



# Social Learning for Adaptive Tourism Management

## BASELINE SURVEY REPORT

October 2009

### Tourism for Future Generations



Jumuiko la Maliasili Tanzania  
Tanzania Natural Resource Forum

## CONTENTS

1. Introducing the project .....	2
2. Executive summary .....	3
3. Background .....	4
4. Methodology.....	4
5. Findings... ..	5
5.1 Village land use management .....	5
5.2 Natural resource management and conservation.....	6
5.3 Employment and livelihood diversification .....	7
5.4 Local governance and accountability .....	8
5.5 Tourism development and management.....	10
6. Conclusion and recommendations.....	11
7. About the partners.....	12

## 1. INTRODUCING THE PROJECT

The aim of this project is to develop innovative approaches to community involvement in tourism planning that communities and responsible tourism businesses across Tanzania can all benefit from. The project is co-ordinated by the Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRF), and implemented by a team consisting of representatives from TNRF, Ujamaa Community Resource Trust (UCRT), Honeyguide Foundation and Tasconsult. Funding is provided by the IUCN's Ecosystem Grants Programme and Sand County Foundation's Bradley Fund for the Environment. The project will run from April 2009 to March 2010.

The geographical area is Ngorongoro District in the villages of Piyaya, Engaresero, Pinyinyi and Arash. These villages are involved because of existing, or high potential for tourism activities in the area. There are already established relationships between these villages and Honeyguide and UCRT.

### Goal of the project

Better planned tourism to directly improve local livelihoods and rangeland ecosystem management through ethical business partnerships with rural communities.

### Objectives

- To produce participatory adaptive management plans for tourism in four villages in the Lake Natron and Loliondo areas of Ngorongoro District.
- To produce a toolkit of best practices derived from the workshop and the project's accumulated experience for use in other private investor-community initiatives involving tourism.

### Introducing the baseline survey

The baseline surveys which were carried out in May and June 2009 were designed to serve several purposes. The questions aimed to elicit information forming a basis for evaluation at the end of the project period and beyond. In addition, the surveys aimed to capture information which would enable the project team to understand the needs and requirements of the various stakeholders and provide information to direct the project towards achieving the objectives. The information also provides valuable inputs in the workshops, and can be useful to the various stakeholders.

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The scope of the baseline survey was 4 project village areas, Pinyinyi, Engaresero, Arash and Piyaya. All of the villages have existing tourism enterprises that have been in operation within the villages for a number of years, with the exception of Pinyinyi. Each of these companies is experienced in tourism ventures and also operate in other areas of Tanzania.

The household survey confirmed that the local community was well aware of the natural resources present on village land, however efforts to conserve these resources are not proactive and do not incorporate the village members sufficiently. For example, Lake Natron is the largest body of water in the project area and the lake is to be proposed as a Ramsar site, but there was no indication that the village government or members of the village were aware of this development, nor was it clear what it meant to them.

Wildlife is managed centrally by the Wildlife Division (WD). However, due to little support from the WD or district authorities, the village authorities have taken the initiative to manage conflicts between wildlife and humans. One example of participation between the village and the tourism companies exists where they jointly established a conservation scheme that involved the contribution of funds to compensate village members for loss of livestock due to predators.

Piyaya, Arash and Engaresero villages have committees that are responsible for the environment and tourism activities. The baseline study examined household awareness of such bodies and their roles. It was clear in all villages that the structures governing natural resources and tourism were not known among the general populace. All village governments requested training and support to improve governance and tourism management. Although the village leadership and members are aware of the natural resources and basic tourism attractions of their villages, they lack the knowledge of tourism as a business. The village governments also lack the opportunity to identify the particular products that would provide the basis to strategically broker lasting deals and to manage the development of tourism.

The fee structure for tourism products differed from village to village. It was not entirely clear how the fees were realized. It was noted that fees being charged by other administrations such as the WD and gate entrance fees

charged by the district authorities, threaten the competitiveness of the tourism product.

The household survey revealed repeated requests from the various members of all the villages for more transparency in contracts, revenues and donations made to the village. Villagers feel they lack information about contracts with the tourism enterprises, affecting their ability to question the village leadership. For example, one village indicated there were no contracts with any tourism enterprises. However, a current contract was later provided to the survey team by an operator. Hence, little was known of the various tourism development initiatives existing in the village, nor of the total value of donations being invested in village development through tourism enterprises.

The tourism companies and the village governments did not have the same understanding of the contract obligations, as further evidenced by the frequent breaches of contractual agreements by both parties. Formal communication between the tour operators and the village government varied significantly. Ad hoc communication was the norm, and only one village conducted regular meetings. Written guidelines for responsible tourism were either not available or the copies provided by the tour operators and the villages differed. Also, there were no mechanisms for evaluating the performance of such guidelines or bylaws.

The contribution of the tourism enterprises to employment and livelihood diversification is hindered for two main reasons. First, communities live in arid areas and are geographically separated from the main offices of the tourism enterprises, making negotiations and marketing of cultural attractions difficult. Second, many of the local people have little education, and therefore employed in the less demanding jobs within the tourism enterprises.

The inadequate employment and little proactive action to develop this sector have significant impacts on the mindset of the local community and the likelihood for tourism to directly improve the households' economy.

---

\* Ramsar is the name of an international convention for the sustainable protection of important wetland resources for water birds. It is named after a town in Iran.

### 3. BACKGROUND

The four villages that participated in the baseline study are all within Ngorongoro District. Arash and Piyaya are neighbouring villages and have very similar tourism products. Engaresero and Pinyinyi villages also neighbour each other but only Engaresero has a substantial tourism product. Pinyinyi village has a small commitment from a tour operator. The populations of Piyaya, Arash, and Engaresero average to 4,600 people, while Pinyinyi village has a larger population of 6,392.

All villages have support from non-governmental organizations, including Oxfam, Ereto Ngorongoro Pastoralist Project and Ujamaa Community Resource Trust (UCRT) — largely providing capacity development. Only Piyaya and Arash villages received development aid, such as school sponsorship and solar panels from the tour operators with whom they have contracts.

In general, the tour operations within the villages all offer camping, walking, cultural experiences, and photographic and hunting safaris.



### 4. METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was developed based on the project indicators, and was modified for three different groups of respondents: village government officials, households, and tour operators. The survey was conducted by a small team from UCRT and Honeyguide Foundation in the project villages of Piyaya, Arash, Pinyinyi, and Engaresero.

**Village government survey:** The baseline team conducted semi structured interviews with two village leaders in each village, which took one full day per location. They also collected key documents and records from the village leaders to verify information.

**Household level survey:** The objective of the household survey was to collect information and get the community's general perception of the tour operations within the village. Members from 20 households were interviewed within each village area — the aim being to have a cross section of the community. The interviewers targeted four respondents per village from each of the following categories:

- Those employed by a tourism company (e.g. watchman, walking guide or cook)
- Those not employed but receiving benefits from tourism (e.g. independent walking tour guides, bead jeweller or shop owner)
- Those having no engagement with tourism (e.g. those living far away)
- Those who live near tourism but do not directly receive benefits, their *boma* (homestead) is near a camp or the road but they do not sell or are not employed by tourism
- Ad hoc interviewees with community members

In addition, interview respondents came from different *bomas* or areas, were a mix of ages with a balanced between men and women, in order to ensure a diverse perspective.

**Tour operator survey:** The questionnaire was circulated to nine tour operators by email, and six responded. The tour operators selected all invest in the baseline villages. All the operators for Arash and Pinyinyi responded, the most active tour operators in Piyaya responded, and one operator in Engaresero responded.



## 5. FINDINGS

The completed questionnaires were summarised for comparison between the villages and analysed in order to draw some conclusions concerning the area's tourism activities. The findings are grouped based on the respondents' knowledge, understanding and perceptions of:

- village land use management
- natural resource management
- employment and livelihood diversification
- local governance and accountability
- tourism development and management

If any information is incorrect, the authors apologise but stress that this is information they have recorded in good faith. The surveys are available for reference by contacting [info@tnrf.org](mailto:info@tnrf.org).

### 5.1 VILLAGE LAND USE MANAGEMENT

**Land allocated for tourism:** The village land area measures available were estimates and varied substantially between villages. Engaresero is the smallest with 1,045 km<sup>2</sup>, followed by Arash with 1,950 km<sup>2</sup> and Piyaya with 2,700 km<sup>2</sup>. Much of Piyaya is within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) and Pinyinyi's records were not available.

On average village governments estimated that between 20 to 35 percent of villages land is used for tourism. Roughly, Piyaya has the most land made available to tourism (810 km<sup>2</sup>), although this figure can be misleading if the area given includes the NCAA and is thus not available for village revenue collection. Arash follows with 682 km<sup>2</sup> and then Engaresero with 209 km<sup>2</sup>.

**Land use plans:** Of the four villages, only Engaresero has a land use plan and a certificate of ownership. Arash has a land use plan but it is not registered as they have a conflict over the boundary with Malambo village. Negotiations are well under way between the two village governments. Piyaya has a plan in draft and also have to resolve a conflict over village boundaries with Malambo, negotiations are in the final stages between the two parties using the village government as well as using the council of elders. Without a plan Pinyinyi competes with Oldonyo Sambu over land.

**Land governance:** The village activities and land are governed by the village government. However, there are other administrative bodies that also govern resources within the village land. The NCAA and the WD have authority over land, natural resources and wildlife. However, the relationship between

these authorities and the village seems to be poor, and there are no recorded visits from the WD to the four villages. Tanzania National Parks borders Arash village and supports the village, without meeting with the village authorities. According to the survey, the WD and NCAA have made no contributions to the village development. The villagers see this lack of contributions as the cause of conflicts over who owns and has rights to the land, particularly in relation to the Wildlife Act.

Also, the village leaders were very aware of the nature of conflict between hunting and photographic tourism and the competition over wildlife resources. Feeling threatened, the village government acknowledged a need to resolve the conflict. However, few strategies were yet in place.

**Conflicts over land and resources:** The respondents mentioned few conflicts over land use and management. Pinyinyi indicated a conflict between the village leadership and members over a water catchment area. Engaresero had a similar conflict over deforestation. Arash indicated that they had no conflict due to the village land use plan even though the plan had not been officially registered. All villages stated that they had no conflicts over land use for tourism activities.



## 5.2 NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION

The natural resources within the villages are managed to an extent by the village government, but other external administrative bodies have specific responsibilities such as the WD in regards to the wildlife, Ramsar conventions for wetlands, and Lake Natron. The baseline survey investigated the attitudes and understanding of the village government and village members regarding the natural resource management within the village lands, given that these lands are an integral component of tourism attractions.

### Village by-laws governing natural resources

Three villages, Engaresero, Arash and Piyaya, have bylaws to govern natural resources. However, all the bylaws are waiting for the district's approval prior to implementation. Pinyinyi did not have bylaws. No copies of any of the village bylaws were made available for the baseline survey. Therefore, the contents of these by-laws have not been scrutinized.

### Community awareness and participation

The household survey confirmed that the general members were quite aware of the natural resources within the village. Also, it confirmed that through meetings such as the village Annual General Meeting village leadership informs members about the conservation issues affecting the village.

Despite the flow of information the village leadership are not proactive in natural resource conservation and do not involve the village members sufficiently. The specific concerns varied between villages depending on the unique tourism environment and the government efforts to inform and gain support from the village members. Arash village did not report any conservation initiative taking place, as reflected in the household survey where 80 percent of interviewees were not

aware of any conservation campaign and where 20 percent of interviewees were clearly aware that there was none.

### Water and wetlands

Lake Natron is the largest body of water in the project area, and has been proposed as a Ramsar site. However, having not had a visit from the Wildlife Division (WD) to inform the village about the Ramsar process, there was no indication that the village government or members were aware of this development and what it would mean to them. Ideally, the Ramsar process should be addressed to avoid conflicts and misunderstandings regarding the proposed status change of the lake. The baseline study recorded that Pinyinyi residents had some conflicts over the management of certain water catchment areas and had proceeded with disciplinary action for those members who violated the Village Council order to conserve the area. Of all Pinyinyi residents, 55 percent attended meetings to discuss water catchment areas. However, conflicts continue to arise.

### Forestry

No forestry conflicts were recorded in the baseline study except in Engaresero where the village leadership uses the village bylaws to protect the acacia forest within the village. A total 70 percent of the Engaresero households had attended meetings to discuss this issue.

### Wildlife

Wildlife in Tanzania is managed by the WD. However, the village authorities have taken the initiative to manage conflicts between wildlife and humans due to minimal support from the WD or district authorities.

In Piyaya and Arash the Maasai *moran* (warriors) hunt lion either as a means to demonstrate courage or to retaliate when livestock are killed by lion. Arash had held meetings to raise awareness on lion conservation. However, the household survey indicated that only 40 percent of the village residents attended such meetings. Lion hunting is seen as an ongoing problem for the tourism companies who value enormously the presence of lions as part of their product. In Arash elephants destroy the crops and occasionally kill people. Although the village has reported



the issue to the WD and District Council, there has been little response. Wildebeest are seen as a threat to cattle primarily in Piyaya and Arash, as they transfer disease to cattle and compete over pasture and water. However, the village felt there was nothing they could do about this threat. In Engaresero, baboons were responsible for hunting goat kids. Again, the conflict was reported to the district authorities with no response.

In Piyaya, wild dog sightings have recently been more frequent and have added a major attraction for tourists. However, the dogs have been hunting livestock frequently and, thus, endangering their own existence by provoking retaliation from the Masai livestock keepers. The village in partnership with the tour companies established a wild dog

compensation fund, whereby both parties contribute funds to compensate village members who have lost stock to the dogs. This initiative has proven successful as the wild dogs have remained in the general area over time. However, records of how much had actually been contributed were not made public. Respondents of the household survey (55 percent) knew of the fund and had attended meetings to discuss the conservation efforts.

#### Grasslands

In the land use plan for Arash and Engaresero, areas allocated for grazing were clearly indicated. Piyaya and Pinyinyi have no land use plans, but they use the traditional agreements of land allocation and grazing.

### 5.3 EMPLOYMENT AND LIVELIHOOD DIVERSIFICATION

Very little attention has been paid to livelihood diversification or employment of the local communities within tour company operations. In all four villages only minimal staff are from the local community and very few supplies are purchased locally. Employment of the local community is mainly seasonal, part time, and made up of men. The study found only one example of a female employee. No training opportunities were made available to the local community other than 'on-the-job' training.

Most of the small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that are engaged with the tour companies are either existing shops selling goods required occasionally or small cultural businesses supporting women. However, the SMEs do not extend outside of these two areas into products such as meat, milk, vegetable, poultry or egg production to supply tour operations.

The tourism companies in **Arash village** employ up to 27 village members only on a part-time basis, all of whom are men. Training is provided informally. Arash village also has a proactive initiative whereby a tourism company contributes US\$4 per client to a fund for women.

The companies in **Piyaya village** employ a total of 22 full time local staff, three of whom are based in Arusha town. A total of 15 additional people are employed on a seasonal

basis (December to April). The village has a cultural *boma* which contributes its proceeds from tourists to support underprivileged women and provide them the opportunity to sell beadwork. Also, the tour operators occasionally purchase from Piyaya's shops.

**Engaresero village** has more business flows through purchases at its shops, amounting to over 10 million Tanzanian Shillings between 2006 and 2009. Engaresero also hosts a women's beadwork project that is administered by the village government. One tour operator employed seven people on a full time basis, and two people on a part time basis, provided training on the job, and also focused on guide skills development. At the time of compiling the baseline analysis, one major operator in the area had not yet responded.

**Pinyinyi village** unfortunately does not have tourism and, thus, no economic benefits can be recorded.



## 5.4 LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The baseline study investigated the accountability and diligence of village government to establish structures within the village to manage tourism and natural resources.

### Community awareness of local governance

Piyaya, Arash and Engaresero villages have committees responsible for the environment and tourism activities. The baseline study examined household awareness of such committees by inquiring whether the interviewee was aware of the committee's existence, its role, and members.

Household awareness varied from village to village. It was clear in all villages that the general populace was not aware of the governance structures, roles and responsibilities for NR and tourism management. All village governments requested assistance from the survey team to improve governance, mainly through training and support in the following areas:

- Administrative and financial controls and procedures
- Environmental management
- Legal assistance especially for contract negotiation and development

### Community awareness of tourism governance on village land

Each village government indicated that the Village General Assembly was the only way to inform the village members about the revenues earned from tourism, and that no other informational mechanisms are yet in place.

Not surprisingly, the household survey revealed little awareness among members of the village about revenues from tourism. Transparency of contracts between villages and tour operators was also generally low, with few members of the village aware of the details of the contracts and negotiations with tourism enterprises.



### Arash

In Arash all the revenues from tourism were posted on the public notice board. However, 55 percent of respondents knew of the revenues but said the government was not transparent. Another 15 percent knew of the revenues only through the Village General Assembly and the notice board, and 15 percent did not know of any revenue whatsoever.

Also apparent was a lack of general understanding about the role of the village government roles, with 15 percent of the households surveyed indicating that they did know of the governance structure nor of the natural resource committee. About 70 percent did not know anything about the governance structure nor its members, and with 15 percent not knowing that a specific committee was responsible for tourism and natural resources.

Ironically, the Arash village government publicized all committee member names on a notice board in the village office along with the roles and responsibilities of the committee. Apparently, the availability of information for the public is not sufficient for ensuring widespread awareness of governance systems.

### Piyaya

When conducting the household survey, 10 percent of households knew of a natural committee, and 90 percent indicated that they did not know much of any governance structure in the village, except for the main leaders like the chairman and the village secretary. However, these respondents were not aware of a village natural resource committee.

Another 55 percent of the households stated that the government was not transparent regarding village revenue, 20 percent did not know of any tourism revenues specifically. Those who did know of revenues (25 percent) had received the information through the Annual General Meeting and notice board.

### Engaresero

In Engaresero village 25 percent of the households surveyed did not know of any governance structure whatsoever, 45 percent knew of a natural resource committee, 10 percent indicated they knew of a special



tourism committee, and 20 percent did not believe that there was a committee dedicated to natural resource management.

Another 60 percent of the households surveyed indicated that the village government was not transparent with revenues, 5 percent knew of no tourism revenues and 35 percent indicated that they know of tourism revenue through the AGM. The two operators in Engaresero were not aware of the contract the village had with a hunting company.

### Pinyinyi

In Pinyinyi village, the village leadership informed the survey team that no tourism was taking place within their village. However, the survey team were then informed by the Tanzania Wildlife Company (TAWICO), one of the tour operators, of a contract and small-scale tourism activities taking place in Pinyinyi. Of the households surveyed, 90 percent were sure that no tourism was taking place, and, hence, that no revenue was being earned. The other 10 percent of households claimed they did not know if revenue was being earned or not.

Apart from the revenues, 55 percent of households indicated they were not aware of the village's governance structure.

### Tourism revenues to the villages

Tourism revenues earned by villages through contracts, cultural tourism and donations from tour operators for village development and livelihood improvement are crucial to the success of tourism for future generations. The accountability and transparency of the systems for revenue management must facilitate full community participation and support for village bylaws and other regulating structures designed to preserve the tourism resources, such as wildlife habitat .

If the community does not see economic advantages from the tourism, they will not fully support business contracts between the village government and the tourism investors. During the household survey, repeated suggestions arose from various residents of all the villages demanding more transparency of revenue collection made to each village. These demands are mainly a result of the lack of information about the contracts between the village governments and the tourism enterprises. Without adequate information village residents have a weak foundation of knowledge for basing critiques of the village leadership and revenue management.

Little was known of the both the nature and value of the philanthropic initiatives by tourism enterprises existing in the village for local development:

- The **Arash** household survey indicated that 10 percent of the village residents participated during the meeting where tourism and contracts were discussed. 20 percent of the surveyed members had previous contact with or had met the tour operator, 25 percent were aware of donations from tourism enterprises, while 55 percent did not know of any donations and 20 percent indicated that there were no donations.
- In **Piyaya**, the household survey indicated 30 percent participation during the meeting where tourism and contracts were discussed, and 60 percent of the surveyed members had met the tour operators. Another 45 percent were aware of donations from tourism enterprises and how the resources were used.
- **Engaresero** had 30 percent participation during any meeting where tourism was discussed but no contracts have been tabled for discussion. Of the surveyed members, 45 percent had met the tour operators and 90 percent were not aware of any donations from tourism enterprises. According to an agreement with a tour operator, the village had to provide receipts for revenue paid to the village. However, over the past 3.5 years of partnership, the tourism enterprise had not received any receipts.
- **Pinyinyi** village has few tourism activities. Only one contract exists with a hunting tour company that seldomly uses the area. None of the surveyed members were not aware of this contract or any donations or support from the company.



## 5.5 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

The baseline survey investigated the mechanisms in place allowing the village government to manage the contracts and activities relevant to the tourism enterprises operating within the villages.

All the villages except for Pinyinyi had more than one contractual agreement with tour companies, some of these contracts have been in operation for over 10 years while others are more recent. Piyaya and Engaresero have three contracts each and Arash has two contracts.

### Comprehension of contractual agreements

All tourism investors surveyed have current contracts in the sampled villages. According to the village leadership, these contracts address a broad range of issues such as gender equality, cultural activities, environmental and socio-economic impacts. However, the tourism enterprises surveyed differed in opinion, stating that in fact these issues were not in the contract (except for a contract in Arash). This gap indicated that the tourism companies and the village government did not have the same understanding of the obligations and contents of the contracts, as further illustrated by the recurring breaches of contractual engagement by both sides.

### Understanding of tourism product

Each village features different tourist attractions with varying standards. However, the baseline survey indicated that village members and leadership were not conversant with the differences between various destinations and products, and therefore would have difficulty both managing the conditions for such products and brokering any complicated contracts in a strategic way.

### Fee structure

The fee structure differed from village to village for the various tourism products. It was not entirely clear how the fees were realized. Also, fees administered by other authorities, such as the Wildlife Division and district councils (for gate entrance fees) threaten the competitiveness of the tourism product.

### Communication, roles and responsibilities

The baseline survey observed a lack of opportunity for formal communication between the tourism operators and the village government. Piyaya tour operators have three meetings per year with the village government, although operators in other areas have ad hoc meeting arrangements. However, in Piyaya and Arash the tour operators employ a village liaison officer to facilitate communication.

Also, the roles and responsibilities of the tourism operators and the village government, were not clear, as was apparent by the lack of understanding about guidelines and regulations for responsible tourism practices. Either guidelines were not available or the guidelines available were different according to the tour operator and the village government. Obviously, there also were no mechanisms for evaluating the performance of such guidelines or by-laws.

The study recorded only one example of direct village management of a tourism product. In Engaresero the village government tried to collect fees from tourists via guides who trek up Mount Lengai. However, they failed to collect the fees.



## 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Responsible tourism can be an economic tool used for the conservation of natural resources. A key ingredient to the sustainability of resources on community land is the ability of the revenues to contribute to the wellbeing of the communities. In this process the community that benefits will value these natural resources and gain motivation to protect and conserve them for future generations.

**Establishing land use plans:** The baseline survey indicated that most of the villages did not have land use plans, the tool that enables the village to manage the resources and allocate land in a transparent and participatory manner.

It will be necessary for all the villages to create land use plans in order to guide the present and future leaders to responsible land management. Preferably, these land use plans should indicate the land accessible to tourism enterprises.

**Improving communication:** As the governance of natural resources within the villages includes other administrative actors such as the Wildlife Division, Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority and Tanzania National Parks, it would be advisable to improve the communication between the multiple stakeholders to build a cohesive approach to natural resource conservation.

Additionally, the village by-laws should be circulated to all stakeholders to provide an opportunity to comply. Any further development of bylaws, guidelines and regulations should be created in a participatory manner to ensure consent from all stakeholders. Joint conservation initiatives have been successful in one village, providing opportunities to strengthen awareness and commitment to the natural resource preservation and fortify partnerships. Further research on the opportunities for similar initiatives should be considered.

**Local capacity development:** For the largest stakeholder group – the residents of Arash, Engaresero, Pinyinyi, and Piyaya villages – the baseline study indicates a range of recommendations for improving participation and capacity:

- The local communities need training and support to improve good governance and management of the natural resources and

the revenues derived from tourism.

- Research into mechanisms for the village leadership to disseminate information to the community will provide a secure environment for long term commitment from the community who will appreciate and, thus, conserve natural resources.
- Improving the capacity for the leadership to negotiate the processes for developing and closing a contract using a participatory approach, to develop their capacity to improve and market their product will enable the leadership to feel confident in the decision making process, removing the anxiety of their business and partnerships.

The local community needs to understand that tourism is a business they have already invested in.

Responsible tourism on community land that depends on locally available natural resources has become increasingly recognized under a new term, “geotourism”. The geotourism approach to socially and environmentally ethical tour operations takes into account the interdependence of natural resource conservation, community livelihood development and tourism businesses.

For example, small and medium enterprises can increase the provision of cost-effective produce and services to the resident tourist camps; tour operators can employ more local residents within the camps enabling benefits from tourism to directly improve the livelihoods of local households; tour operators, residents, and governing authorities can increase their coordination and communication to conserve natural resources.

Given the limitations of current initiatives for community-based tourism in Tanzania as described in this report, further research into opportunities for the local community to benefit economically in an ethical and sustainable manner is required.

For the sustainability of tourism in the four surveyed villages, future projects and studies that build on this baseline survey may be inclined to support increased local participation, specifically, by planning land use, sharing information sharing on tourism management structures, developing small business, and building the general management capacity of local leadership.

## ABOUT THE PARTNERS

**Honeyguide Foundation** was initiated after the need was identified for an institution to bridge the gap between the communities and the tourism industry in order for both parties to benefit from tourism economically and therefore to have a long term vested interest in the management of their natural resources. The organization supports communities and environmental conservation in Tanzania, making use of tourism as a sustainable source of income.

**Ujamaa Community Resource Trust** aims at strengthening the capacity of local ethnic minorities in northern Tanzania to better control manage and benefit from their lands and natural resources. UCRT's ultimate goal is to improve community and household level welfare through improved land and natural resource management. This project will build on the work of UCRT who will play an important role in the implementation of the project outcomes.

**TasConsult** is a relatively new locally owned consultancy company, providing services to local authorities, local and international NGOs. Its focus is 'capacity building for development' and its services include strategic planning, programme evaluations, multi stakeholder processes. The company also includes expertise in preventive health care and financial services and has links with additional advisors and service providers.

**The Tanzania Natural Resource Forum** is a growing network of over 2,000 individual members and civil society organizations that works to improve natural resource governance for sustainable livelihoods, through information sharing, policy advocacy and the support of best practices in natural resource management. At the heart of TNRF's work as a change agent are these topical areas of focus: Forestry, Wildlife, Pastoralism and Livelihoods and Community-based Tourism.



© Damian Bell

© Tanzania Natural Resource Forum, 2009

PO Box 15605 Arusha | Tel: +255 755 022267 | Fax +1 815 550 2312 | Email: info@tnrf.org | www.tnrf.org