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Why benefit sharing is important

The Convention on Biological Diversity recognizes that equitable sharing of income and assets is an important component of strategies for biodiversity conservation.

Local communities living and farming adjacent to the Volcanoes National Park in Rwanda - providing habitat for critically endangered mountain gorillas.
Benefit sharing can take many forms

**Tangible benefits**
- Revenue sharing, employment, direct income, infrastructure, etc.

**Intangible benefits**
- Capacity building, skills training, cultural benefits, etc.

*Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017*
Benefit sharing can take many forms

**Tangible benefits**
Revenue sharing, employment, direct income, infrastructure, etc.

**Intangible benefits**
Capacity building, skills training, cultural benefits, etc.

*Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017*
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Legend of Pathways of Influence
a. Direct impacts
b. Production linkages
c. Income and consumption linkages
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A. Protected area revenue sharing – *State protected areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Protected area</th>
<th>% tourism revenue to local communities</th>
<th>Financial benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Madagascar</strong></td>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>US$ 5,500 (1992/3), US$ 6,750 allocated to community fund spend on social projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mozambique</strong></td>
<td>Maputo Special Reserve</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>US$ 66,400 as cash to community trusts (2009-2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rwanda</strong></td>
<td>Virunga Volcanoes National Park</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>US$ 428,000 (2005-2008) spent on social projects (e.g. education, environmental protection, food security and water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td>South African National Parks (21 national parks)</td>
<td>1% tourism revenue and other funding partners</td>
<td>US$ 112.3 million (FY 2014-15: Estimated). Spent on 17 socio-economic initiative projects (e.g. computer and science laboratories, nurseries, water provision, school dormitories).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tanzania</strong></td>
<td>Lake Manyara National Park</td>
<td>7.5% budget</td>
<td>US$ 32,000 (2006-7) spent on teachers house, classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amani Nature Reserve</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Approx. US$ 2,000 per year distributed equally among 18 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarangire National Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>US$ 329,669 (2000-2005) on community development projects (e.g. school dormitory and renovation, renovation of cattle dip).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uganda</strong></td>
<td>Bwindi Impenetrable Park</td>
<td>20% park entrance fees, plus US$5 from every gorilla permit</td>
<td>US$ 523,546 (1996-2014) spent on local administration building, education, feeder roads, health, income generation projects, fighting crop raiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kibale, Bwindi, Mgahinga National Parks</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>US$ 83,000 (1995-98) spent on 21 schools, 4 clinics, 1 bridge, 1 road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Elgon National Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>US$ 11,313 (1999 – 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth National Park</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>US$ 919,742 (1996-2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017
A. Protected area revenue sharing – *State PAs*

**Example:** Rwanda’s revenue sharing program

- 5% revenue sharing scheme for Volcanoes National Park fees
- RDB issues call for proposals
- Project selection at sector and district level against criteria: community benefit & conservation
- Preferential benefit where there is HWC & close to the PA
- Project contracts signed with district authority
- Duration 1-15 month projects
- Community ownership over assets established

*Nielsen and Spenceley, 2011; Tusabe and Habyalimana, 2010*
A. Protected area revenue sharing – *State PAs*

**Example:** Rwanda’s revenue sharing program

Funds disbursed to community projects around Volcanoes National Park, (2005-2008)

- Schools and classrooms
- Water tanks
- Basketweaving, beekeeping
- Sabyinyo Community Lodge

*Nielsen and Spenceley, 2011; Tusabe and Habyalimana, 2010; Telesphore, 2009*
A. Protected area revenue sharing – *Conservancies*

**Example:** Northern Rangelands Trust, Kenya

- 60% of tourism revenue used to fund community development projects (USD 545,000 in 2013)
- Used to support basic services: child education, healthcare etc.

*ALU, 2020; NRT, 2021; King and Craig, 2015*
A. Protected area revenue sharing

Protected areas selective about types of tourism revenues in revenue sharing (e.g. not including more lucrative incomes such as gorilla trekking fees or tourism concession fees)

Local people may be dissatisfied with their share of benefits (e.g. actual benefits of less than USD 0.5 per person, per year)

Individual costs of human wildlife conflict exceed benefit sharing receipts

Weak distribution system for community payments (e.g. not all of the money allocated to benefit sharing is distributed – either by councils or by community trusts/entities)

Benefit sharing is not explicitly linked by communities to tourism or conservation

Benefits don’t necessarily reach the poorest people

Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2019; English and Ahebwa, 2018; Tumusiime & Vedeld, 2012; Nielsen and Spenceley, 2011
A. Protected area revenue sharing

- Ensure financial distribution is transparent, clear and well governed
- Make the link clear between the benefits, conservation and tourism
- Ensure those most affected by the PA benefit most (i.e. HWC, opportunity costs)
- Reduce red tape, and government control over use of funds (e.g. CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe will now pay communities directly, not through Rural District Councils)
- Ensure that increased value of tourism receipts & biodiversity improvements increases the value of benefits shared
- Monitor, report and communicate who receives what
- Determine whether distributing cash or project support most effective

Helsinga, Groote and Vanclay, 2019; Spenceley, 2014
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B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – *community-based tourism*

Community–owned tourism enterprise

Community

- Ownership
- Management
- Control
- Benefits

Communally-owned tourism venture

*Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017*
B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – community-based tourism

**Example: Covane Community Lodge, Mozambique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of company</th>
<th>Scholtz Consultoria e Serviços Lda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Limpopo National Park (LNP) buffer zone, Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year established</td>
<td>2004 (when run by the community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of company (i.e. listed, privately owned, etc.)</td>
<td>Community owned lodge Private management company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of camps/lodges</td>
<td>CCL: chalets (8 beds), traditional Shangaan huts (15 beds), a houseboat (4 beds), and campsites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment/partnership option</td>
<td>Infrastructure: community owned Land: government owned, DUAT to the community Management company: private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff employed</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% local staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial summary</td>
<td>USD 3,000 in rental paid to the community each year USD 50,734 in wages to local community members between 2015 and 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Snyman and Spenceley, 2019*
B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – community-based tourism

Example: Covane Community Lodge, Mozambique

ASSEMBLEIA GENERAL
(General Assembly)
All members of the Canhane community

Comissão de Gestão Social
(Social committee)
10 elected representatives of Canhane

COVANE COMMUNITY LODGE
Employees

HELVETAS

Snyman and Spenceley, 2019
B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – *community-based tourism*

Community–based small business

Community

Tourism venture

Individual ownership & control

Benefits

*Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017*
B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – *community-based tourism*

**Example:** Wild Tours, South Africa

The [Wild Coast](#) in [*South Africa*](#) is one of the most diverse hiking experiences in the entire country. The terrain is challenging as the hills of the former Transkei never end. However, there are few places on earth where you are one moment on top a cliff and the next down on a secret beach and the next having tea in a mud hut getting to know local culture. The extreme experiences are never ending, cows chilling on the beaches, waterfalls directly into the ocean and [Xhosa](#) cultural interactions that will change you forever.

*#TravelYoung* today while [Hiking the Wild Coast](#).

This is *Jimmy Selani* getting hikers ready for their hike from Port St Johns to Coffee Bay from Amapondo ([#Backpackers](#)).

*Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017*
B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – joint-venture partnerships

Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017
### B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – *joint-venture partnerships*

**Example: Damaraland Camp, Namibia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of company</th>
<th>Wilderness Safaris (WS) Namibia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Torra Conservancy, Kunene region, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year established</strong></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Status of company (i.e. listed, privately owned, etc.)** | Damaraland Camp (Pty) Ltd  
A joint equity venture partnership between WS Namibia (60%) and the Torra Conservancy (40%) |
| **List of camps/lodges**         | Damaraland Camp (20 beds)  
Damaraland Adventurer Camp (8 beds) |
| **Investment/partnership option**| Government land leased to conservancy  
Tenure in line with equity partnership  
JV partnership between private sector and community conservancy |
| **Total number of staff employed** | 32                             |
| **% local staff**                | 65%                            |
| **Financial summary**            | USD 225,719 paid in terms of lease fees to the conservancy from 2015 to 2017  
USD 33,000 paid to community members from 2015 to 2017 for goods and services  
USD 30,556 per month on staff salaries |

*Snyman and Spenceley, 2019*
B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships – *joint-venture partnerships*

**Example:** Damaraland Camp, Namibia

**Agreements**

1. Joint Venture/Equity held in Newco (Pty) Ltd – Shareholders Agreement
2. Leasing Agreement between Newco (Pty) Ltd and Conservancy minimum of 10 years with option to renew for a further 10 years
3. Management Agreement between NLC (Pty) Ltd and Newco (Pty) Ltd Incorporation JMC with Conservancy, onsite lodge management, Head office support function, fee based on % of total turnover.
4. Marketing Agreement between NTS (Pty) Ltd (owned by WS) and Newco (Pty) Ltd, fee based on % of total turnover

**Notes**

(A) Conservancy is the holder of the Concession issued by MET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damaraland Camp</th>
<th>Lease fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>USD 69,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>USD 72,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
<td>USD 93,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>USD 225,719</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Snyman and Spenceley, 2019*
## B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Challenges and barriers (p1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessing resources</strong></td>
<td>Land and resources:</td>
<td>Disputes are rife and reoccur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support infrastructure and facilities:</td>
<td>Inadequate and poorly constructed and maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensuring commercial viability</strong></td>
<td>Viability:</td>
<td>Lacks of viable business plan. Costs paid by donor funding not revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market compatibility:</td>
<td>Lack of adequate source market or access to the source market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion and communication:</td>
<td>Little or inappropriate promotion and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market linkages &amp; replication:</td>
<td>No commercial linkages or economies of scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility:</td>
<td>Cannot respond to market changes due to inadequate knowledge/ skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of ownership:</td>
<td>Community members feel excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community support and stakeholder relationships</strong></td>
<td>Community interest in tourism enterprise:</td>
<td>Resistant or not committed to tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community spirit:</td>
<td>Community conflict. Progress is hindered by personal interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder communication:</td>
<td>Weak between partners &amp; community. Messages misunderstood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of community role and rights:</td>
<td>Tensions due to lack of understanding of roles and rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships:</td>
<td>Weak. Partnership obligations not fully understood or there is conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing expectations and the distribution of benefits</strong></td>
<td>Integration in broader development strategy:</td>
<td>Considered a quick fix to reduce poverty, isolated from other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations:</td>
<td>Over-optimistic. Expectation of quick, easy and sizable benefits for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit distribution:</td>
<td>Mechanism not agreed/fully understood/properly implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise governance:</td>
<td>Not accountable, unclear roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Challenges and barriers (p2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring social equity</td>
<td>Empowered, participation and decision-making:</td>
<td>Participation dominated by the powerful, and wanes over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of understanding of who the role players and beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to opportunities.</td>
<td>Powerful people access opportunities. Women and youth are marginalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for greater capacity</td>
<td>Understanding of tourism, and what tourists need:</td>
<td>Limited understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards:</td>
<td>Lacks of knowledge and training, affecting product quality and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital investment:</td>
<td>Lack of collateral to secure loans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial management and benefit distribution:</td>
<td>Failure to manage cash-flow and benefit distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for employees and managers:</td>
<td>Need for sufficient skills and adaptability to operate the venture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training ceases when donor funding ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training providers:</td>
<td>Difficulty in accessing affordable training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training focus:</td>
<td>Generic and not appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserving culture and heritage</td>
<td>Customs and heritage sites:</td>
<td>Over-commercialisation and damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and use of natural resources:</td>
<td>Pollution and degradation without rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating legal environment</td>
<td>Bureaucratic procedures and legal requirements:</td>
<td>Communities discouraged by red tape and navigating complicated bureaucracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017*
### B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Drivers of success (p1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessing resources</strong></td>
<td>Land and resources:</td>
<td>Clear and well-defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support infrastructure and facilities:</td>
<td>Adequate, well-constructed and maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensuring commercial viability</strong></td>
<td>Viability:</td>
<td>Commercially viable and sustainable. Good quality product or service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market compatibility:</td>
<td>Strong market demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion and communication:</td>
<td>Good marketing and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market linkages &amp; replication:</td>
<td>Strong linkages, including throughout the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility:</td>
<td>Dynamic and able to adapt to a changing market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of ownership:</td>
<td>Strong sense custodianship within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community support and stakeholder relationships</strong></td>
<td>Community interest in tourism enterprise:</td>
<td>Willing and enthusiastic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community spirit:</td>
<td>Cohesive and mostly unified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder communication:</td>
<td>Ongoing, inclusive and regular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of community role and rights:</td>
<td>Clear between partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships:</td>
<td>Strong, based on mutual respect and trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing expectations and the distribution of benefits</strong></td>
<td>Integration in broader development strategy:</td>
<td>Tourism part of broader strategy and one of several economic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations:</td>
<td>Realistic regarding timeframes, returns and challenges of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit distribution:</td>
<td>Distributed as agreed by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise governance:</td>
<td>Effective, accountable and transparent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017_
### B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Drivers of success (p2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring social equity</td>
<td>Empowered, participation and decision-making:</td>
<td>Community members, including women and youth, are empowered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to opportunities.</td>
<td>Allocated on fairly and in relation to the needs of the venture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for greater capacity</td>
<td>Understanding of tourism, and what tourists need:</td>
<td>Clear, and community also has the competencies to manage and operate the venture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards:</td>
<td>Address market demand. Community is educated and trained to meet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital investment:</td>
<td>Adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial management and benefit distribution:</td>
<td>Sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for employees and managers:</td>
<td>Adequate training (formal and on-the-job).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training providers:</td>
<td>NGOs, government and the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training focus:</td>
<td>Customized for the community, the market and the location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserving culture and heritage</td>
<td>Customs and heritage sites:</td>
<td>Promotes revitalisation and preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and use of natural resources:</td>
<td>Promotes conservation and the sustainable use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating legal environment</td>
<td>Bureaucratic procedures and legal requirements:</td>
<td>Support agencies provide assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017_
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C. Tourism value chain benefits

Secondary suppliers

Nodes

Direct service providers

Supporting institutions

Mitchell and Le Chi, 2007
C. Tourism value chain benefits

Accommodation (hotels, campsites, B&Bs)  Food (restaurants, intermediaries, farmers)  Excursions (tour operators, transport, guides)  Handicrafts (producers, vendors)

Spenceley, Rylance, Nanabhay, and van der Watt, 2017; Spenceley, 2022
C. Tourism value chain benefits

Example: Kasane, neighbouring Chobe National Park & Victoria Falls, Botswana

Spenceley, Rylance & Lloyd, 2015
C. Tourism value chain benefits

Source: World Bank data

Souza, Chidakel, Child, Chang and Gordevski, 2021; World Bank, 2021; www.nps.gov/subjects/socialscience/vse.htm
C. Tourism value chain benefits

- **Lack of acceptable local suppliers and products:**
  - Quality, quantity, reliability inadequate to meet demand

- **Price:**
  - Buying in bulk with discounts from established suppliers

- **Exclusionary procedures and policies:**
  - Existing procurement contracts
  - Requirement for insurance and VAT registration
  - Cash flow challenge with 30 day payment terms

- **Inertia and staff resistance to change:**
  - Staff incentives on financial performance, so stick with low-risk established suppliers

---

**Challenges**

The process for identifying local, small, BEE suppliers was extremely challenging for Spier - principally because no centralised database of suppliers existed in the area. The local small business development agency had only two garden maintenance companies and one baker on their books. All potential suppliers had to be identified through a process of time-consuming research and investigation.

Sun City, a resort visited by 600,000 tourists a year, has a central buying warehouse which procures goods for the whole complex. This area essentially pays for itself in terms of the savings it is able to generate from buying in bulk and negotiating low prices.

**Ashley, Haysom, Poulteny, McNamb and Harris, 2005**
## C. Tourism value chain benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure point/strand/supply chain</th>
<th>Blockages and opportunities</th>
<th>Target group of intervention</th>
<th>Desired change in value chain performance</th>
<th>Different forms of possible intervention (long-list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase local food supplies</td>
<td>Cheap imports</td>
<td>Fruit and vegetable farmers</td>
<td>Increased percentage of tourist food sourced from local farmers</td>
<td>Farm extension on seasonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seasonality of production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer association for shared marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chefs prefer a single wholesale contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaffordable transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financing of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with chefs on logistics of local sourcing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ashley, Mitchell and Spenceley, 2009*
C. Tourism value chain benefits

- Adapt policy to support local procurement
- Support local entrepreneurs with infrastructure and equipment, technical support, training & access to $
- In-source contract to help local businesses get started
  - Break contracts into smaller chunks
- Help suppliers reach economies of scale and cope with seasonality
- Use facilitators to liaise between buyers and suppliers
- Ensure tourism enterprises:
  - Pay living wages
  - Provide recruitment opportunities for local applicants
  - Invest heavily in training of local staff

Recommendations

Ashley, Haysom, Poultney, McNamb and Harris, 2005
Benefit sharing options

A. Protected area revenue sharing

B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships

C. Tourism value chain benefits

Zhu et al, 2021; Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017
Benefit sharing options

A. Protected area revenue sharing

B. Tourism enterprise ownership and partnerships

C. Tourism value chain benefits

Intangible benefits

Zhu et al, 2021; Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017
Concluding remarks

Tangible benefits

Revenue sharing, employment, direct income, infrastructure, etc.

Intangible benefits

Capacity building, skills training, cultural benefits, etc.

Spenceley, 2021 a b c; World Bank, 2021; Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017
Concluding remarks

Tangible benefits
Revenue sharing, employment, direct income, infrastructure, etc.

Intangible benefits
Capacity building, skills training, cultural benefits, etc.

Critical components:
- Use multiple pathways
- Good governance
- Transparency
- Fair and equitable
- Adaptable
- Meaningful contribution to sustainable livelihoods

Spenceley, 2021; Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance, 2017
Guidance on developing, evaluating and reporting benefit sharing from tourism
Thank you!

Sharing benefits from tourism in protected areas with local communities:
Options, challenges, and recommendations

Dr Anna Spenceley
World Bank Consultant
Chair, IUCN WCPA Tourism and Protected Areas Specialist Group
annaspenceley@gmail.com
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Vanice Mirembe Daawa
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Awareness & Human Wildlife Relations,
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UGANDA WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

Uganda’s Experiences With Benefit Sharing From Protected Areas

Vanice Mirembe Daawa
Manager Awareness And Human Wildlife Relations
Uganda Wildlife Authority background

- Established in 1996 by the Uganda Wildlife Statute (now Uganda Wildlife Act 2019) through a merger of then Uganda National Parks (UNP) and Game Department (GD).

- UWA was created to ensure sustainable management of wildlife and to coordinate, monitor and supervise all activities related to wildlife management in Uganda.

- Currently, UWA manages 10 national parks, 12 wildlife reserves and 5 community wildlife areas. It also provides guidance to 14 wildlife sanctuaries and is responsible for the management of wildlife both in Protected Areas (PAs) and outside the PAs.
Uganda’s Wildlife Protected Areas

Legend:
- Country boundary
- Forest Reserves
- Wildlife Protected Areas
- Community Wildlife Management Area
- National Park
- Wildlife Reserve
- Wildlife Sanctuary

www.ugandawildlife.org
Revenue Sharing Program

• The enactment of the Uganda Wildlife Statute of 1996 (now Wildlife Act Cap. 2019), under Section 65 (4), legally obliged Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), to provide a conditional grant worth 20% of its park entry fees with local governments surrounding the protected area that generate the funds through tourism entry fees.

• Approximately USD 14.6 m has been shared with communities through the revenue sharing scheme between 2000 and 2022
Why share tourism Revenue

• This obligation is based on the acknowledgment that communities at the frontline of protected areas endure a disproportionate burden of the costs associated with the conservation of protected areas, and yet the benefits they gain are considered minimal (Manyindo & Makumbi, 2005)

• Revenue sharing is intended to act as an incentive for local communities and local government to actively participate in wildlife conservation
Where does the money come from?

- The money comes from the Park entrance fees tourist pay.
- In BIMP, an additional US $10 is given to communities from every gorilla tracking permit.
- The amount of money varies depending on the number of tourists who visit the Park. The more the numbers, the more the revenue.
How is the money disbursed?

- The money from gate collections is sent by UWA to the districts who keep 5% to cover administration costs and pass the remaining 95% on to the sub counties for the agreed projects.

- Only villages that share a boundary with the Park are included in the programme. This is because they bear more of the costs of conservation such as crop damage, than other villages that are further away from the Park.
What can the money be spent on?

Revenue sharing money can be spent on household and community projects that meet two basic criteria

• they must contribute to improving the livelihoods of households in frontline villages
• they must contribute to reducing human-wildlife conflict

• Projects like goat rearing, piggery, tree planting, bee keeping have been funded at household level.
• The construction of schools, health centers, feeder roads and water tanks have been funded at community level
• projects to help reduce crop damage by wild animals such as planting Mauritius thorn hedges, trenches
Revenue sharing projects
A Health facility in Buliisa District
MFNP
A valley water dam at Akayanja- LMCA
Classroom block and staff house
Trenches to prevent crop raiding by elephant and buffalo
Goats supplied in BINP
How are projects selected?

• Each village bordering the Park forms a Community Project Management Committee
• The Committee writes applications for projects selected during village meetings
• The Village Chairman forwards the proposals to the Parish Development Committee, which selects the most important projects and submits them to the Sub County Chief.
• The Sub County Chief calls a meeting at which the Parish Chiefs, the Conservation Area Manager and other government officers pick the best projects.
• These are integrated into district development plans after which the Chief Administrative Officer asks UWA to release for them
How are individual priorities addressed

• Villages set priorities at the village level and make decisions on which projects to put into the revenue sharing programs

• Community members are encouraged to attend these village meetings

• UWA encourages people to write about any worries they may have to the Chief Administrative Officer, copying the Conservation Area Manager

• Letters should refer to minutes of decisions taken during the village meetings if possible.
Who does the monitoring?

- Monitoring of the implementation of projects is done at all levels of the revenue sharing programme, from the village to the District.

- District and sub country officials keep 5% of the revenue sharing funds to cover the costs of monitoring.

- Villages are able to monitor projects on the ground.

- UWA also monitors revenue sharing projects and reports on them.
Community Benefits

Community access to essential protected area resources

• such as fish, herbal medicine, wild food item like bamboo shoots in Mt Elgon Region, handcraft materials and other non-timber resources.

• example: Resources access (RMNP since 2012 Bamboo harvest has contributed an equivalent of US $11,463)

• Other resources Medicinal, thatch, water, cultural values, food

• Resource access worthy over $580m has been given out for
Community Benefits..

**Community-based tourism**

- Lodges, Crafts, Food sales, Unskilled labor
- Direct income to household level
- RMNP Unskilled labor – US $30 for 7 days (annually, US $25,500)
- RMS community – US $232,000 annually
- BINP unskilled labor – US $10 daily (annually US $216,000)
- Community Lodge at Buhoma (Since 1994 – US $2.14 million)
- Management of Wildlife with the private stakeholders and communities generated over USD 3 million for communities.
Community Benefits...

**Employment**
- UWA employment policy takes local community as priority
- US $573,696 is paid to local community park staff annually
  - **BWINDI ALONE**
- Research on Lodges – 76.2% local Comm.
  - Adjacent Comm – 80% of low level jobs
  - Adjacent Comm – 65% of mid level jobs
  - Adjacent comm – 44% of senior level jobs
Community Benefits..

- At the 40 lodges around Bwindi
- Frontline villages earn US $151,651 annually
- Parish level community earn US $211,669 annually
- District level community earn US $333,333 annually
- This goes directly to household income
- Bwindi generates US $5.3 million for Govt annually
- Lodge owners US $13.3 million annually
Community Benefits

**Water Resources**

- Protected Areas are known as key water catchment areas
- About 95% of the water consumed for domestic purpose is unmetered
- Metered water around RMNP serves over 300,000 people
- Metered water around RMNP fetches US $936,667 annually for government
- More users are located on the DRC side, Sudan, Egypt
RS contribution cont.

- Improved participation of local communities and local government officials in the management of protected areas (GMP process, resources access and project identification and management).
- RS has empowered local communities to have a stake in the management of protected areas thus, stimulating community support towards wildlife conservation.
- Revenue sharing fund has contributed towards the Government effort towards the eradication of poverty and improvement of rural livelihoods.
RS contribution cont..

- Improved accessibility to social services
- health centres, schools, roads, water) by protected neighbouring communities
- Revenue sharing has created opportunity for engaging local communities and local government
Lessons

- Revenue sharing and other community benefits facilitate effort to demonstrate the social economic values of protected areas.

- Revenue sharing and other community benefits act as incentives for local communities and other stakeholders to actively participate in protected area management.

- Capacity building and empowerment of beneficiary communities is important if RS fund is to have an impact on conservation and livelihoods.

- Accountability and transparency are crucial

- Hinging RS on strong legal, policy and institutional framework is to successful implementation.

- Regular monitoring of RS implementation enhances value for money
Challenges of RS

• It heavily depends on tourism which is very sensitive to both internal and external factors (COVID 19, economic crisis, security and others)

• Governance issues such as accountability and corruption.

• Inadequate capacity by community groups to effectively manage some of the funded projects.

• Potential of attracting opportunistic political intervention instead of support for conservation.
Thank you
Phonesuck Inthavong

**Ecotourism Head**

Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, Lao PDR
Wildlife Ecotourism and Benefit Sharing Model in Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, Lao PDR.
THE NAM ET-PHOU LOUEY NATIONAL PARK IS:

... ONE OF THE LARGEST CONSERVATION AREAS in Laos

... HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT AREA FOR WILDLIFE BIODIVERSITY:

- 20+ carnivore species
- 50+ mammal species
- 300+ bird species
Geographical extent – 3 Provinces – 10 districts
Population: 91 guardian villages (42,600 people, 2015)
One of the highest poverty rates in the country.

- TOTALLY PROTECTED ZONE
  - 309,000 ha
- CONTROLLED USE ZONE
  - 198,000 ha

- Entry only with NEPL permission
- Biodiversity monitoring & research
- Law Enforcement
- Conservation ecotourism
- Communities can gather NTFPs
- Hunt non-protected species with authorized weapons in non-breeding season
- Tourism

*Source: NEPL NP’S Management Plan (Decree: 411,000 ha, Map: 507,000 ha)
Each WILDLIFE SIGHTING by visitors results in a MONETARY INCENTIVE* to the eco-tourism villages.

*Wildlife species with higher conservation value have higher incentive value.
Collection: Approx. 10$ per day for foreigners (included in the tour price).

Distributed fund value calculation:

Visitor arrivals + Wildlife seen by visitors = Total EBF collected

Wildlife species with higher conservation value (IUCN red list + local priorities) have higher incentive value.

Cat I - CR + key predators
Cat II - EN and VU
Cat III – NT and LC

To obtain fair amount per village size, the EBF to be received by each village is based on the number of households.

1 case = -25%
2 cases = -50%
3 cases or more = -100%

EBF can be again collected next year. Levied amount is kept in the fund for next years usage or is used for law enforcement activities.

Is distributed to the villages during the annual ecotourism outreach event.

EBF is used for activities selected by the village by a public vote and must benefit the whole community.

Example of activities: Village infrastructure improvements (school, water system, village radio, fencing etc), or adding to an existing micro-finance fund or medical bank.
ECOTOURISM PRODUCTS

Wildlife Trekking Trail Network
*Since 2016*

- Mountain experience (Elev. 781-2257 m)
- Vegetation: Evergreen Forest and all other.
- Best for healthy forest experience
  --> “Feel like a Field Biologist”
- Moderate to Challenging
- Dry Season Only
- 3 service provider villages
- 12 beneficiary villages

30% of all NEPL NP villages
26 beneficiary villages
4 service provider villages

Nam Nern Night Safari
*Since 2009/10*

- River experience (Elev. 650-781 m)
- Vegetation: Mix deciduous Forest, Shrub/Bamboo
- Best for wildlife spotting & birdwatching
- Easy & Family Friendly
- Almost All Year Long
- 1 service provider villages
- 14 beneficiary villages
ECOTOURISM SERVICE PROVIDER CONTRACTS

Wildlife spotters/guides
Boatmen
Porters
Cooks
Handicraft group & Washing group

Only 1 person per household
Priority for service providers from poor or disadvantaged households
Must have “clean” record regarding the wildlife crime of min. 2 years

40% are women
Most men are former hunters.
WILDLIFE & KEY LESSONS LEARNED
WILDLIFE

NNNS Average Annual Wildlife Sightings per Tour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wildlife Sightings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trek camera trap. Dhole (EN) chasing red muntjac (LC)
Trek camera trap.  
Clouded Leopard (VU)
Trek camera trap.
Marbles Cat (NT) devouring a rodent
• **CLOSE COLLABORATION** with local communities and government actors throughout the development and management of the ecotourism program is essential

• **TRANSPARENCY AND EQUITY** of the ecotourism service group selection and funds distribution is key to maintaining trust

• **THE LINK BETWEEN CONSERVATION** and **TOURISM INCOME MUST BE CLEAR AND DIRECT** – simply improving community income may not lead to improved conservation efforts.

• **IMPACT MONITORING** and **LAW ENFORCEMENT IS ESSENTIAL** for positive conservation outcomes

• Ecotourism Benefit Fund can provide **A WAY TO MEANINGFULLY** and **POSITIVELY CONNECT** with local communities
Mayra Castellanos

Tourism Professional
Heart of the Amazon Project, Cerro Azul, Colombia

William Alexander Rojas Melendez

Leader
Fantasias Community Association, Cerro Azul Puerta de Chiribiquete, Colombia
Welcome to the Gateway of the Colombian Amazon

Cerro Azul is located in the municipality of San José del Guaviare, capital of the department of Guaviare, inside the Serranía La Lindosa-Angosturas II National Protected Forest Reserve.

More than 4,141 people live there, about 1,160 families.

This mountain range is part of an important biological corridor and transition zone between the Andes, the Orinoco and the Colombian Amazon, in addition to its high content of scenic and cultural manifestations.
We conserve what we value, we value what we know!

Since 2000, the development of community-based nature tourism has been growing in the region, becoming a productive alternative and a conservation strategy, which gained greater relevance after the signing of the Peace Agreements between the National Government and the FARC EP in 2016.

The Cerro Azul Cave Paintings have established themselves as a unique attraction in the world and a scene of archaeological importance.
In the year 2008, the community association Fantasías de Cerro Azul Puerta de Chiribiquete was born as an alternative to replace illicit crops.

Thanks to the impulse of governmental entities and the support of international cooperation today:

24 families are guardians of the natural and cultural heritage of the territory.

58% Men  
42% Women

- Indigenous Tukano and Desano ethnic groups
- Afro
- People with disabilities
- Victims of violence
Fair distribution of benefits

Generation of jobs and income for local communities and cooperation in the tourism value chain of the territory.

- **Tour operators**: Travel agencies, transportation companies, hotels, etc.
- **Service providers**: local tourists
  - 21 people work as local guides
  - 12 people provide gastronomic services
  - 7 people supporting the tourist operation (reservations and reception)
- **Community Action Board of the sidewalk**: 92 people are part of the Junta de Acción comunal
- **Conservation**
- **Suppliers of products and services**
- **Property holder/attraction**
- **Maintenance of available infrastructure for the provision of activity and services tourist**
  - 40 people are part of the Community Association
- **Community association**: Cerro Azul Fantasías
  - Chiribiquete Gate
Generation of jobs and income for local communities

**Visitor flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>$13,308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>$38,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cooperation and solidarity with the tourism value chain stakeholders**

Through the tourist operation protocol:

- National, departmental and local entities
- Environmental authorities
- Research and education institutions
- Tourism operators and service providers
- Business organizations
- Other local and national tourism associations
- International cooperation
Collective efforts in search of tourism sustainability

Recycling of over 8,000 PET bottles

Collection of 15kg of used batteries through an alliance with the Association of Recycling Operators - ASORED

Cerro Azul's little birds of a quarter together with the company Tronex

changed the "rubber slings" for colored pencils, cameras and binoculars to protect the birds
Capacity building and experience sharing for community governance
Lessons learned

It is necessary to work day by day in the commitment of the local population in the tourism initiative.

A common basis of understanding about tourism contributes to social cohesion and the fair distribution of benefits.

- Formalization and training is crucial as it allows access to financing and other support mechanisms.

- The articulation of the actors that are part of the tourism value chain is essential for these models to be successful.

- The community approach is fundamental, as it allows for the sustainability of the process based on collective construction.
Thank you

@cerroazulpuertadelchiribiquete
San José del Guaviare, Colombia
Adam Thalhath

Sustainability Manager & Community Outreach Manager
Six Senses Laamu, Maldives

Shaha Hashim

Chairperson
Maldives Resilient Reefs
Maldives Programme Manager
Blue Marine Foundation
To help people reconnect with themselves, others and the world around them.
This is our *HOW*: how we deliver on our promise of our name and reawaken your senses through Emotional Hospitality, Crafted Experiences, Pioneering Wellness, Local Sensitivity & Global Sensibility, Responsible & Caring, and Fun & Quirky manner.
Responsible & Caring

Caring for hosts and local communities.
Committed to preserving the environment and sustainable operations.
Our Community

Six Senses Laamu engages the talent of local Maldivians, many of who are from the vicinity of the resort. Additionally, fresh produce such as local fish, fruit and vegetables, and services are from the surrounding area, thereby benefiting the local economy and communities.

57% Maldivian hosts
79% Laamu Atoll hosts
19% Expenditure for Laamu Atoll

Sustainability Fund

Our sustainability fund comprises 0.5 percent of revenues, 100 percent soft toy sales and donations, and 50 percent of house-bottled water sales. It is available to fund projects that benefit local communities and ecosystems where by any resident of Laamu can apply for funding for a project which aids in sustainable development and/or marine conservation.

69% Invested in Local project in 2021
18,573 residents access to clean water
RESPONSIBLE & CARING

Eku Eky (Together)

Eku Eky, meaning ‘together’ in the local language of Dhivehi, is an initiative that began, in 2016, with local stakeholders to make the community inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. Each meeting brings together Island Councils, Women’s Development Committees, schools, police stations, and active local NGOs.

45 stakeholders

18,573 residents are represented

Laamafaru Festival

Laamafaru Festival is an annual event held in Laamu Atoll, Maldives, since 2016, to raise awareness about the environment and cultural heritage conservation. It is a community driven festival where young and old come together to celebrate the marine ecosystems of Laamu Atoll.

11 Local islands

3,597 Local students
Restoring coral reefs in the Maldives as climate resilient ecosystems for the benefit of people, nature and the economies that depend on them

6 years of partnership
These areas cover 2,678 hectares of Laamu Atoll’s most critical habitats.
Community support and buy-in is essential for the success of Marine Protected Areas.

30 Laamaseelu Farudhun trained

07 Fisheries Officers trained

321 resource-use interviews conducted
Supporting fisheries co-management to maximise benefits for fishermen while ensuring the sustainability of fisheries.

- 14 fishermen signed up to the ‘Laamaseelu Masveriyaa’ Code of Conduct
- 458 Fish landing recorded
- 32 fishers participated in Laamu Fisheries Forum 2021
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