

**PPT Working Paper No. 10**



**Methodology for  
Pro-Poor Tourism Case Studies**

Caroline Ashley  
Overseas Development Institute

December 2002

## **PPT Working Paper Series**

- 9 Strengths and Weaknesses of a Pro-Poor Tourism Approach, Results of a Survey to Follow-Up Pro-Poor Tourism Research Carried Out in 2000-2001**, by Dorothea Meyer
- 10 Methodology for Pro-Poor Tourism Case Studies**, by Caroline Ashley
- 11 Strategies, Impacts and Costs of Pro-Poor Tourism Approaches in South Africa** by Anna Spenceley and Jennifer Seif
- 12 Tourism in Poor Rural Areas: Diversifying the Product and Expanding the Benefits in Rural Uganda and The Czech Republic**, by **Jenny Holland, Louise Dixey and Michael Burian**
- 13 Coping with Declining Tourism, Examples from Communities in Kenya**, by Samuel Kareithi
- 14 Addressing Poverty Issues in Tourism Standards**, by Dilys Roe, Catherine Harris and Julio de Andrade
- 15 Improving Access for the Informal Sector to Tourism in The Gambia**, by Bah, A. and Harold Goodwin
- 16 Tourism to Developing Countries: Statistics and Trends**, by Dorothea Meyer, Dilys Roe, Caroline Ashley and Harold Goodwin (forthcoming)
- 17 Outbound UK Tour Operator Industry and Implications for PPT in Developing Countries**, by Dorothea Meyer (forthcoming)

These working papers, produced under the title 'Lesson-Sharing on Pro-poor Tourism', are the result of a collaborative research project carried out by the PPT Partnership. The PPT partnership is comprised of Caroline Ashley (ODI), Harold Goodwin (ICRT) and Dilys Roe (IIED). They are funded by the Economic and Social Research Unit (ESCOR) of the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

The PPT Working Papers represent the opinions of the specific authors rather than the Partnership or DFID. They are published by the PPT partnership in order to exchange information and ideas, stimulate debate and encourage others to adopt PPT.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction – to the New Reader .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	The original purpose of the project and the methodology .....	3
1.2	Practicalities: research steps, timing, who developed it, who used it.....	4
1.3	Some reflections and warnings.....	5
1.4	The wider relevance of this methodology .....	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Background For Case Study Researchers .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Aims of the project .....	9
2.2	Defining PPT strategies and case studies.....	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Doing Section A: defining the ‘initiative’ and scope of case study .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Doing Section B: assessing PPT strategies and impacts .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	Overview .....	12
4.1.1	The area and context .....	12
4.1.2	Background and details of the PPT initiative .....	12
4.2	Pro-poor focused actions.....	13
4.2.1	Assessment of broad pro-poor tourism strategies.....	13
4.2.2	Specific actions to involve the poor or address barriers to participation .....	13
4.3	Results and impacts on the poor .....	14
4.3.1	Progress, challenges .....	14
4.3.2	Identifying impacts on poor people .....	14
4.3.3	Financial benefits to the poor .....	15
4.3.4	Impacts on livelihoods of the poor.....	16
4.3.5	Broader contributions to poverty elimination.....	17
4.4	Review, Lessons .....	17
4.4.1	Different perspectives .....	17
4.4.2	Reflections on this PPT initiative .....	17
4.4.3	Reflections on the PPT research .....	17
	<b>Appendix 1 Updated definition of PPT.....</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>Appendix 2 Updated overview of PPT strategies .....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Appendix 3 Updated list of further reading on PPT .....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>References.....</b>	<b>22</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1: Case study countries, initiatives, organisations and authors.....	5
Table 2: Case study initiatives .....	10
Table 3: Types of PPT strategies .....	20

# 1 Introduction – to the New Reader

This document contains the methodology guidelines given to authors of six case studies on pro-poor tourism initiatives in 2000. This introduction has been added to explain to new readers the purpose and context of the method, what is included and left out, and a few pointers and warnings.

## 1.1 The original purpose of the project and the methodology

The project on *Pro-poor Tourism Strategies* (2000–2001) was designed to assess what was already being done in different countries to develop ‘pro-poor tourism’ (PPT), to assess preliminary impacts, and to identify ‘good practice’ lessons of use to others. Six case studies were chosen to cover a range of countries, and a spread of types of initiatives and implementers (government, NGO, business). Each case study was an ‘initiative’ of some form, that was designed to benefit the poor, among other objectives. They were not explicitly called ‘pro-poor tourism’ initiatives, but were selected because they were up-and-running initiatives that could show some impacts on the poor, useful strategies, and problems encountered.

In 2000, the idea of harnessing tourism more effectively for poverty reduction had been developed, but there was no documented experience specifically on PPT. Thus the calls for more PPT were based on hypotheses and related experience in fields of community tourism, private sector-community partnerships, ecotourism etc. A key purpose of the 2000-2001 project was to move the PPT discussion down to practical analysis of actual work in the field. But at the same time, it needed to draw the analysis and findings back up to the level of generalisations and policy level, to develop international analysis of PPT. The primary aim of the case studies was not to provide recommendations for implementers at the local level (useful by-product as they may have been). It was to learn from the case studies for wider discussion of PPT approaches.

*“The **purpose** of the project is to review emerging experience of pro-poor tourism through application of a common framework, and to identify practical strategies that can be further developed, tested and shared.”* Project document, 2000

The purpose of the methodology was to provide a common analytical framework for assessing six very diverse situations and to ensure the analysis focused on poverty-related issues, not on general project history and achievements. It was particularly important to have a shared method for several reasons:

- The initiatives differed enormously in type and scale
- Assessing tourism initiatives from a poverty-focused perspective was new, and quite different to normal evaluations which would compare progress against project-defined objectives, or broad ‘sustainable tourism’ goals. Thus it was important to ensure authors focused on poverty issues and were given tools to do so.
- The purpose of each case study was to contribute towards a bigger picture, gained by comparing and contrasting. Thus information of comparable types (to the limited extent possible) was needed.
- It was a thinly-resourced project (budget of £40,000 in total) thus it was not possible to bring the case study authors together for discussions of methods and findings during the work.

The method outlined here addressed two main questions in analysing tourism:

- i. What strategies are being used to enhance impacts on the poor?
- ii. What impacts do these strategies have on the poor: positive and negative, financial and non-financial, and for whom?

It is important to emphasise the focus on *strategies*. The case studies did *not* aim to add the voluminous literature on whether tourism per se is good or bad for the poor: there are plenty of case studies of both persuasions. They sought rather to focus on the useful strategies, and on impacts generated in those situations where pro-poor interventions were adopted.

## 1.2 Practicalities: research steps, timing, who developed it, who used it

The methodology was developed at the end of the first phase of the project: as selection of the six case studies were being finalised and before field work began. It was developed by the UK project team, and drew heavily on our own previous work in fields of responsible tourism, community tourism, sustainable livelihoods, and socio-economics, and on some specific work on pro-poor tourism done in 1999 for DFID with Deloitte and Touche (Deloitte and Touche *et al.* 1999). In addition, inputs were made by experts in poverty assessment.

The methodology was sent by email to the case study authors, as part of an intense communication process by phone and email, over their case studies. Unfortunately it was a hurried one-way process, rather than a two-way iterative development of a methodology. Some of the case study authors were involved as implementers of the projects being reviewed. Some instead were consultants hired in to do the assessment (in full collaboration with the company or organisation of the case study).

The initiatives, locations, type of lead implementing agency, and link to the case study author are summarised in Table 1. The case studies were selected against various criteria, such as being already established, generating impacts, including elements aimed at increasing benefits to the poor, and representing a spread of types of organisation and initiative. Practical criteria were willing participation of the implementing organisation, availability of data and of a case study author, and feasibility of quality assessment in the limited time available.

Once the case study work began, there were 3 distinct phases:

- i. Defining the case study (Section A)
- ii. Conducting the field work, writing up the main report (Section B)
- iii. Editing, revising, and further analysing the case study.

The first stage was very important, as there was a lot of discussion about the scope of the study:

- What was the case study to focus on?
- Just the activities of the NGO or company or government, or those of all the partners too?
- And where there were several linked initiatives at different sites in a country, was the case study just of one 'site' or of the initiative across sites?

This is covered in Section A of the methodology presented here. Final parameters differed by country, but in each a leading organisation of a defined initiative was identified, along with the main local sites for assessing impact.

The second stage was completed by the authors, using the methodology, often in conjunction with staff of the initiative. It involved a varying mixture of fieldwork with poor people involved, and

desk work and interviews with staff. In most cases it was done over a period of 2 to 4 months, but not as a full-time activity.

The third stage involved intensive input from the UK PPT team, in assisting to structure the findings, draw out implications, and process the masses of data in ways that enabled aggregated findings related to poverty impact and useful strategies to emerge. Several drafts were done of each case study.

Once the case studies were written, an overview report was produced by the UK team (Ashley, Roe and Goodwin 2001), which involved further collaboration with most of the case study authors.

**Table 1: Case study countries, initiatives, organisations and authors**

Case Study	Country	Implementing Agency	Study author
Wilderness Safaris, Rocktail Bay and Ndumu Lodge	Maputaland, South Africa	Tour Operator – Wilderness Safaris	A consultant working for WS plus outside researcher
The Spatial Development Initiative and Community-Public-Private Partnerships (CPPP) Programme at Makuleke and Manyeleti	Northern Province, South Africa	South African government – mainly Development Bank of Southern Africa	Project manager and fund manager
SNV project on tourism in, West Nepal	Humla District Nepal	International development agency – SNV	Independent researcher/consultant
Community Based Tourism Associations in Namibia and Uganda (NACOBTA, UCOTA)	Namibia and Uganda	Membership associations of community-based tourism initiatives – Namibian Community Based Tourism Association and Uganda Community Tourism Association	Independent consultant (for NACOBTA)  Programme Advisor (for UCOTA)  Linked by independent researcher/consultant
Tropic Ecological Adventures engagement with Huaorani Indians	Ecuador	Small tourism company – Tropic Ecological Adventures	Independent researcher plus staff of Tropic's NGO and Tropic
St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme (HTP)	St. Lucia	Donor-funded government programme – St Lucia Heritage programme	Consultant from an NGO with involvement in the project

### 1.3 Some reflections and warnings

Experience of implementation of the project, plus hindsight, further experience, and a follow-up review with those involved in the case studies, suggest the methodology had some clear strengths, and also some important limitations.

On the positive side, identifiable strengths were:

- Authors found it useful for providing a coherent analytical framework for thinking about poverty impacts. It brought together many disparate issues about poverty issues in the tourism initiative, which may have been already known, but had not been analysed together. In the follow-up review with case study authors and implementers this was an area of consensus.

**Reflections from a case study author on the methodology**

*“All issues were known to us, I have worked in this field a long time now, so they were important, but it was actually the way in which they were brought out into the open – that has really been helpful, to collect ideas and use them in a coherent structure. This also gave it some kind of theoretical perspective, which we or I at least, did not have before. Put together it all makes a lot of sense. There was really nothing much new but by simply putting it together it made a huge difference, so now we have what we always thought in a written form, rather than just playing with ideas, they are now shaped and firm”*

Comment by an author, 2002

- The method demanded tangible data about actual impacts on poor people. How many people earn an income? Out of how many? Of what amount? For what? Authors were required to move beyond generalisations, which is where too many reports get stuck.
- It also focused on other types of impacts on livelihoods, going into issues that can matter to the poor but may get ignored in a financial analysis (such as changes in access to resources, information, or empowerment).<sup>1</sup> The requirement to include non-financial information, in turn required (most) authors to consult directly with the poor themselves to gain indicators of these impacts.
- The methodology identified some pro-poor strategies or impacts that were important but had not been described as an explicit part of the initiative before. It did this by providing a ready-made checklist of types of strategies and types of impacts, both of which were broad. Thus engagement with policy-making was identified to be a useful strategy in several projects, even though this was not initially described as part of the work. Benefits to the poor in terms of access to infrastructure and information emerged strongly in several cases, even though these were not explicitly intended outputs. Thus approaching the case study with some PPT concepts helped to ensure that the analysis went beyond the conventional boundaries of project thinking.
- PPT project co-ordinators found it useful for generating some comparable findings from diverse cases, though comparability remained a problem. In particular, the ready-made categorisation of types of PPT strategies and impacts, and a dummy table for listing barriers to the poor and actions to overcome them, were useful.

Difficulties arose in applying the methodology within the case studies. Most of these arose in the assessment of impacts. In particular:

- It was difficult to collect data on impacts. In some cases this was because the initiatives were established but not yet generating large impacts. Issues of logistics and lack of time also played a part.
- Where data was available, particularly on jobs and earnings, the amount of raw data was vast: earnings from different periods for different people at different rates. This needed to be processed into a usable format, to address questions such as: how many earn, what are the averages and ranges for different groups, how significant are these compared to household income? The methodology lacked guidance on how to do this.
- The aim was to assess the impacts on the poor *of a PPT intervention* rather than of tourism per se. But it was very difficult to assess causality, and to identify what incomes or opportunities were due to tourism development in general, and what extra benefits arose from the PPT

<sup>1</sup> Thus it used a ‘livelihoods approach’ but did this by identifying categories of impacts that are typical in tourism initiatives rather than simply using categories from a ‘sustainable livelihoods framework’, which had proved somewhat formulaic in previous assessments. Typically livelihoods analysis involves categorising impacts according to changes in each type of asset: natural, social, physical, human and financial. This was used by Ashley for a methodology for assessing wildlife enterprises in East Africa, but on reflection led authors to use them as formulas, rather than particularly insightful categories (Ashley 2000).

strategy. In the end, the case studies assessed the impacts of tourism within the context of a PPT initiative.

- Virtually all of the case study reports gave much more attention to positive impacts than negative ones. This may be because these positive PPT strategies were truly generating few negative impacts, but may also be a reflection of bias in the method and project objectives.
- The case study reports were also weak on identifying the distribution of impacts among the poor. This is partly because of the broad definitions of 'poor' used within the project context (if any definition was used at all), and partly because more detailed research would have been needed to explore distributional inequalities.

Finally, a major weakness of the methodology is that it only focuses on what information to collect and what questions to answer. Although it provides some categories, empty tables and key questions to use in aggregating the data, it provides no actual guidance on how to do this aggregation, analysis and interpretation.

Apart from the practical problems of implementing the methodology as intended, some broader limitations of the methodology need to be recognised, as they affect its value for future use:

- The methodology was written for analysing one initiative, one specific case study. A different approach would be needed for analysing pro-poor tourism action or impacts at, say, the level of a destination or country.
- While the focus on impacts at local level is important, impacts above the local level receive scant attention. For example, impacts on policies or policy-makers, incremental change in market access of the poor, or a wider demonstration affect. The methodology does not provide any tools for assessing these.
- The written guidance included here only covers part of the assessment process: what to do, what data to collect, and how to tabulate results. Analysing the information and interpreting it is just as important, but is not covered.
- The methodology was developed rapidly in the UK. A more constructive process as part of a longer project would have developed it collaboratively drawing on authors' different skills and experiences. Collaboration would not only have informed the methods, but strengthened the authors ability to assess and interpret their case studies within the wider PPT context.

## 1.4 The wider relevance of this methodology

Since the project, there have been several requests from researchers and students, for information on the assessment methods used. We believe the methods used in 2000-2001 could be improved, and certainly need to be adapted to other situations. Nevertheless, there are three reasons for sharing the methodology more widely:

- To encourage or help others interested in assessing tourism initiatives from an explicitly pro-poor perspective;
- To provide the frameworks we used for (i) assessing different types of PPT strategies, and (ii) combing analysis of financial and non-financial impacts on poor people;
- To implement the principle that research conducted and funded with the ultimate goal of poverty reduction should be as transparent as possible, and share information widely and free of charge with all those that can make use of it.

Anyone using it in a different context should bear in the mind the need to adapt it from our specific purposes to theirs. Most obviously the 'background' for case study authors would need to



be done afresh, but other parts of the approach may also need review. In addition, the process after the fieldwork will need attention – how is the information to be analysed, written up and disseminated.

The remainder of this document is the methodology provided to the case study authors, along with a few notes inserted to explain points to new readers. It was, and is, structured into three main sections:

- i. Background for case study authors (section 2 of this working paper)
- ii. Doing Section A: defining the initiative (section 3 of this working paper).
- iii. Doing Section B: assessing pro-poor strategies and impacts (section 4 of this Working Paper).

The newly-added appendix contains some updated information for new readers and potential users of the methodology. In particular, the revised definition of PPT now used by the PPT Partnership, the revised matrix of PPT strategies which can be used to analyse what actions are being adopted, and a revised list of background reading.

We would be glad to hear of new case studies being done using elements from this methodology.

*Caroline Ashley, Harold Goodwin and Dilys Roe, November 2002*

[info@propoortourism.org.uk](mailto:info@propoortourism.org.uk)

## 2 Background for Case Study Researchers

*Note: this is the background that was provided to researchers on the pro-poor tourism project in 2000. It is not 'generic' to those using such a methodology.*

### 2.1 Aims of the project

This project is looking for good practice in pro-poor tourism to identify what actually helps the poor.

The aim of the project is to document and assess progress in implementing 'pro-poor tourism strategies' in order to share lessons with a wide international audience. Your case study is one of six on pro-poor tourism (PPT) strategies. The six are highly varied. In order to draw out key themes, lessons or contrasts between the six, a common methodology is needed.

Please do read the DFID Briefing Paper *Tourism and poverty elimination: untapped potential*, and the Natural Resource Perspectives (NRP) paper *Pro-Poor Tourism: Putting Poverty at the Heart of the Tourism Agenda*, as these are essential background to this project. They can be downloaded from <http://www.odi.org.uk/rpeg/tourism2.html> or we can fax them to you. The case studies should illuminate whether and how the themes of these papers work in practice.

### 2.2 Defining PPT strategies and case studies

#### *Defining pro-poor tourism and PPT strategies*

The definitions in the DFID briefing may be useful:

*Pro-poor tourism generates net benefits for the poor (i.e. benefits are greater than costs). Economic benefits are only one (very important) component – social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits also need to be taken into account.*

*Pro-poor tourism strategies are concerned specifically with impacts on poor people, though the non-poor may also benefit. Strategies focus less on expanding the overall size of tourism, and more on unlocking opportunities for specific groups within it (on tilting the cake not expanding it).*

*Note: See updated definitions, strategies and background reading in appendix 1, 2, 3.*

Three other points are important to note in defining pro-poor tourism strategies:

1. Variety: PPT strategies can be at local, regional or national level, undertaken by communities, NGOs, governments, businesses, etc., and may focus on just one part of the picture (whether it's employment of the poor, skills, small enterprise, natural resource management, cultural change etc). Examples are in the NRP and Briefing paper referred to above.
2. PPT strategies rarely stand in isolation from general tourism development. In fact they need to be incorporated for two reasons: mainstream activities (such as tourism planning) need to be influenced by pro-poor perspectives; and pro-poor tourism cannot succeed without successful development of the whole tourism destination. One of the challenges in each case study will be to define what is 'pro-poor' within overall tourism development approaches.
3. Because of (2), benefiting the poor may not be a primary objective, or even explicit objective of those implementing a pro-poor tourism strategy. For example, the Development Bank of Southern Africa is implementing broad tourism development programmes in which pro-poor objectives are explicit but secondary. The case study will look at the effectiveness of these

elements within the broader programme. However, an organisation may be solely concerned with pro-poor tourism. For example, the Namibian Community Based Tourism Association exists to promote community-run tourism enterprises. So the existence and actions of the organisation can all be regarded as pro-poor interventions, and the case study will assess progress in different aspects of their work.

In this project, the effectiveness of suggested PPT strategies is being studied by identifying organisations that are implementing PPT strategies through one or more practical initiatives, and then assessing the actual impact on the poor.

The table lists the likely case studies illustrating the type of initiative and organisation involved in each.

**Table 2: Case study initiatives**

<i>Country</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>PPT initiative</i>
South Africa	SA Government and Development Bank of Southern Africa	Govt. tourism devt Strategy within Spatial Development Initiative: combining investment support and infra-structure devt with empowerment objectives
Namibia	Namibian Community Based Tourism Association	Technical support to community tourism enterprises. Liasing with govt and private sector on behalf of CTE's.
St Lucia	Hotels  St Lucia Heritage project	Purchasing local supplies  To be defined
Ecuador	Tropic Ecological Adventures	Tour operator working with communities
Uganda	Uganda Community Tourism Association (comparison with NACOBTA)	Technical support to local enterprises.
South Africa	Wilderness Safaris	Joint ventures and other work with communities in areas of operation
Nepal	SNV project	Community-level work: diversification from agriculture into village tourism

*The remainder of this covers:*

*Section A: the first step in the research – defining the initiative and research*

*Section B: the bulk of the case study – questions to address*

*Section A should be completed before work on Section B begins, as it is important that the researcher, collaborating institution (PPT implementer) and UK research partner are all clear on the scope of the case study before the detailed work is done.*

### 3 Doing Section A: Defining the 'Initiative' and Scope of Case Study

Please summarise what 'initiative' your case study is about:

- what organisation(s) are the focus of the case study, and what initiative or strategy for pro-poor tourism are they pursuing?
- define the pro-poor element: is the initiative focused almost entirely on benefiting the poor within an area of tourism development? Or is it a broader tourism development initiative with a pro-poor component?
- in what way is it pro-poor and different to 'conventional' tourism development?
- is the initiative working at the micro-level (with specific enterprises or communities), macro level (the policy context) or both?

Also:

- what data is already available about impacts on poor people? What methods and sources will be used in the research to assess impacts? What is meant by 'poor' in the local context?

The '**organisation**' or 'institution' could be a community, a business, government department etc. There may be several organisations collaborating in a PPT initiative.

By '**initiative**,' we mean the *actions* or *steps* that are being taken to increase the involvement or benefits to the poor. The focus on *initiatives* is what makes this project different from many previous case studies. Detailed description of how the poor benefit or suffer from tourism does not tell us *what* to do to make tourism pro-poor. So the case studies are all of practical steps that in some way intervene in the process of tourism development, to influence it in favour of the poor. For example, a case study may describe a new community-run lodge. But it is not the lodge that is the focus of the case study but the approaches of the community, the land board, development bank, NGO, etc., which enabled it to be a community lodge and not a conventional privately run lodge. It may be difficult to ascribe causality to the initiative when other factors may also contribute to change, but initiatives are a necessary starting point for the analysis.

**Impact on the poor:** Although the first essential step is to define institutions and initiatives, the real aim of this project is to understand *impacts on the poor*. Not just to describe what was done and how well, but whether it has had any useful effects. Therefore it is important to ascertain from the start what kind of information is or will be available.

Who the '**poor**' are is difficult but important to define. There is an international poverty line (US\$1 per person per day, averaged among household members) and most countries have a national poverty line, but these are hard to apply in the field. It is often more useful to identify disadvantaged groups by socio-economic status (landless labourers, female headed households, poor fisherman, etc) or use key indicators of poverty (no regular wage income in the household, unable to eat 2/3 meals a day). Such indicators are also useful for distinguishing the 'poorest' (e.g. dependent on others etc) from the 'fairly poor' (e.g. unskilled labourers, struggling, some casual work etc). Please use locally appropriate indicators but be explicit about them and indicate their relevance to the US\$1 indicator.

## 4 Doing Section B: Assessing PPT Strategies and Impacts

This section outlines the questions to be addressed in the case study report. It is divided into four parts:

Part 1 is descriptive – essential but needs to be kept short.

Part 2 probes further into pro-poor actions.

Part 3 reviews progress and results – the key focus

Part 4 asks for reflections.

In some of the country case studies, two or three specific field sites that fall under the broader initiative will be explored in more detail, particularly to illustrate local impacts. In these cases, complete Sections 1 and 2 for the overall PPT initiative, but add any specific details for the field site. In Section 3, detail the impacts at each field site, and draw wider conclusions about impact for the overall programme.

### 4.1 Overview

#### 4.1.1 *The area and context*

##### **Where is the initiative taking place?**

- What are the key geographical, cultural or historical characteristics.
- Is the area an established tourism destination? What types of tourists (international, domestic, regional)? What tourism segments (Coastal, urban, rural; mass-market, luxury, adventure, wilderness etc.)? Is tourism growing or declining?

##### **What is the general *policy context* in which the initiative is taking place?**

- What is the attitude of government to tourism?
- Does the government have pro-poor policies in general, and specifically within tourism (if so, how serious?)?
- Which organisations are influential in tourism development?

#### 4.1.2 *Background and details of the PPT initiative*

Describe the initiative(s) – who is doing what? Where, why and when?

This may include a description of several examples/locations/enterprises where the institution is active.

Each case will need to be told in its own way but please pinpoint the following:

- Who started the initiative? Why?
- Who are the key actors or partners?
- When did the initiative commence?
- Who is doing what and how (attach further detail if necessary - please send copies of any documents or publicity). What is done at the micro (local) level, what at macro (policy)?
- How is the initiative funded? How much does it cost to implement?
- What market or market segment is the initiative targeted at (domestic, regional, international; high income vs. budget 'backpackers')?
- Are pro-poor objectives explicit or implicit in the initiative?
- What elements of the initiative are specifically pro-poor? Please be very specific about how the initiatives are pro-poor. Which types/groups of poor people are involved?
- What efforts are made to involve other stakeholders (eg: government, private operators etc)? If not already covered, be explicit on the extent of private sector involvement.

## 4.2 Pro-poor focused actions

### 4.2.1 Assessment of broad pro-poor tourism strategies

Strategies for PPT can be broadly categorised into at least 6 types. Identify which of the following strategies apply (it may be more than one) and give details of them. For background information see pages 3-4 of *Tourism and poverty elimination*.

1. Expansion of business opportunities for the poor: e.g. have small enterprise development programmes (training/support/micro credit) been developed or markets expanded?
2. Expansion of employment opportunities for the poor: e.g. are unskilled jobs created and available to the poor?
3. Addressing/enhancing the environmental impacts of tourism that particularly affect the poor: e.g. any changes in access of the poor to land and natural resources.
4. Enhancing the positive and addressing the negative social and cultural impacts of tourism on the poor (e.g. sexual exploitation, loss of identity, women's economic participation, improved communication, health, schools, infrastructure, etc.).
5. Building a supportive policy and planning framework: e.g. encouraging government approaches that support PPT.
6. Developing pro-poor processes and institutions: e.g. decision-making that includes participation by the poor (whether in government, at local level, within a resort/enterprise etc).
7. Any other strategy or principles which lie behind the initiative.

*See updated categorisation of strategies, in Appendix 2.*

Please send copies of any strategy or policy documents that have been produced.

Note that strategies 1 and 2 were merged in *Tourism and Poverty Elimination* but for this work should be kept separate.

### 4.2.2 Specific actions to involve the poor or address barriers to participation

Many barriers limit the economic involvement of the poor in tourism. Several were identified in *Pro-Poor Tourism: Putting Poverty at the Heart of the Tourism Agenda*, along with some suggested actions that can address them (see Table 3 and explanatory text on pages 2-3). Please consider the relevance of each of the following and identify whether or not it has been part of the initiative. Add any others.

**Actions to address barriers to participation of the poor in tourism**

Issue	Identified as a barrier	Means of overcoming it
Lack of human capital of the poor – e.g., skills		
Lack of financial capital of the poor – e.g., micro credit, revolving loans		
Lack of social capital/organisational strength		
Gender norms & constraints		
Incompatibility with existing livelihood strategies		
Location		
Lack of land ownership/tenure		
Lack of “product”		
Planning process favours others – lack of planning gain		
Regulations & red tape		
Inadequate access to the tourism market		
Low capacity to meet tourist expectations		
Lack of linkages between formal and informal sectors/local suppliers		
Tourist market (segment) inappropriate		
Lack of pro-active government support for involvement by the poor.		
Others – please define		

**4.3 Results and impacts on the poor***4.3.1 Progress, challenges*

- What progress has been made in implementing the initiative and what has been achieved? What challenges encountered? To what extent have barriers been overcome? How?
- What are the key factors influencing implementation of the initiative?
- If PPT is just one element of a broader programme, what are the specific challenges and progress of the PPT element? How does it fit in with the rest of the programme?
- How has the initiative evolved or adapted to new circumstances?
- What had been done to assess impacts to date?

*4.3.2 Identifying impacts on poor people*

What impacts are evident so far? This information needs to be precise and requires quantitative data, although qualitative changes are also important.

*Causality:* in many cases it is difficult to attribute impacts specifically to ‘the initiative.’ Try to specify which impacts are due to tourism development in general (or other sources of change) and which are due to the pro-poor element of the case study initiative? This can only be a matter of

interpretation and opinion as it's impossible to test the counter-factual – what would have happened without the initiative. Therefore collate different opinions, identify who says what, highlight divergences of opinion - are there 'competing narratives' or schools of thought?

Please also identify key factors that have influenced the initiative and its impacts: e.g. that have enabled it to have positive impacts or prevented it from achieving anticipated benefits. Please be honest and critical! Enough guff is written on tourism – let's have the facts.

Who has benefited from the initiatives (include all beneficiaries)? Distinguish between different groups within 'the poor' and include benefits to the not-so-poor and non-poor. Who has suffered costs or negative impacts from the initiative, if anyone? How and why have they suffered or benefited?

#### 4.3.3 Financial benefits to the poor

How much cash is being earned by poor people as a result of the PPT initiative? To assess impacts on poverty, it is important to know:

- How many people are earning sufficient amount to move from 'poor' to 'not-poor' due to the PPT initiative? Provide details.
- Among the poor, how many people are earning income and roughly how much they earn per person due to the PPT initiative.

A single total cash figure is of little help. So in making estimates, distinguish between different amounts being earned by different people, as in the table below.

#### Financial earnings of the poor

	Approx. amount per person (range)	Who earns it (type of person)	How many earn it	How many might in future?
Wage income				
Earning from self-employment, informal sector sales, casual labour				
Small enterprise earnings/profits				
Collective income to the community				
Other cash income				

Note: Rows may need to be further sub-divided – for example to separate craft-makers, food-suppliers and casual labourers in row 2. Where to draw the line between informal sector sales and small enterprise is a matter of interpretation. An arbitrary distinction is: hawking and vending (pavement sellers) are informal sector, whereas an enterprise with a fixed commercial site (e.g. campsite, café) is small enterprise.

Note: it may be difficult to separate earnings by the poor from earnings by the not-so-poor. (eg. of 20 hotel employees are they all 'poor?'). Use broad categories (eg include unskilled workers but not managers) and use the third column (who earns it) to show where some earners might be not-so-poor, or have moved out of poverty due to this cash income.

It is essential to assess how much of their earnings is *additional income* - above what they would earn from former or alternative activities? Has the tourism initiative prevented or enhanced other types of earnings (e.g. from alternative uses of the land, wildlife etc)?

Comment on the significance of these earnings – what do they buy, how much difference do they make?



#### 4.3.4 Impacts on livelihoods of the poor

In addition to cash earnings, what are the broader types of impacts on poor people: on access to assets, on their other activities etc. (see Ashley et al., 2001, chapter 5)?

- For each type of benefit/cost to poor people, how many people does it affect?
- Quantify data where possible: numbers of jobs/businesses, amount and number of loans, amount of land affected, number of schools supported etc.
- Also include qualitative changes in livelihoods (eg: skills, community cohesion or conflict, access to water/roads/communications, sustainability of the natural resource base), indicating significance of the change, who it affects and numbers affected. Where impacts can't be quantified, they must at least be identified.
- Identify any consequential development due to tourism and its associated infrastructure
- Include any reduction in negative impacts of tourism on the poor due to the initiative
- Specify which poor groups are affected, and distinguish between the poor and the 'poorest'.
- Which are the most significant impacts? how significant are they to livelihoods? Illustrate using personal histories where appropriate.

Put the impacts in context by identifying other significant causes of livelihood change in the area and key trends in livelihoods (e.g.: a period of drought, of growth, major new roads...) and indicate how much change could reasonably be due to tourism.

Please summarise your research results in the following form. For each stakeholder group add another pair of columns or repeat the table as necessary. Results in this form can be readily compared and can later be synthesised into key impacts on livelihoods as in Ashley et al. (2001) Table 2.

#### Positive and negative impacts on livelihoods of the poor

	Benefits	Losses, problems
Skills, access to education		
Natural resources (access to, use/productivity)		
Community organisation, cohesion, pride		
Access to investment funds, loans		
Infrastructure: - Water - roads, transport - telephone, communication - other		
Health, access to health care		
Access to information		
Funds for the community		
Other livelihood activities: farming, employment, migration etc		
Markets, market opportunities		
Policy environment		
Influence over policy makers		
Jobs		
Opportunities for informal sector & small businesses		
Casual labour opportunities		
Household income		
Local culture		
Overall vulnerability of households		
Other....		

### 4.3.5 Broader contributions to poverty elimination

#### Impacts above the household/community level

Apart from direct effects on poor people's livelihoods, what broader or longer-term impacts does the initiative have relevant to poverty elimination, e.g. changing attitudes, influencing the policy context, opening markets, building social organisations?

#### Anticipated impacts:

- What further success and/or problems are anticipated?
- Who is expected to benefit further from the initiatives? (Include all beneficiaries, identifying who, how many and in what way, as precisely as possible)
- How sustainable is the initiative and its outputs - financially, environmentally, and institutionally?
- How replicable is the initiative? (by others or by the same institutions?)

## 4.4 Review, lessons

### 4.4.1 Different perspectives

Please try to give the views of the following on the initiative:

- The National Tourist Office
- The project initiator
- Poor people, community representatives
- Two or more in-country incoming tour operators.
- Any development agency involved in the project.
- Tourists
- Critics

### 4.4.2 Reflections on this PPT initiative

What are the main strengths and weaknesses of this initiative?

What are the main factors that constrain or facilitate progress in PPT?

What are the main lessons learnt relevant to others interested in PPT?

### 4.4.3 Reflections on PPT research

What light does the case study shed on broad questions about PPT?

- Is it possible to adapt tourism so as to make it more pro-poor?
- Do the benefits of PPT to the poor make it worth the effort? Or is it better to simply expand overall tourism in the hope of a 'trickle-down' effect?
- To what extent should PPT strategies focus exclusively on the poor? Is it worth trying to include the poorest, or focus only on the fairly poor?
- Can PPT be applied to mainstream 'mass tourism,' and not only to ecotourism or other niche segments?
- How can PPT strategies be commercially feasible and include the private sector?
- Can practical PPT action at a destination be effective without change at policy level too? And vice versa? Where should effort be focused?
- Add your additional comments or reflections.

## **Appendix 1 Updated Definition of PPT**

Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) is tourism that results in increased net benefits for poor people. PPT is not a specific product or niche sector but an approach to tourism development and management. It enhances the linkages between tourism businesses and poor people, so that tourism's contribution to poverty reduction is increased and poor people are able to participate more effectively in product development. Links with many different types of 'the poor' need to be considered: staff, neighbouring communities, land-holders, producers of food, fuel and other suppliers, operators of micro tourism businesses, craft-makers, other users of tourism infrastructure (roads) and resources (water) etc. There are many types of pro-poor tourism strategies, ranging from increasing local employment to building mechanisms for consultation. Any type of company can be involved in pro-poor tourism - a small lodge, an urban hotel, a tour operator, an infrastructure developer. The critical factor is not the type of company or the type of tourism, but that an increase in the net benefits that go to poor people can be demonstrated.

Source: [www.propoortourism.org.uk](http://www.propoortourism.org.uk)  
October 2002

## Appendix 2 Updated Overview of PPT Strategies

### Overview of PPT strategies

Strategies for pro-poor tourism can be divided into those that generated three different types of local benefit: economic benefits, other livelihood benefits (such as physical, social or cultural improvements), and less tangible benefits of participation and involvement. Each of these can be further disaggregated into specific types of strategies.

*Strategies focused on economic benefits include:*

- Expansion of employment and local wages: via commitments to local jobs, training up locals for employment.
- Expansion of business opportunities for the poor. These may be businesses/entrepreneurs that sell inputs such as food, fuel, or building materials to tourism operations. Or they may be businesses that offer products directly to tourists, such as guiding, crafts, tea shops etc. Support can vary from marketing and technical support (e.g. by nearby mainstream operators), to shifts in procurement strategy, or direct financial and training inputs.
- Development of collective community income. This may be from equity dividends, lease fee, revenue share, or donations, usually established in partnership with tourism operators or government institutions.

In general, staff wages are a massive boost to those few that get them, small earnings help many more to make ends meet, and collective income can benefit the majority, but can often be misused. Thus all three types are important for reaching different poor families. Strategies to create these benefits need to tackle many obstacles to economic participation, including lack of skills, low understanding of tourism, poor product quality and limited market access.

*Strategies to enhance other (non-cash) livelihood benefits generally focus on:*

- Capacity building, training and empowerment.
- Mitigation of the environmental impact of tourism on the poor and management of competing demands for access to natural resources between tourism and local people.
- Improved social and cultural impacts of tourism.
- Improved access to services and infrastructure: health care, radio access, security, water supplies, transport.

Such strategies can often begin by reducing negative impacts – such as cultural intrusion, or lost access to land or coast. But more can be done to address these issues positively, in consultation with the poor. Opportunities to increase local access to services and infrastructure often arise when these are being developed for the needs of tourists, but with some consultation and adaptation could also serve the needs of residents. Strategies for capacity-building may be directly linked to creating boosting cash income, but may also be of more long-term indirect value, such as building management capacity of local institutions.

*Strategies focused on policy, process, and participation can create:*

- More supportive policy and planning framework that enables participation by the poor.

- Increased participation by the poor in decision-making: i.e. ensuring that local people are consulted and have a say in tourism decision making by government and the private sector .
- Pro-poor partnerships with the private sector.
- At the minimum: increased flow of information and communication: meetings, report backs, sharing news and plans. This is not participation but lays the basis for further dialogue.

Implementing these strategies may involve lobbying for policy reform, involving the poor in local planning initiatives, amplifying their voice through producer associations, and developing formal and informal links between the poor and private operators.

Table 3 summarises this typology of PPT strategies

**Table 3: Types of PPT strategies**

<b>Increase economic benefits</b>	<b>Enhance non-financial livelihood impacts</b>	<b>Enhance participation and partnership</b>
<i>More specifically:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boost local employment, wages</li> <li>• Boost local enterprise opportunities</li> <li>• Create collective income sources – fees, revenue shares</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building, training</li> <li>• Mitigate environmental impacts</li> <li>• Address competing use of natural resources</li> <li>• Improve social, cultural impacts</li> <li>• Increase local access to infrastructure and services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create more supportive policy/planning framework</li> <li>• Increase participation of the poor in decision-making</li> <li>• Build pro-poor partnerships with private sector</li> <li>• Increase flows of information, communication</li> </ul>

Note: this presentation of PPT strategies uses the same broad typology as in earlier PPT reports with a few additions. PPT Partnership, November 2002

## Appendix 3 Updated List of Further Reading on PPT

### Main outputs of the 2000-1 project on PPT Strategies

1. *Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work For The Poor. A review of experience.* Caroline Ashley, Dilys Roe, Harold Goodwin. ODI, IIED, and CRT, April 2001.
2. *Pro-poor Tourism Strategies: Expanding opportunities for the poor.* Caroline Ashley, Harold Goodwin and Dilys Roe . Pro-poor tourism briefing No 1. ODI, IIED, CRT. April 2001.
3. *The Tourism Industry and Poverty Reduction: A Business Primer.* Dilys Roe, Harold Goodwin and Caroline Ashley. Pro-poor tourism briefing No.2. ODI, IIED, ICRT. March 2002.

### PPT Working Papers

No 1. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism, Wilderness Safaris South Africa: Rocktail Bay and Ndumu Lodge.* Clive Poultney and Anna Spenceley

No 2. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Case studies of Makuleke and Manyeleti tourism initiatives: South Africa.* Karin Mahony and Jurgens Van Zyl

No 3. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Case study of pro-poor tourism and SNV in Humla District, West Nepal.* Naomi M. Saville

No 4. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism: NACOBTA the Namibian case study.* Nepeti Nicanor.

No 5. *UCOTA - The Uganda Community Tourism Association: a comparison with NACOBTA.* Elissa Williams, Alison White and Anna Spenceley

No 6. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Tropic Ecological Adventures - Ecuador.* Scott Braman and Fundacion Accion Amazonia

No 7. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism: a case study of the St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme.* Yves Renard

No 8. *Pro-poor Tourism Initiatives in Developing Countries: Analysis of Secondary Case Studies.* Xavier Cattarinich. Report to PPT Project. ODI, IIED and CRT, London. 2001.

### Forthcoming (provisional titles)

No. 9 Strengths and Weaknesses of a Pro-Poor Tourism Approach, Results of a Survey to Follow-Up Pro-Poor Tourism Research Carried Out in 2000-2001, by Dorothea Meyer

No 10 Methodology for Pro-Poor Tourism Case Studies, by Caroline Ashley

No 11 Strategies, Impacts and Costs of Pro-Poor Tourism Approaches in South Africa by Anna Spenceley and Jennifer Seif

No. 12 Tourism in Poor Rural Areas: Diversifying the Product and Expanding the Benefits in Rural Uganda and The Czech Republic, by Jenny Holland, Louise Dixey and Michael Burian

No 13 Coping with Declining Tourism, Examples from Communities in Kenya, by Samuel Karethi

No 14 Addressing Poverty Issues in Tourism Standards, by Dilys Roe, Catherine Harris and Julio de Andrade

No 15 Improving Access for the Informal Sector to Tourism in The Gambia, by Bah, A. and Harold Goodwin

No 16 Tourism to Developing Countries: Statistics and Trends, by Dorothea Meyer, Dilys Roe, Caroline Ashley and Harold Goodwin (forthcoming)

No 17 Outbound UK Tour Operator Industry and Implications for PPT in Developing Countries, by Dorothea Meyer

### **Earlier writing on the PPT concept: 1998-2000**

*Pro-Poor Tourism: putting poverty at the heart of the tourism agenda*  
by Caroline Ashley, Charlotte Boyd and Harold Goodwin, Natural Resource Perspectives, Number 51, Overseas Development Institute, London. March 2000.

*Sustainable tourism and poverty elimination: a report for the Department of International Development*  
Deloitte & Touche IIED and ODI, April 1999.,

*Tourism and poverty elimination: untapped potential*  
Department for International Development Briefing Paper, April 1999.

*Enhancing community involvement in wildlife tourism: Issues and challenges*  
by Caroline Ashley and Dilys Roe, IIED Wildlife and Development Series No. 11, London, UK, December 1998.

*Sustainable tourism and poverty elimination*  
by Harold Goodwin, DFID/DETR Workshop on Sustainable Tourism and Poverty, 13 October 1998.

### **Other recent material on PPT by PPT team members**

*Harnessing Tourism for Poverty Elimination: A Blueprint from the Gambia, Final Report to DFID, Natural Resources Institute, 2002*

*New Forms Of Engagement Between Communities And The Private Sector In Tourism And Forestry In Southern Africa* by Caroline Ashley and William Wolmer, 2002

*Pro-poor Tourism: harnessing the world's largest industry for the world's poor*  
by Dilys Roe and Urquhart, P., World Summit on Sustainable Development Opinion, 2002

*Getting the lion's share from tourism: Private sector-community partnerships in Namibia. Volume 1, 2 and 3* by Dilys Roe, Maryanne Grieg-Gran and Wouter Schalken. Poverty, Inequality and Environment Series No 1, June 2001.

For links to the above plus additional materials on PPT, visit the publication page on the PPT website at: [www.propoortourism.org.uk/ppt\\_pubs.html](http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/ppt_pubs.html)

## References

Ashley, C., Roe, D. and Goodwin, H, (2001), *Pro-poor tourism strategies: Making tourism work for the poor*. Pro-poor tourism Report no 1. London: Overseas Development Institute, International Institute for Environment and Development, and Centre for Responsible Tourism, University of Greenwich

Ashley, C. (2000) *Applying Livelihood Approaches to Natural Resource Management in Initiatives: Experiences in Namibia and Kenya*, Overseas Development Institute Working Paper No.134