Country case studies on policy, governance and institutional issues, FAO Fisheries and aquaculture technical paper 556/1

Gerhardinger L., et al (2011): Environmental Management, Marine Protected Dramas: The Flaws of the Brazilian National System of Marine Protected Areas

René Schärer works with communities in the fishing village of Prainha do Canto Verde in the north-eastern state of Ceará, Brazil, supporting local development, environmentally and socially responsible tourism and fighting land speculation. He is a founding member of the NGO Instituto Terramar, Brazil, and the Philanthropic Association Amigos da Prainha do Canto Verde, Switzerland.

Eco-Tourism – Great Potential for Economic Development in Extractive Reserves

Prainha do Canto Verde pioneered community tourism in Brazil when the residents started to explore the activity in an organized fashion in 1998. Women, men and adolescents provide tourism services in guesthouses, restaurants, or by offering transfers, excursions, and eco-trails with local guides. Community and school infrastructure is used to organise meetings with groups from schools and universities, and exchange visits from protected areas from around the country.

Service groups provide coffee breaks and look after the meeting room facilities where all necessary equipment – television, video and data show – is available and community groups talk about the village history. Other residents use their talents for arts and handicrafts which are sold at the local fair trade shop together with natural products from the village and other communities from the state of Ceará which joined in the community tourism and fair trade networks.

The TUCUM tourism network already has 12 members along the 574 km coastline of the state of Ceará. Six fair trade outlets of the Bodega Network are consolidating their marketing effort and planning to sell online soon. Other people benefitting from the demand of tourists for healthy food are local farmers. The great advantage of community tourism is that nobody depends on the tourism revenue for survival, so the people can live with the low season. Income from tourism, arts and handicrafts, family agriculture and computer and communication services complement income from the principal activities like fishing, hunting, foresting, and agriculture depending on the eco-system where the community is located.

Since the community of Prainha do Canto Verde has joined Extractive Reserves in 2009, it has drawn attention to the potential of eco-tourism. Prainha do Canto Verde receives over 1,200 tourists per year with 3,105 overnights distributed in five guesthouses. Several groups from other protected areas from all over Brazil have already visited Prainha and the case study has been presented in workshops joining hundreds of people from RESEX and other protected areas. We hope that Instituto Chico Mendes will join forces with the Ministry of Tourism to develop this promising segment of tourism to promote economic development, nature conservation and meaningful, sustainable poverty reduction.

International Financial Institutions Gaining Ground: Tourism Infrastructure Development in India

By Equations

Since the later part of the 1990s, International Finance Institutions (IFIs) have been gaining ground in India. They have been finding it easy to operate in an environment where an ad hoc attitude ruled the roost, and where a deregulated and fully liberalised tourism economy had erased spaces for local communities to raise their voices. In 1997, four member countries⁵³ of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) agreed to the formation of a sub group termed the South Asian Growth Quadrangle. Cooperation was focused on sustainable utilization of natural resources (water and energy), trade and investment, transportation and tourism. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) vigorously pushed subregional economic cooperation in South Asia modelled after what it had done in Greater Mekong Subregion. Despite serious criticism of projects that are planned away from the public gaze and without community participation, the push for IFI-advised tourism development continues.

Implementation Problems in the 1990s

The 1990s saw a sudden spurt in IFI presence in tourism. But there were problems associated with tourism development projects funded by the IFIs, as highlighted by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG)⁵⁴. The CAG Audit report on Union Government (Civil) for the year ending March 31, 1999 reported that Ministry of Tourism released funds for 158 tourism infrastructure projects during the period 1992-1997 under the scheme titled



"Development of Tourism Infrastructure". The scheme was aimed at ensuring comfortable and moderate accommodation to tourists at reasonable rates by way of constructing hospitality facilities such as tourist bungalows, complexes, lodges, reception centres, way-side amenities, etc. Central assistance was provided to state governments on a cost-sharing basis. The state governments were generally expected to meet the cost of land identified for the project with other ancillary facilities such as electricity, water supply and approach road; while the central ministry was expected to meet the cost of construction, including internal electrification, water supply and sanitary fittings etc.

119 out of these 158 projects were not completed as of June 1999. Test checks of accounts had shown that in respect of 67 projects, delay in implementation of 14 months to 65 months was attributed to non-availability of land, change in

⁵³ The South Asian Growth Quadrangle consists of Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal and the North eastern states of India (Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura and Sikkim)

⁵⁴ The Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India audits all receipts and expenditure of the Government of India and the state governments, including those of bodies and authorities substantially financed by the government.

the designs/estimates, late award of the work, non-availability of clearance from other organizations, projects not being commercially viable, and disputes with executing agencies. This exposed the completely lackadaisical attitude and tearing hurry with which the Union Ministry had continued approving proposals submitted by state governments without ascertaining critical factors. Many of the commissioned projects were not being used for tourism promotion and were non-operational.

The CAG recommended that "Tourism Ministry should review the incomplete projects to ensure their completion urgently and also review the working of the completed projects along with impact assessment on tourism".⁵⁵ The scheme needed to be re-tailored in the light of shortcomings noticed in its implementation. The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) believed that tourism promotion, instead of being viewed as a source of revenue, deserved consideration as a tool of national integration, employment generation and above all a possible means of building global goodwill and better understanding of India and its composite culture and great heritage. Considering the poor infrastructure ratings given by the tourists, general decline in tourism, paltry budgetary allocation for tourism, lack of effective partnership between Ministry and the private operators and the trade, PAC hoped that all the issues would be addressed adequately and progressive policy enunciation made in the new National Tourism Policy at the earliest.⁵⁶

However, against the backdrop of scathing criticism voiced in the performance audit, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) and Parliamentary Standing Committee (PSC) on Tourism should have stressed studying the social and ecological impacts of tourism. The criticism had also pointed at the utter lack of regulatory regime at the Ministry of Tourism, which should have been reviewed thoroughly.

Towards Public Private Partnerships (PPP)

India's 9th Plan (1997-2002) and 10th Plan (2002-2007) documents had arguments to more than quintuple the financing of tourism related infrastructure. If we include the plan allocation to states, the figure touched an equivalent of US\$814.448 million. Clearly, if planners were to integrate concerns from auditors, they would have also underlined a need to ensure accountability, introduce robust regulatory mechanisms and not merely increased involvement of international and bilateral finance and private sector participation for the sector. N K Singh's contribution to a symposium on reorienting India's policy on tourism underlined that "out of 1,310 tourism projects undertaken in 10th Plan, 740 projects remained incomplete".⁵⁷ Despite the changing rhetoric that started to employ terms like cultural tourism, pro-poor tourism, exploring heritage etc., there still remain bottlenecks.

IL&FS Infrastructure Development Corporation⁵⁸ broad projections in the year 2007 suggested that over the next twenty years India is required to invest Rs 229,657.79 crores (US\$ 50.6 billion). To meet these enormous funding requirements, they propose the Public Private Partnership (PPP) route. The allocation to Union Ministry of Tourism in 11th Plan (2007–2012) stood at an equivalent of US\$ 912.89 million. Significant upscaling to the plan was seen when for the 12th plan the Ministry asked the Planning Commission for an allocation

⁵⁵ CAG's Audit findings can be downloaded from www.cag.gov.in/reports/civil/2000_book2/chapter18.pdf

⁵⁶ Excerpts from CAG Activity Report 2001-'02, Chapter 5.

⁵⁷ Seminar No 554, October 2005, www.india-seminar.com/2005/554/554%20n.k.%20singh.htm

⁵⁸ IL&FS IDC is the infrastructural wing of Infrastructure Leasing and Financial Services Ltd. (IL&FS)

amounting to four and a half times the size of the allocation in the previous plan. Where will the money come from to finance such an enormous increase in allocations?

IFI-funded subregional tourism infrastructure

The first decade of this century has been marked by IFIs paving the way for South Asian nations under the rubric of developing subregional tourism infrastructure projects modelled after the Mekong Subregional Tourism model as well as pushing IFI assisted "inclusive" infrastructure development projects in the region. Although regional economic cooperation alliances have existed (e.g. SAARC), ADB has prioritized sub-regional cooperation and integration for development, by projecting the hinterland and borderland as "gateways". But many see beneath this rhetoric traces of the "growth triangle or quadrangle" or "sub-regional economic zone" concept that a few lead economies of the region had toyed with in the late 1980s and early 90s at the behest of ADB and other donor agencies. The success factors of these triangles or quadrangles were the presence of a highly developed and well endowed city/area that has run out of land and labour, a surrounding area plentiful in land and labour, and a political desire to reduce the visible and invisible distance between the two. ADB documents claim that the rationale for supporting sub-regional cooperation rests on two factors – to permit countries to respond collectively to common trans-boundary problems and secondly improving access to expertise, trade, investment, information and technology. There is also a claim that a sub-regional cooperation strategy can advance poverty reduction by freeing up trade and transactions, improving regulatory environments, increasing competitiveness and enabling countries to meet their trade liberalisation commitments.⁵⁹

Since stand-alone tourism projects were found to be extremely difficult to execute efficiently on account of the cross-sectoral nature of tourism coupled with complex institutional frameworks, IFIs couched them under the rubric of being a sub-component in biodiversity conservation projects (for example a project in Sikkim funded by the Japan International Cooperation Agency – JICA) or infrastructure and transport projects. One of the important criteria set down by IFIs like ADB for approving sector specific lending is the institutional capacity of the borrowing country and implementing agency to formulate comprehensive and long term sector development plans and execute projects that might be funded with a vision to achieve them. Till now the strategy has been first to fund technical assistance and rope in a consultant agency to formulate such a sector development plan which may subsequently lead to projects that can be funded.

Poor community participation

Projects are planned away from the public gaze and without substantial participation of organisations that work with local communities in analysing the social and ecological impacts of tourism.⁶⁰ In India, local communities have time and again opposed these projects. For example, the opposition from local communities to ADB financed "inclusive tourism infrastructure development project" related works in the vicinity of Pong Dam in Himachal Pradesh and alternative suggestions put forth by them clearly underline the fact that until a very late stage, community participation is not actively sought despite the lip service and rhetoric employed in published reports by international financial institutions and central and state governments receiving external aid for tourism development. Even the criticism voiced by

⁵⁹ Asian Development Bank, Annual Report, 2004

⁶⁰ Equations (2008): IFIs and Tourism: Perspectives and Debates

CAG in the course of performance audits of public sector undertakings in tourism and the failure of governance and due diligence pointed out therein gets ignored by governments.

For example, in the context of the ADB's South Asia Subregional Economic Cooperation (SASEC) Tourism Development Plan (TDP), the time overruns that were pointed out in the CAG audit became the sole concern of the Government of India which was then foregrounded to push for an increased consultative role granted to the private sector. Those very State Tourism Development Corporations (STDCs) that have come under criticism in the performance audit of their functioning have recently announced plans to develop tourism infrastructure through PPP mode.

This trend clearly points to a need to engage with the public and constitutional audit institution and to build campaigns taking up failure of governance issues. Civil society also needs to explore campaign and advocacy spaces with Public Accounts Committees of state assemblies that are empowered to follow up on the performance audits, while at the same time developing social audit campaigns as a follow up on constitutional audit agency's performance audit reports. CAG offices at the level of state and centre do come under the purview of the Right to Information Act and community groups as well as civil society organisations can seek relevant information following upon missing details in CAG's performance audit reports on STDCs.

Integration vs. restriction: Whose line is it anyway?

In the case of sub-regional development plans, quite naturally, the focus is on bringing down restrictions to regional and sub-regional integration even to the detriment of the interests of local communities. For example, in the context of the north eastern region in India, an important idea that has been repeatedly expressed in the SASEC Tourism Development Plan and echoed by government ministries and tourism promoters has been the relaxation of the Restricted Area Permit (RAP), Protected Area Permit (PAP) and Inner Line Permit (ILP) rules that apply to some portion of North East India. In its section on issues and constraints for subregional tourism, the Tourism Development Plan makes specific mention of the ILP and PAP required for outsiders to the states of Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and parts of Nagaland. Although many constitutional offices, such as Governor of Manipur in his speech before assembly and groups such as the Diaspora community from the North East at a recent Pravasi Bharatiya Sammelan (a conference of diaspora Indians), have voiced such sentiments, there are also local community groups, such as Mizos and indigenous communities in Arunachal Pradesh, who have vehemently protested against such proposals. Despite criticism of this suggestion, the Government of India decided to lift the Protected Area Permit in three north-eastern states – Manipur, Nagaland and Mizoram – with effect from January 2011 for an initial period of one year.

Developing enclaves

One of the main programmes suggested in the SASEC Tourism Development Plan is the Key Area Programme. A total of 33 projects have been suggested for the implementation around the key areas. Earlier experiences of such strategies (e.g. Special Tourism Areas proposed in the 1992 Tourism Policy) have turned places like Bekal in Kerala, Mahabalipuram in Tamil Nadu, Puri in Orissa and Sindhudurg in Maharashtra into enclaves of investment, exploitation and isolation from their surroundings. These have left natural resources exploited, communities displaced and destinations spent. Despite these and other criticisms voiced repeatedly ever since the SASEC Tourism Development Plan was published, neither ADB nor state and central bureaucracy appear to have pondered over these concerns. The push for IFI advised tourism development continues. The new strategy announced by Union Tourism Minister Subodh

Kant Sahay in 2011 lays stress on developing Special Tourism Parks on the lines of Special Economic Zones (SEZ) where projects would be implemented in a PPP mode.

What does the future look like?

Along with negative impacts on spaces for people's participation and governance, resulting in the dilution of safeguards, it is important to see these developments in the context of the global economic process which have resulted in the liberalisation and de-regulation of our economy. The influence of IFIs on national economic policies has been consistently increasing. The latest trend is the introduction of PPPs in a formal way and the pressure on the state to institutionalise this model of development.

In India, it is the ADB which has been playing an important role in influencing and formulating PPP related policies. As a result of this, the Department of Economic Affairs, within the Ministry of Finance has announced a draft PPP Policy, 2011. The draft National Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation & Resettlement Bill, 2011 also mentions and makes special provisions for PPP projects. In the context of tourism, this needs to be the next level of investigation and action.

Equations is a research, policy, advocacy and campaigning organisation working on tourism and development issues in India since 1985.

The Challenge of Meaningful Participation: Time for the UNWTO to Open its Doors to Civil Society

By Rachel Noble and Joseph Jenkinson

Opportunities for organisations representing communities negatively affected by tourism development to participate in processes under the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) are currently extremely limited, especially when compared to the majority of other UN organisations. As a UN agency, the UNWTO is required to be transparent and accountable to all tourism stakeholders. The UNWTO claims to be the leading international organisation in the field of tourism policy issues. Its membership includes 155 countries, seven territories and more than 400 affiliate members.

Participation in the UNWTO should be accessible to all those with a stake in tourism, not just those who can afford membership. "PLATMA", the UNWTO's online forum set up to increase dialogue between the private and public spheres of the industry, remains closed to those not affiliated with the UNWTO. The UNWTO needs to take a proactive role in ensuring the participation of all tourism stakeholders, particularly those who are socially marginalised and who otherwise struggle to have their voices heard. Meaningful engagement is likely to include the need to provide financial support to CSOs so that they may attend relevant conferences and events. Clear mechanisms for providing written submissions would also be welcomed.

In 2011, seven international campaigning groups renewed calls for UNWTO to enable poor communities negatively affected by tourism to have a voice in UNWTO processes. The NGOs are urging the UNWTO to allocate sufficient resources to develop and implement mechanisms for enhanced civil society engagement, based on a clear policy and strategy. This is vital if human rights violations in tourism development are to be effectively addressed by the UN

agency. The call was set out in two campaign briefings: "UNWTO-Civil Society Participation: Why it is time for the UNWTO to open its doors"⁶¹, and "Putting Tourism to Rights"⁶². The briefings were presented to the UNWTO at a seminar on tourism ethics in Bali on 11-13 June 2011.

UNWTO's current levels of civil society engagement are insufficient and unrepresentative of the multi-stakeholder approaches commonly practiced by the majority of UN agencies. Meaningful civil society engagement, including with organisations challenging unsustainable tourism development practices and associated human rights violations, is essential for eradicating exploitation within the global tourism industry and for promoting a more ethical industry, as espoused in the UNWTO's Global Code of Ethics for Tourism⁶³.

Since then, the UNWTO has acknowledged a need for increased civil society participation. It has stated its commitment in this regard and affirmed its willingness to consult with NGOs on what form this could take. However, the UNWTO also states that it is severely hamstrung by resource limitations – but surely this is a question of priority rather than absolutes. As a membership organisation, it is primarily accountable to its members, who also significantly shape the UNWTO's agenda. This membership is overwhelmingly dominated by national tourism ministries and tourism businesses, including in countries where democratic processes and freedom of speech are extremely limited, and for whom community consultation is not a priority, despite being absolutely essential to the development of sustainable, equitable tourism development. The recent ill-judged decision by the UNWTO and World Travel & Tourism Council to extend an invitation to Zimbabwe's President Mugabe to be a "Global Leader for Tourism" – a man who has perpetuated massive human rights abuses against his own people through a repressive, autocratic regime and who has caused major long-term socioeconomic harm to the country – underlines the major gaps in accountability if the UNWTO listens only to its members.

Admittedly, there is also a need for civil society organisations across the world engaged in challenging the harmful impacts of tourism and offering a critical perspective on this massive global industry to link up and organise themselves more effectively. We too need to learn from the civil society networks that have been formed to engage in other specific UN processes, such as UNAIDS (see below), and to seek resources in this regard. Securing funding will not be easy, given the widespread lack of recognition among the donor community that tourism can do harm as well as good. Indeed, this is the challenge we have always faced and the reason why tourism development is so rarely on the agenda of decision-makers as a human rights issue, who instead push constantly and uncritically for tourism's growth as a panacea to developing countries' economic woes. The European Tourism Network (TEN) was created in 1984 as an informal solidarity network to the Ecumenical Coalition on Tourism (ECOT) representing the global South. In the years since these networks formed, countless campaigning groups, community-based organisations and grassroots networks have sprung up around the globe. There is immense potential for a global civil society network that could

⁶¹ "UNWTO-Civil Society Participation: Why it is time for the UNWTO to open its doors" by Tourism Concern has been endorsed by: EED Tourism Watch (Germany); Naturefriends International (Austria); Respect (Austria); Informatie Verre Reizen (Netherlands); Arbeitskreis für Tourismus und Entwicklung (Switzerland); and the Ecumenical Coalition on Tourism (ECOT). www.tourismconcern.org.uk/uploads/file/campaigns/UNWTO-CSO%20Participation-Briefing-June11.pdf

⁶² "Putting Tourism to Rights" was produced by EED Tourism Watch and is based on Tourism Concern's report of the same name, plus additional analysis undertaken by EED Tourism Watch and Arbeitskreis für Tourismus und Entwicklung.

⁶³ For more information about the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, visit: www.unwto.org/ethics/index.php

draw strength from its diversity while being unified under a call for just, equitable, democratic, people-centred and environmentally sustainable tourism – including the right of communities to say "no" to the development of tourism in their homes.

Article 10 and the World Committee on Tourism Ethics

In particular, the UNWTO could undertake specific steps to increase CSO awareness and engagement in relation to Article 10 of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, and the associated activities of the World Committee on Tourism Ethics (WCTE). Article 10, "Implementation of the principles of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism" provides for the establishment of the WCTE as an impartial third party body whose role it is to conciliate on disputes regarding the implementation or interpretation of the Code. Article 10 therefore has the potential to provide an important non-judicial, non-state based mechanism for communities who believe their rights have been violated by specific parties involved in tourism development to seek redress.

However, as of now complaints must be submitted jointly by the plaintiff and alleged offender. Where the plaintiff is a poor local community and the accused party a powerful international hotel group backed by a national government, the power differentials make the submission of a joint complaint untenable in the majority of cases.

Furthermore, in order to be effective, such remedial mechanisms must be legitimate, accountable and transparent, as highlighted in the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights⁶⁴. Article 10 and the WCTE are lacking on all accounts, given the low levels of



awareness that exist amongst CSOs, the overarching exclusivity of the UNWTO with respect to non-industry based stakeholders and small CSOs generally, and the need for aggrieved parties to submit issues for consideration to the WCTE jointly. Tourism Concern suggests that the extracts below from the Effectiveness Criteria for Non-judicial Grievance Mechanisms offered within the UN Guiding Principles could be used by the UNWTO to inform improvements to the WCTE processes in respect to Article 10, so that it may become a more effective and accessible means for human rights

victims to potentially seek non-judicial redress.

⁶⁴ Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (March 2011) Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework. www.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/ruggie/ruggie-guiding-principles-21-mar-2011.pdf

Effectiveness criteria for non-judicial grievance mechanisms⁵

In order to ensure their effectiveness, non-judicial grievance mechanisms, both State-based and non-State-based, should be:

- (a) **Legitimate:** enabling trust from the stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended, and being accountable for the fair conduct of grievance processes;*
- (b) **Accessible:** being known to all stakeholder groups for whose use they are intended, and providing adequate assistance for those who may face particular barriers to access;*
- (c) **Predictable:** providing a clear and known procedure with an indicative timeframe for each stage, and clarity on the types of process and outcome available and means of monitoring implementation;*
- (d) **Equitable:** seeking to ensure that aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice and expertise necessary to engage in a grievance process on fair, informed and respectful terms;*
- (e) **Transparent:** keeping parties to a grievance informed about its progress, and providing sufficient information about the mechanism's performance to build confidence in its effectiveness and meet any public interest at stake;*
- (f) **Rights-compatible:** ensuring that outcomes and remedies accord with internationally recognized human rights;*
- (g) **A source of continuous learning:** drawing on relevant measures to identify lessons for improving the mechanism and preventing future grievances and harms.*

However, any voluntary mechanisms such as Article 10 should not detract from the duty of governments to protect human rights. Governments must also provide access to redress for victims through robust regulatory frameworks and judicial mechanisms that ensure the protection of civilians, including against human rights abuses committed by third parties. This includes transnational corporations and business enterprises operating extraterritorially, and thus relates to many private sector tourism stakeholders. Where states have failed to adopt legislation that would impose extraterritorial liability on multinational corporations for the breach of human rights, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises provide a potential alternative tool for holding companies accountable for human rights abuses. They are applicable to all companies from OECD countries.

Mechanisms of CSO involvement

A number of key documents, including the Stakeholder Empowerment Project (2009)⁶⁵, the Cardoso Report⁶⁶ and the Aarhus Convention⁶⁷ provide examples of key documentation on civil society empowerment and the need for meaningful engagement of civil society in all UN processes at the decision making level.

The UNWTO should consider its positioning within the wider UN system. For example, a closer alignment with treaty-monitoring bodies, such as the Human Rights Committee, could foster new lines of communication, support and intra-UN agency understanding on issues of tourism development, human rights and civil society engagement.

Almost all UN agencies have a civil society "focal point" whose role is to ensure mainstreaming of civil society into agency processes and effective communication with CSOs in this regard. The CSO Focal Point is usually a staff member of the particular agency, programme or fund.

⁵ The Stakeholder Forum (2009), The Stakeholder Empowerment Project: Stakeholder Forum for a sustainable future, www.stakeholderforum.org/fileadmin/files/Thepercent20Stakeholderpercent20Empowermentpercent20Project.pdf

⁶ The Cardoso Report (2004), A/58/817, <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/376/41/PDF/N0437641.pdf?OpenElement>

⁷ Aarhus Convention (1998), www.unece.org/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf

Their role is to act as a point of information for all civil society actors working around the issues, and also to innovate new interfaces with civil society (i.e. hearings, dialogues, advisory boards, partnerships, etc.).

Many UN agencies have "civil society hearings" with relevant ministers, where CSOs can submit evidence for or against specific policy processes and have a general influence over decision making e.g. UNAIDS, Civil Society Hearing during the High Level Meeting on AIDS, 2008⁶⁸.

Roundtables allow decision makers to explore issues more fully with smaller groups but also for civil society and other stakeholders to interact with the decision makers. When carried out effectively they can generate high quality discussion in a "safe" and "risk free" environment.

Multi-stakeholder dialogues are useful in identifying points of convergence and divergence amongst a range of stakeholder groups. A key objective of multi-stakeholder dialogues is to enhance levels of trust between the different actors, to share information and institutional knowledge, and to generate solutions and relevant good practices.

Global civil society forums have become a popular method for gathering stakeholders, sharing knowledge and developing policy statements amongst different actors. They often run just prior to the intergovernmental high level meeting so that a set of recommendations, a declaration or a statement can then be passed on and included in the high level segment.

Four models of CSO-UN agency cooperation

Four existing models of civil society organisation (CSO)-UN agency participation and cooperation provide examples from which the UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) could draw in seeking to develop its own mechanisms to increase CSO participation in UNWTO processes. In addition, Stakeholder Forum's "Stakeholder Empowerment Project" (2009) provides a wider contextual background to this discussion. It includes an evaluation of a comprehensive set of case studies exploring models of civil society engagement in UN processes and institutions. The report also includes a "Stakeholder Empowerment Handbook".

1. UNEP and the Global Civil Society Forum

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) aims to protect the environment through engaging with a multitude of stakeholders who share the same purpose. Working on a global scale it seeks the expertise of specialists to develop its strategy at the policy level. The Annual Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) under UNEP became the main entry point for the participation of NGOs/CSOs in UNEP's work at the governance level. Within this forum, civil society comes under the collective term of "The 9 Major Groups". These are:

- farmers
- women
- the scientific and technological community
- children and youth
- indigenous peoples and their communities
- workers and trade unions

⁶⁸ The Stakeholder Forum (2009): Case Studies: Hearings, The Stakeholder Empowerment Project: Stakeholder Forum for a sustainable future, Chapter 2, pp.15-20. www.stakeholderforum.org/fileadmin/files/Thepercent20Stakeholderpercent20Empowermentpercent20Project.pdf

- business and industry
- non-governmental organizations and local authorities
- other relevant stakeholders⁶⁹

The Major Groups Facilitating Committee (MGFC) was set up to provide guidance to, and to coordinate the engagement of, major groups in the Global Civil Society Forum (GCSF) cycle. Alongside the nine Major Groups Facilitating Units, 12 regional representatives from UNEP's six defined global regions are selected during the regional meetings. UNEP has tried to cover all groups and all global regions in organising the Forum. However, in doing so the freedom for individual voices to be heard is restricted as "groupings" and "representatives" channel autonomy into a form of hierarchical democracy. The level of engagement seen in ECOSOC (covered later), where individuals and NGOs have the freedom to make informal oral interventions are excluded from the participatory process at UNEP.

Mechanisms of participation⁷⁰

Access for Major Groups is given to all meetings during negotiations, unless certain committee meetings or breakout groups are described as "closed". During the forum, it is the responsibility of the Major Group representatives to deliver statements previously put together by the group members and to speak on behalf of the group when called upon to do so. Major Groups can also contribute through organising side events, participating in side events, participating in the morning meeting at the green room and participating in the special policy sessions for each Major Group. Restricted access is granted to Ministerial panels and roundtables.

However, an often recurring issue at many UN meetings is the question of civil society and its access to the "rooms" in terms of what "access" really constitutes in reality. "Access" is often confused with the "right to speak", which is in fact controlled stringently. Rule 69 of the UNEP proceedings stipulates that the Chair of the Forum is to decide to what extent civil society will be allowed to participate at meetings of UNEP and governing bodies. So whilst Rule 69 does allow for civil society to make oral statements (via the Major Group representative), it is the Chair's responsibility to ensure the levels of participation do not "overburden" the forum. In other words, physical access allowing civil society to present at "floor level" and to listen in to the debate should be at a minimum granted, although this often translates in reality to an observer role.

UNEP has made progress in regard to developing its commitment to NGO/CSO participation since creating an NGO section after the 1972 Stockholm conference. However, despite creating the GCSF, which meets annually to consult on key environmental issues to be addressed by the Member States, the structure excludes a channel for direct participation by NGOs such as that seen at the ECOSOC conferences. Instead, a hierarchical democratic system combined with the controls on CSO participation by the Chair as stipulated in Rule 69,

⁶⁹ Guidelines for improving the Global Civil Society Forum (2008), Accessed: 30.03.11. Available: www.unep.org/civil_society/PDF_docs/Guidelines-Round1-CSO-revised-31Mar08.pdf

⁷⁰ ⁷⁰ Strandenæs, J.G (2009), How to understand and use the 'Guidelines for Improving the Global Civil Society Forum Cycle', unanimously adopted at the Global civil Society Forum, 2008; International Environmental Governance at Operational level- A possible interpretation and user guide' Available: www.unep.org/civil_society/GCSF10/pdfs/IEG-interpretation-user-guide.pdf

weakens the Forum's intention of providing a space for NGO engagement by silencing the voice of the individual.

2. Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism (GPST)

The GPST is a global initiative launched in 2010 with the aim to make tourism worldwide environmentally, socially and economically sustainable. It was created from the conversion of the International Task Force on Sustainable Development. The secretariat of the initiative is hosted by UNEP. The partnership aims to focus on policy, projects, tools, and networks for all tourism stakeholders, at all scales, by working on:

- policy frameworks
- climate change
- environment & biodiversity
- poverty alleviation
- cultural and natural heritage
- private sector sustainable practices
- finance & investment

The GPST is funded by direct financial contributions and in-kind support from members. Membership fees vary. For example, a prospective NGO (or not-for-profit) with a budget below US\$ 100m (the smallest bracket) would have to pay US\$ 500 in order to join the GPST. For many small civil society entities this is impossible.

The GPST will be a UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) Type II Partnership: a multi-stakeholder, voluntary initiative. Its organisational structure will consist of an Annual General Assembly with a Steering Committee, which will be the executive body and will implement decisions of the Annual General Assembly. An Advisory Committee will provide guidance and advice to the Steering Committee. The Secretariat (UNEP) will support all activities and provide various services to members.

It may be sometime before the GPST is able to start influencing policy. Therefore the extent to which NGOs will be able to engage in these decision making processes remains to be seen. The GPST has taken some important steps towards a sustainable global practice for tourism. However, given the membership fees, the GPST still seems to be geared towards larger organisations and those with more influence on the tourism industry. Thus, despite the UNWTO's involvement, it should not serve as a substitute for the UNWTO establishing its own processes to encourage and enhance CSO engagement and participation.

3. United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

ECOSOC serves as the forum for discussing international economic and social issues, including human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for formulating policy recommendations addressed to member states and the UN system.⁷¹ Guided by the UN Charter, ECOSOC is the one UN body that has established rights for NGOs to observe and

⁷¹ ECOSOC website, About ECOSOC, Background Information, ECOSOC at work: www.un.org/en/ecosoc/about/index.shtml

contribute to its work.⁷² ECOSOC consults with over 3200 NGOs to discuss key issues on the international agenda in the area of economic, social and environmental development.

NGOs/CSOs can find opportunities for participation or mutually beneficial working relationships by seeking "consultative status" with ECOSOC (based on Article 71 of the UN Charter and ECOSOC resolution 1996/31). Organisations must however adhere to a number of prerequisites that are stipulated to ensure a mutually beneficial relationship between parties. These include:

- a relevance of the organisations activities to the work of ECOSOC
- a commitment by the NGO/CSO to a democratic decision making mechanism
- an official registration under the appropriate government authority for at least two years.⁷³

There are three types of status that NGOs/CSOs can be accredited with (General, Special and Roster)⁷⁴. The type of status affects the overall level of engagement in ECOSOC activity by organisations and determines which channels of participation are available to utilise. Organisations wishing to apply for General Category must be "concerned with most of the activities of the ECOSOC and its subsidiary bodies". These tend to be fairly large, established international NGOs with a broad geographical reach. Special Status is granted to NGOs "which have a special competence in, and are concerned specifically with, only a few of the fields of activity covered by the ECOSOC". These NGOs tend to be smaller and more recently established. Organisations which "can make occasional and useful contributions to the work of ECOSOC or its subsidiary bodies" are included in the Roster. These NGOs tend to have a rather narrow and/or technical focus.

Mechanism of NGO/CSO engagement⁷⁵

Through the ECOSOC yearly conferences, NGOs/CSOs with consultative status have the chance to influence policy guidance (not necessarily in a negotiating role) on "recommendations for action" to member states and the UN System, with the potential to help draft a treaty. Gaining consultative status enables organisations to make a contribution to the work of the UN by serving as technical experts, advisors and consultants to governments and Secretariat. Sometimes, as advocacy groups, they espouse UN themes, implementing plans of action, programmes and declarations adopted by the United Nations.

In summary the actual mechanisms of NGO/CSO participation in ECOSOC take three basic forms: written statements, oral statements and oral interventions. The length of written statements is capped depending on the type of status the submitting organisation is accredited with and oral statements must be approved prior to the conference. Oral interventions can occur liberally throughout.

The influence of NGOs/CSOs at ECOSOC has grown considerably over the last few years. In the period 2009-2010, NGO participation saw a 50 percent increase in oral presentations and a 37 percent increase in the submission of written statements. In addition, organisations granted

⁷² UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service publication, Intergovernmental Negotiations and Decision Making at the United Nations How it works, www.un-ngls.org/orf/DMUNpercent20bprev1.pdf

⁷³ For full listing see ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31.

⁷⁴ www.un.org/esa/coordination/ngo/faq.htm

⁷⁵ NGO Branch (2010), '2010 ECOSOC High Level Segment Report 28th June – 2nd July: Non-Governmental Organisations Participation', Department of Economic and Social Affairs, www.un.org/esa/coordination/ngo/

consultative statuses are also invited to attend international conferences called by the UN, General Assembly special sessions, and other intergovernmental bodies. (The participation modalities for NGOs are governed by the rules of procedure of those bodies).

4. United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII)⁷⁶

The UNPFII was established as a subsidiary body of ECOSOC in 2000, by ECOSOC resolution 2000/22⁷⁷. Discussion on the need of such a forum began in the 1980s and was proposed by indigenous peoples who feared that the UN system failed to address indigenous issues. Today the forum deals with indigenous issues related to economic and social development, culture, environment, education, health and human rights. Through the forum, indigenous people have secured a position from which to participate in the UN system, by reporting to ECOSOC on all issues concerning indigenous peoples. The Forum marks a new direction in opening UN decision making to non-state participation.

To support the Forum the Inter Agency Support Group (IASG) was set up alongside the Indigenous Peoples Forum to allow the UN system and other intergovernmental organisations to analyse recommendations made by the Forum with a view to facilitating comprehensive and coordinated responses to the UNPFII. The IASG is made up of 31 UN bodies. Furthermore, in 2002 the Secretariat for the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (SPFII) was set up to support and facilitate all work regarding the conferences and members.

The forum is comprised of 16 independent experts who serve for a term of three years as members and may be re-elected or re-appointed for one additional term. Governments nominate eight of the members and the other eight are nominated directly by indigenous organizations in their regions. In addition, hundreds of participants hailing from indigenous communities and non-governmental organizations around the world join the 16 members of the Permanent Forum for an interactive dialogue. Some 1,200 people participate annually, including indigenous participants, civil society organizations, member states and intergovernmental entities.⁷⁸

As a subsidiary body of ECOSOC the mechanisms for engagement comply with those outlined in the ECOSOC section above (i.e. in terms of status type and written/oral participation). Therefore, those with consultative status at ECOSOC can participate through written and oral statements prior to the conference and through oral interventions during the conference. All stakeholders present at the conference have the ability to participate through oral interventions during discussions and debates as they see fit, bearing in mind that there are often many representatives wanting to speak and a time limit to various phases throughout the conference.

The Way Forward

As set out above, our joint NGO briefing in 2011 provided the UNWTO with examples of existing models of UN agency-civil society engagement. It is now incumbent upon the UNWTO and its members to allocate the requisite resources to further research to develop and implement mechanisms for sustained, enhanced civil society engagement, based on a clear policy and strategy, and devised in an inclusive, participative manner. Their public commitment to achieving this goal is welcome, but action remains limited. Additionally, we in

⁷⁶ www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/index.html

⁷⁷ www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/structure.html

⁷⁸ www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/members.html

global civil society offering a critical perspective on tourism issues must set about organising ourselves more effectively, so that we can engage with and challenge the UNWTO in a meaningful and sustained way.

Rachel Noble is Head of Policy and Research at Tourism Concern. Joseph Jenkinson was formerly a research intern with Tourism Concern and now works for Azafady. Tourism Concern is a UK-based NGO campaigning for ethical tourism that benefits local communities.

www.tourismconcern.org.uk

Organisations

Alba Sud is a Catalan association, specialized in research and communication for development, and founded in Barcelona in 2002. The association also has presence and collaborators in several Latin American countries (Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Mexico), and presents itself as a platform of exchange and joint work between professionals from distinct disciplines related to research and communication for development from different parts of the world. Alba Sud sees research and communication as tools to service proposals on transformation and emancipation, in fight against inequality and in support of societies with higher levels of inequality

EED (Church Development Service – An Association of the Protestant Churches in Germany) supports programs of partner organisations and monitors development policies of Governments and Multilateral Institutions to help ensure peace, justice and human rights. **Tourism Watch** is a brand and a working unit within the EED and promotes with ecumenical partners a sustainable, environmentally sound and socially responsible tourism. Its tasks include raising awareness for responsible travelling, consultancy for ecumenical study-tours, dialogue with the travel industry, lobbying activities, advocating alternatives in tourism and publishing “TourismWatch”. In October 2012, EED will merge with Bread for the World and become “Bread for the World – The Church Development Service”. The office will be in Berlin.

Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) is South Africa’s leading responsible tourism NGO and owner and operator of the world’s first (and still only) tourism fair trade certification system. FTTSA is a member of the Global Sustainable Tourism Council, the Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism and the Code International, and is the elected Secretariat of the Sustainable Tourism Certification Alliance Africa for the period 2012-2015.

Instituto Terramar was founded in 1993 as a result of the protest trip of a Jangada - traditional sailboat used on the coast of the Northeast of Brazil. The NGO is working with coastal communities in the state of Ceará for sustainable local development of artisanal fisheries, subsistence agriculture, handicraft and community tourism. Terramar has organized several International Seminars of Sustainable Tourism in cooperation with EED Tourism Watch, Akte and other European NGOs. These events were supported with grants from SST Swiss Foundation for Sustainable Tourism and the philanthropic Association Friends of Prainha do Cento Verde, both in Switzerland. The community tourism network TUCUM won the TODO Contest in 2008.

Kabani – the other direction is a non-profit organisation based in Kerala, India. Kabani is concerned about the impacts of tourism and development on people’s livelihood and environment. The organisation does research, advocacy, networking, and training activities for sustainability in tourism development and facilitates campaigns against unsustainable forms of tourism. Kabani supports community tourism initiatives which have their basis in the local population, focusing on the socio-economic security and sustainable development of the villages and the protection of natural resources.



www.albasud.org



www.eed.de

www.tourism-watch.de



www.fairtourismsa.org.za



www.kabani.org



www.terramar.org, www.tucum.org, www.amigosprainha.org



Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e.V. (EED)
Ulrich-von-Hassell-Str. 76
D-53123 Bonn
Germany
Telefon: +49 (0)228 8101-0
E-Mail: eed@eed.de
www.eed.de