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ABSTRACT

Tourism in the South Luangwa National Park (SLNP), Zambia is growing. Left unmanaged there may be irreversible negative consequences; voluntary certification could be a solution to this. Through consultation with stakeholders at all levels of the area’s photographic safari industry, tourism practice in the SLNP was assessed, as was the potential for establishing a certification scheme for the area. The challenges of establishing such a scheme were also analysed and recommendations were made with regard to future options.

It was found that, despite current lack of effectively enforced regulation, tourism practice in the area was generally deemed to be of a high ethical and environmental standard, although all stakeholder groups recognised that there was room for improvement. However there were differences of opinion as to which of these improvements were most important and how they might be achieved.

The suggestion of developing a certification scheme for the area was met with mixed feelings by different stakeholder groups. Although its potential, both as a mechanism for improving practice and for marketing were recognised, other factors such as: demand, reliability, cost, policing and standardisation, made it less appealing to tour and safari operators, yet tourists were more welcoming of the idea. There was however a current lack of awareness among tourists of tourism certification schemes. The importance of trust and reliability were seen to be key to tourists’ decision-making. The process of establishing a certification scheme appears to be a challenging one, factors such as: politics, interpersonal relationships and lack of current policy were stopping safari companies from operating as they would like and therefore could threaten the success and effectiveness of certification.

The findings were compared with the literature and an attempt was made to offer suggestions to address these challenges and make recommendations for future progress. It was concluded that further consultation and investigation into the options for regulation were required, and that any attempt at certification should adopt a participatory approach so as not to destroy the local sense of responsibility.

Key words: Responsible, Tourism, Eco-tourism, Certification, Eco-labels, Luangwa, Zambia
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Tourism in Zambia’s South Luangwa National Park (SLNP) is growing, left unregulated it could have an irreversible negative impact on the park, its wildlife, people and tourism industry. One mechanism which has the potential to regulate tourism is that of voluntary certification (Font & Buckley 2001, Honey 2002). The aim of this study was to examine the feasibility and potential value of certifying responsible tourism practice in the SLNP. By seeking the views of stakeholders involved in the photographic safari industry in the area I attempted to investigate the possibility of setting up a tourism certification scheme. Below is a conceptual framework with an introduction to responsible tourism certification.

1.2 Responsible Tourism

Although no one definition exists, ‘responsible tourism’ can be described as tourism which is “practised by tourists who make responsible choices when choosing their holidays, such as minimizing their environmental and social impacts and ensuring their activities benefit local people” (Roe 2006). It grew from the concept of ‘eco-tourism’, definitions of which also differ dramatically (see Goodwin 1996, Fennell 1999, Diamantis & Westlake 2001), but should emphasize the ecological significance of a destination and thus provide guidance to tourists as to appropriate conduct. It also imparts the impression that a provider of travel services is ‘ecologically committed’ (Goodwin 1996, Fennell 1999, Roe 2006). There is an overlap with other terms such as ‘sustainable tourism’ and ‘fair trade tourism’, and although the term ‘responsible tourism’ was used in this study and during research, it is important to note that in the text these terms have been used interchangeably (although ‘responsible tourism’ is preferred). The key concept is that all these terms refer to the triple bottom line of environmental, social and economic sustainability.

Such nature-based tourism can provide a significant contribution to environmental protection as well as socio-economic development, but through its own activity can also result in high levels of resource consumption, pollution and waste (Roe et al.
1997, Fennell 1999, Buckley 2004); yet many types of tourism, including photographic safaris, depend on ‘pristine environments’ to attract tourists. It therefore makes good business sense for the tourism industry to operate in an environmentally and socially sound way (Font & Buckley 2001).

Characteristics of responsible tourism are:

1. minimizes negative economic, environmental, and social impacts
2. generates greater economic benefits for local people and enhances the well-being of host communities, improves working conditions and access to the industry;
3. involves local people in decisions that affect their lives and life chances;
4. makes positive contributions to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, to the maintenance of the world’s diversity;
5. provides more enjoyable experiences for tourists through more meaningful connections with local people, and a greater understanding of local cultural, social and environmental issues;
6. provides access for physically challenged people; and
7. is culturally sensitive, engenders respect between tourists and hosts, and builds local pride and confidence.

(from Goodwin 2005 source: Cape Town Declaration)

1.3 Certification

1.3.1 Tourism Certification

Certification is the procedure by which an awarding body gives written assurance and awards a logo to signify that a product, process, service, or management system conforms to specified requirements (Synergy 2000, Epler Wood & Halpenny 2001, Font & Buckley 2001, Honey 2002, Rainforest Alliance 2003). In tourism, certification is used primarily to check on the activities and standards to ensure consumer safety and satisfaction. The key components of certification include:

- Voluntary participation by businesses.
- Well defined criteria and standards.
- A process of auditing and assessment.
- Recognition of those who meet the criteria, through a label or logo.
- Follow up, in due course, to check continued compliance

(From UNEP 2006)
While certification programmes designed to measure tourism quality, service and
cost are more than a century old, the extension of their use to cover sustainability
issues is more recent (such programmes may also be referred to as awards or
schemes in future in the text) (Font & Buckley 2001, Toth 2002, Rainforest Alliance
2003).

Since the 1990s over 250 voluntary initiatives in tourism have been documented,
which include codes of conduct, awards, benchmarking, best practices, eco-labelling
and certification programmes (see Synergy 2000, Font & Buckley 2001, Honey
2002, Leader-Williams 2002, Rainforest Alliance 2003). These range from local
initiatives, through to state, national and global schemes. However, because tourism
is such a multi-faceted industry, certification programmes face complex challenges,
most schemes, to date, have focused on the easiest component - accommodation
(Buckley & Font 2001, Leader-Williams 2002).

A key distinction in these newer ‘green’ certification programmes is whether the
programme uses process-based or performance-based methodologies (see
Appendix 7). The former use management systems, while the latter use
benchmarks. Increasingly, certification programmes are moving towards
performance-based methodologies, as these focus on what a business does with
regard to various environmental, socio-cultural and economic issues. Also, the
tourism industry is characterized by small firms that cannot easily apply process-
based systems, which are often costly, time-consuming and require outside
Rainforest Alliance 2003). Many of the best-known certification programmes in
ecotourism are performance-based, although a number of programmes combine
process and performance criteria (Font & Buckley 2001, Honey 2002).

1.3.2 Why Certify?

The recent interest in the certification of tourism enterprises emerged as a result of
Agenda 21\(^1\), which emphasized the need for businesses to comply with

\(^1\) is a comprehensive plan of action covering human impacts on the environment. It was revealed at the
environmental regulations and policies to mitigate global sustainability problems (Honey 2002, Goodwin 2005). Certification in tourism can act as an incentive to encourage businesses to achieve significant improvements in their environmental and social performance and has the potential to ensure that the tourism industry is held accountable. As tourists (especially from North America and Europe) are becoming increasingly socially and environmentally conscious, and want to believe that their travel will not damage the destinations they visit (Wight 1994, Buckley & Font 2001, Diamantis & Westlake 2001), it is also argued that certification can provide potential marketing benefits to those firms that meet the standards and that credible awards promote sustainable consumption patterns by providing concise and accurate information to consumers to help them identify those products and services which incorporate a good level of environmental and social performance (Synergy 2000, Font & Buckley 2001, Honey 2002, Rainforest Alliance 2003).

1.3.3 Tourism Certification in Developing Countries

Currently tourism award schemes tend to be concentrated in Europe, with a handful in other geographical regions, including the Certification for Sustainable Tourism (CST) in Costa Rica, and the Nature and the Ecotourism Accreditation Programme (NEAP) in Australia (Buckley & Font 2001, Honey 2002, Rainforest Alliance 2003). However developing countries could “soon follow suit in an attempt to protect their natural capital through improving environmental standards and marketing their services to high spending, environmentally conscious western tourists” (Sasidharan et al. 2002). While some question the role certification has to play in responsible tourism (Goodwin 2005), others have expressed concern that the small-scale tourism enterprises of developing countries would be ill-equipped to conform to the environmental standards and criteria circumscribed by international schemes originating in developed nations (Sasidharan & Font 2001, Sasidharan et al. 2002). Yet issues have also been raised over the way standards are currently set by some schemes in developing countries (Sasidharan & Font 2001, Font & Harris 2004). There is currently no tourism certification programme in Zambia, nor one that covers the African continent, although several African countries, most notably Kenya and South Africa, have established tourism certification programmes in recent years, including Ecotourism Society of Kenya (ESOK 2007) and Fair Trade Tourism South Africa (FTTSA 2007).
2. STUDY SITE

This chapter provides background information on the study site; it gives an overview of the conservation effort and tourism in Zambia as well as in the South Luangwa, it also sets out the aims and objectives of the study.

2.1 Zambia


Map 1 Map of Zambia’s location in Africa and of its 19 National Parks
2.1.1 Wildlife Conservation in Zambia

Despite this poverty, Zambia still has a rich and diverse wealth of natural resources, with an elaborate protected areas system and over 41.4% of the country protected under IUCN Categories (Earth Trends 2003). Of these 19 are National Parks\(^2\) (Map.1) which fall under the administration of the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) – a parastatal which comes under the umbrella of the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR) – the government body responsible for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (see Appendix 4 for more details). The conservation strategy of the country has changed somewhat from that of a traditional, protectionist approach in the colonial era, to a more integrated one with the inception in the late 1980 of such programmes as the national Administrative Management Design (ADMADE) programme and the Luangwa Integrated Rural Development Project (LIRDP).

2.1.2 Tourism in Zambia

Tourism is a valuable growth industry in Zambia’s economy. In 2004 Zambia received 515,000 international arrivals and collected US$161 million in international tourist receipts (World Economic Forum 2007). It was estimated that the travel and tourism economy in Zambia generated US$334 million in total in 2006 and provided 51,000 jobs (4.1% of GDP and 3.8 % of jobs), this is expected to grow at between 0.8 and 2.2% per year (World Economic Forum 2007). In 1996 the government reclassified tourism from the social to the economic sector due to its potential to contribute to economic development. The current government plans to continue to open up new areas to tourism wherever there is potential (State House 2006). A large proportion of tourists come to Zambia to enjoy its wildlife and wilderness areas; parks most visited include Mosi-a-tunya (Victoria Falls), Lower Zambezi, Kafue and the South Luangwa (ZNTB 2007). Tourism issues in the country fall under the MTENR and marketing of the country is done by the Zambian National Tourism Board (ZNTB) (see Appendix 4). According to a recent comparison of marketing and branding strategies of several African countries, Zambia’s approach emphasizes a positioning mix of “sincerity and to some extent sophistication, which reflects its overall tourism offering” (Pitt et al. 2006).

\(^2\) formerly Game Reserves until in 1971. They hold category II IUCN status
2.2 The South Luangwa National Park

The South Luangwa National Park (SLNP) is one of 4 National Parks situated within the Luangwa Valley in the Eastern Province of Zambia (Map. 1). With the surrounding 9 Game Management Areas\(^3\) (GMAs) it forms an uninterrupted ecosystem (Astle 1999, ZAWA 1999). The country’s second largest National Park, it covers an area of 9,050km\(^2\); the unique walking opportunities, its exceptional scenic beauty and renowned concentration of large mammals, have helped establish it as a prime tourist destination (Leader-Williams et al. 1990, Butler 1996, Astle 1999, ZAWA 1999). The climate is hot and dry, with an average rainfall of between 700-900mm per year, which falls from November to March (Astle 1999).

Map 2 Vision of Tourism in South Luangwa Nation Park. Tourist Areas & Planned Distribution of Loges & Camps  
(source: Zimba 2006)

\(^3\) formerly Controlled Areas until 1971. They hold category VI IUCN status
2.2.1 Conservation & the Community in the South Luangwa

No human habitation is permitted in the SLNP (ZAWA 1998), however the neighbouring GMA buffer zones support low-density human populations of subsistence cultivators and hunters (Leader-Williams et al. 1990, Marks 2001). These GMAs have become key in generating benefits through photographic and hunting safaris (Astle 1999, Dalal-Clayton & Child 2003). From the very onset, part of the revenue from these activities went directly to the local chiefdom authority (Astle 1999), yet human-wildlife conflicts still remain a major issue, despite a series of programmes and attempts made to alleviate them over the years (Marks 2001, Osborn & Parker 2002, Dalal-Clayton & Child 2003). It is only in the past decade, as tourism has taken off, that development has started to take place in these GMAs, yet its people still remain relatively disadvantaged (Butler 1996, Mvula 2001, Dalal-Clayton & Child 2003, Zimba 2006). Traditional conservation efforts of the 1970s and 1980s were criticised for alienating local people (Gibson & Marks 1995, Astle 1999, Marks 2001), and so there has been a shift from this earlier protectionist approach. Although law-enforcement still plays a key role, attempts have been made to gradually devolve responsibility for wildlife in GMAs to landholders who are encouraged to use it profitably. As a result the Luangwa Integrated Rural Development Programme (LIRDP) – now South Luangwa Area Management Unit (SLAMU) – was established in 1986, which is now the responsibility of ZAWA. Today tourism is the major employer in the area.

2.2.2 Tourism in the South Luangwa

History

In 1949 the first tourist camp was opened by the government, with the agreement of the then chief (Astle 1999). Subsequent tourism infrastructure development took place and more government camps were built in the 1950s. In 1961 ‘walking safaris’, for which the park is now best known, were started by Norman Carr, whose writings helped the Luangwa quickly acquire an international reputation for high quality safaris (Astle 1999). In 1980’s the government encouraged private investment in tourism, and several of the government run camps and lodges became privately owned. Today all lodges and camps are privately owned,
although, inside the park, the land they are situated on is still leased from the government by the operators.

**Visitor Experience**

SLNP is, relatively, the most developed park in the entire Zambian park system and as such has the most elaborate network of tracks and roads, localized around the ‘Mfuwe area’ (see Map 2) (ZAWA 1999). At present only approximately 5% of the whole park is being utilized for game viewing (ZAWA 1999), with the majority of tourist use restricted to this small Mfuwe area (see Map 2). Due to the tendency for flooding, and without adequate all-weather infrastructure much use is extremely seasonal, many camps only being open for five months out of each year (June to November). Game viewing from vehicles is restricted to designated tracks, with night drives and walking the only major activities presently permitted in the park (Astle 1999, ZAWA 1999). Access by road is challenging, so most tourists arrive by plane.

**The Safari Industry Today**

The number of tourist properties in and around the SLNP totals about\(^4\) 40, which, during peak season (June to November) offer in the region of 500 beds; approximately half being inside the park, and half outside (see Table 8). Accommodation varies from 30 to 40 bed, permanent lodges (of which there are three inside the park) to six to eight bed temporary bush camps, which are open for five months of the year (of which there are about 17 inside the park). Accommodation outside the park ranges from camping, to community owned accommodation, and 20 bed lodges. These properties are run by about 20 different companies, largely owned by white Zambians or expatriates, although in the past three years several locals, from Mfuwe, have opened properties. There are however currently only two community-based tourism ventures. The tourism industry in Luangwa in therefore dominated by small, owner-operated businesses, although this has changed somewhat in the past few years with two larger, multi-national safari companies investing in the area.

\(^4\) at the time of research a number of camps and lodges were being built, had closed for refurbishment, had changed ownership or were not fully functional for other reasons and so not open to receive tourists.
Tourist numbers to the SLNP and the revenue they generate have increased steadily over the years (Table 1) partly due to the government's policy of opening up investments in Zambia’s National Parks (ZAWA 1999). The government hopes that tourism will continue to grow, both inside and outside the park, and more camps and lodges are opening each year. The park's draft tourism plans (ZAWA 1999) calls for the Mfuwe area to be used for “mass tourism”, while smaller scale tourism (mainly seasonal bushcamps) should be conducted in other areas of the park (see Map.2). It can be seen from Table 1 that the majority of visitors are international, a large proportion coming from the UK and USA, many of whom book their safari through travel agents and tour operators based abroad in the home country (Mvula 2001, pers. coms with several safari operators 2007). Other stakeholders involved in the SLNP safari industry are introduced in greater detail in Appendix 4, a brief overview is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOURIST ARRIVALS</th>
<th>BEDNIGHTS</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12,776</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>16,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>18,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13,484</td>
<td>6,124</td>
<td>19,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13,877</td>
<td>6,063</td>
<td>19,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17,853</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>23,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19,484</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>25,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20,079</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>25,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Tourist Arrivals, Bednights & Revenue from SLNP from 2000 to 2006
(source: SLAMU Commercial Section)

ZAWA is responsible, for collecting park and lease fees, and, along with the Environmental Council of Zambia (ECZ), for monitoring of safari operators’ conduct, while ZAWA’s conservation and community efforts, through SLAMU, are assisted by several NGOs; namely South Luangwa Conservation Society (SLCS), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), the Chipembele Wildlife Education Trust and Sensitisation and Education through Kunda Arts (SEKA). Their research efforts are supported by several external research organizations including African Wilddog Conservation Zambia (AWDC) and WCS. Safari operators’ affairs are brought to the government’s attention by their representation in the Luangwa Safari Association
(LSA). Despite these NGOs and relevant government organisations being present in the area, there is currently no single independent body, locally or nationally, that oversees responsible tourism practice.

2.3 Aims & Objectives

The aim of this study was, through consultation with stakeholders, to assess the status of responsible tourism in the South Luangwa and investigate the option of certification as a means by which to improve its practice. However during the course of research it became clear that this was too broad and complex a topic to address in the allotted timeframe and with limited resources. Although these issues form part of the dissertation, it was found to be more important and of greater interest to look at the issues and challenges faced by safari operators attempting to conduct their businesses in a responsible way and in developing an award scheme.

In conducting research I hoped to answer the following questions:

- What is the current status of responsible tourism practice in the area?
- What are the main issues relating to the improvement of responsible tourism practice?
- What are the current perceptions of stakeholders on certification?
- How might certification contribute to improvements in practice?
- What are the challenges facing more responsible practice?
- What are the challenges facing setting up a certification scheme?

Study Objectives:

1. To examine the status of responsible tourism in and around the SLNP.
2. To examine stakeholder perceptions of tourism practice and certification.
3. To explore the potential for a certification scheme.
4. To identify the challenges facing responsible tourism practice and the development of a tourism certification scheme.
3. METHODS

This chapter outlines the methods used during the study; how data was collected and analysed, as well as its limitations.

3.1 Data Collection

As I wished to explore a broad question, a flexible, multi-method approach was adopted. I used a case study approach, consulting with different stakeholder groups (Feagin et al. 1991). By using this approach I hoped to “seek something sensible about a complex, poorly controlled and generally messy situation” (Robson 2002). Research was conducted over an eight week period from April to July 2007 in the UK, South Africa and Zambia. Most data collected were qualitative.

A multi-stakeholder approach was adopted. Different stakeholders groups were consulted using different approaches. In order to obtain reliable data, which was transparent and could be cross-checked, my research design incorporates forms of triangulation for some stakeholder groups, including; within-subject triangulation and between-subject triangulation.

Research in the UK was desk-based; including phone interviews, internet and library searches. Research in South Africa took place over a five day period at the Indaba in Durban – the largest annual African Tourism Trade Fair. Online questionnaires were distributed over an eight week period from June to mid July. And finally fieldwork took place over a four week period in the study area - within the SLNP and its surrounding GMAs - in May and June. Informants were drawn from stakeholders at different levels of the supply chain of the South Luangwa photographic tourism industry.

3.1.1 Document Review

A literature review was carried out prior to fieldwork in order to provide a framework and background to the study. Other documents were gathered in the field following consultation with stakeholders. Documents from other certification schemes were also reviewed, along with academic literature and relevant policy papers.
3.1.2 Interviews

Interviews formed the main and most in-depth source of data. Representatives from all groups were interviewed by me, in English (see Appendices 4 and 5 for stakeholder groups consulted). Interviews were transcribed into a notebook before being inputted into a computer. In the initial design it was hope that interviews would also be recorded by dictaphone, however this proved impractical or unpopular with informants and so was quickly abandoned, it was only used in one group interview. Interviews were introduced giving an overview to the nature of the research and that the questions were only a guide and respondents were free to introduce any additional relevant information they wished. Interviewees were also assured that all they said would be kept anonymous.

3.1.2.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Informants from two stakeholder groups – tour operators and safari operators – were interviewed using a checklist of topics that were ‘probed’ (see Appendix 1).

Tour Operators (outbound)

Five semi-structured, in-depth phone interviews were conducted with either the Managing Director and/or the person in charge of responsible tourism practice (in three cases these were the same person) of four small ‘Africa specialist’, UK-based tour operators. Initially twenty companies were contacted by email, and asked for their willingness to participate in phone interviews, but only seven replied. Of these it was only possible to interview four, due to the time constraints of the informants. All operators contacted sold trips to Zambia and the South Luangwa and all those that were interviewed were members of the AITO Responsible Tourism scheme5. Interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour.

Safari Operators (inbound)

Twelve semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted with either the Managing Director and/or the person in charge of responsible tourism practice (in three cases these were the same person) of ten photographic safari operations

5 http://www.aito.co.uk/corporate_Responsible-Tourism.asp [accessed 04.05.07] (also see Goodwin 2005)
based in or around SLNP. All safari operators in the area were contacted by email and/or phone, but it was only possible to meet with ten due to time and logistical constraints on both sides. Most interviews were conducted on site of one of the operators’ properties and combined with tours of that property. The rest were held at Indaba in South Africa. Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 1½ hours. Safari operators were also asked to complete a form regarding their thoughts on responsible tourism practice in the area (see Appendix 2). Any further information was sent by email.

Other Stakeholders

Informants from two stakeholder groups – ZAWA and local conservation NGOs – were interviewed on the topics of responsible tourism in Zambia and SLNP as well as certification, loosely based around relevant questions set out in Appendix 1. Two in-depth interviews were conducted with two informants from ZAWA and five with informants from conservation NGOs involved with the SLNP and/or certification. Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour.

3.1.2.2 Unstructured Interviews

When the opportunity arose short informal interviews were conducted with various informants from the local tourism community, including tourists, guides, lodge/camp staff, researchers and ZAWA scouts. Interviews lasted between 5 minutes and 1 hour.

3.1.2.3 Group Interviews

Two groups interviews were held. Both these opportunities arose during the course of arranging interviews with other informants. One was with three members of various government organisations involved with tourism, including ZAWA and the MTENR. This was held in South Africa and lasted 45 minutes. Another opportunity arose to hold a group interview with three representatives from a multi-stakeholder working group, made up of representatives from ZAWA, SLCS, LSA and Chipembele Wildlife Education Trust, that had been set up to discuss the possibility of establishing a “SLNP eco-award scheme” for operators in the area, this provided
more useful information and the opportunity for a multi-stakeholder consensus to be ascertained. This interview was held just outside SLNP and lasted 1½ hours.

3.1.2.4 Interview Limitations

- Time permitting, conducting interviews with more informants from each stakeholder group, especially tour operators, would have helped in triangulation and reduced potential biases.
- It would have been beneficial in hindsight to have interviewed tour operators from other countries, especially the USA, and not just from the UK.
- Interviews with all safari operators in the area, especially those not members of the Luangwa Safari Association, would have allowed for a more representative opinion to have been gained.
- It was not possible to speak with a representative from the Zambia National Tourism Board (ZNTB) individually, only in a group interview. Also, no representative from the Environmental Council of Zambia (ECZ) was interviewed. Interviews with them might have given an insight into these organisations.
- There may have been some other sampling bias, in that all those informants who agreed to an interview were interested in, and therefore more likely to, practice responsible tourism.
- Deference from respondents for a similar reason should not be overlooked, although I felt that informants were on the whole honest in their responses.

3.1.3 Online Questionnaire

An online questionnaire was designed for tourists using the online software BOS (see Appendix 3 for questionnaire layout). This survey was sent out to tourists following a piloting trial, where eight people who had recently visited the SLNP completed the survey. Following this the survey was slightly modified, before being sent to past visitors to the SLNP. Tourists were asked to complete the survey by sending out the web-link of the questionnaire in the following ways:

- emails sent to previous tourists on safari operator and NGO email databases

https://www.survey.bris.ac.uk
• posted on travel chatrooms by tourists who had previously completed the questionnaire
• mentioned to tourists the researcher met

The survey was designed to investigate tourists’ knowledge, attitudes and practice (KAP) (Foddy 1995) with regard to responsible tourism and certification. The questionnaire contained a mix of closed and open questions in order to gain both quantitative and more in-depth qualitative data. A total of 134 questionnaires were completed over an eight week period.

3.1.3.1 Questionnaire Limitations

• Obtaining more completed questionnaires would have allowed for more in-depth, statistical analysis.
• Additional distribution of a paper version of the questionnaire, would have overcome the problems an online survey has in restricting respondents to only those who have access to the internet.
• No Zambians answered the survey, their opinions might have proved valuable, although it is likely that any certification scheme would be aimed more towards international, not local tourists.
• I would have liked to have changed some of the questions making them more quantitative, so as to allow easier analysis, but this would have involved more extensive piloting.
• There might have been some bias in sampling, due to the methods that allowed the survey to be distributed, for example; it was clear that some properties had been visited far more by respondents than others (see Appendix 6).

3.1.4 Participant Observation

Participant observation was used to gain a high quality insight into this complex situation (Robson 2002, Bernard 2006). During the time in the field, I stayed at one safari lodge and one bush camp inside the SLNP, I also visited many others and spent time in the town of Mfuwe. In so doing I was able to integrate with the numerous stakeholder groups that make up the ‘safari community’ in the South
Luangwa and informally mix with them, thus allowing me to collect data at the same time. Observations were recorded in a notebook that was always carried around.

3.2 Data Processing & Analysis

3.2.1 Interviews

Grounded theory was used for analysis of all interviews. The text was coded for the presence of themes and converted into nominal variables. Open coding was used to process interviews, through the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorising data (Strauss & Corbin 1998, Bernard 2002, Robson 2002). The variables identified in open coding were ranked in terms of the number of times that they were mentioned. Items mentioned repeatedly in the interviews by the majority of informants represented common issues, while additional items mentioned fewer times reflected isolated issues. Codes were used to develop concepts and investigate ideas through an iterative process. In addition notable quotations from respondents were highlighted after transcription and used in conceptual development and for later use to summarise findings (Bernard 2002).

3.2.2 Online Questionnaire

Questionnaire responses were downloaded for the BOS website and those answers that were not already coded by the software were assigned a numerical value. Answers to open ended questions were grouped into categories and assigned numerical values. Data were then inputted into the statistical software package SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) establishing a database which could then be used to obtain statistically data. (Appendix 6 shows socio-economic data from the tourist survey, other key results are can be found in Chapters 4 and 5)

3.2.3 Participant Observation

Observational data were continually reviewed during the course of data collection to amend research techniques and assist in the development of concepts and theories.
3.3 Study Limitations

• Time was a major limiting factor and it was not possible to fully investigate all the issues originally planned.

• Although one of the initial aims of the project was to gather baseline data on the current practices of each lodge, it was felt that the data collected did not give a fair representation of the true picture, as, when asked, safari operators only mentioned the immediate practices they could think of, and not all of them.

• It was not possible either to collect this data accurately with a checklist during field visits, as had been planned, because it was felt that this approach would not have been welcomed by many safari operators and would have hindered other data collection.

• One stakeholder group that had not been covered adequately was the local community; their feelings on the social aspect and practices of safari operators would have been interesting to learn, especially from those not directly involved with tourism, although the role they would play in the development of a certification scheme is unclear.

• The use of a dictaphone, would have reduced interviewer and recording bias, but as already mentioned this was found to be either unpopular or impractical by most informants, and so abandoned.

• The safari operators consulted tended to be from larger, more established companies that were considered to be more responsible, and the tour operators who were asked tended to use these more 'top-end' lodges – these informants seemed more willing to assist with research. Access to a wider range of informants associated with smaller companies would have reduced any bias this might have caused.

• On the whole people seemed very open and honest in their responses and what I was told tended to be backed up by what I saw, or was told to me by other informants, although issues of deference should still be considered.
4. CURRENT TOURISM PRACTICE IN THE SOUTH LUANGWA

This chapter presents findings on responsible tourism in SLNP, the extent to which it is practiced, the areas where it might be improved and the challenges faced, as identified by respondents who were interviewed or completed questionnaires. This information is presented so as to provide a contemporary view of the current state of responsible tourism in and around the park.

4.1 Stakeholder Perspectives on Responsible & Eco Tourism

Most stakeholders questioned had some basic understanding of the concept of the term ‘responsible tourism’. Tourists tended to emphasise its environmental element over the socio-cultural/economic ones. When asked what the term ‘responsible tourism’ meant, 83.6% of tourists (n=134) mentioned something relating to environmental awareness, while only 64.2% mentioned something involving socio-cultural/economic issues. Only 6.7% of tourists and one safari operator had no understanding of the term.

Several safari and tour operators claimed that they preferred the term “responsible” to “eco” tourism or other similar terms, as it was broader. One tour operator claimed it “encompasses the idea of respect for social, environmental and animal welfare issues.” Another stated; “I do not like the word eco-tourism as it implies that only the environment is important.”

The term was however condemned by some safari operators for being a “buzzword”, while other concerns were summed up by a tourist who said “I like the idea of it, but so often the phrase responsible tourism is hijacked and used as a marketing tool.”

4.2 The South Luangwa in Comparison with Other Tourist Destinations

In general, it was thought that, compared with other tourist destinations in Zambia and Africa, the operators in the SLNP are committed to, and are practicing, tourism to a high ethical and environmentally responsible level. Indeed all safari operators
interviewed seemed passionate about the area and its conservation, although they each emphasised different issues as being important to them when asked during interviews (see section 4.4).

Much was being done by the safari operators, environmentally, socially and economically, to address the issues of sustainability (see Figs 1 and 2). Most operators claimed to operate within the park regulations and attempted to support conservation, mostly through the South Luangwa Conservation Society (SLCS). Most claimed they tried to reduce the extent to which their activities polluted the environment, although disposal of waste, both inside and outside the park, was highlighted as a major concern by almost all operators. Several stated they had recently become aware of the issues associated with carbon emissions, and some were addressing this, and local deforestation, through tree planting projects. Most operators were found to try, where possible, to employ local staff, except where there were skills shortages. Staff capacity-building was of key importance to a number of operations and almost all supported a local school in some way. Many attempted to support local farmers, although quality and reliability of produce were claimed to make this hard. It appeared that most realised their social responsibility as employers in the area, indeed all those that were members of the Luangwa Safari Association supported the local Kakumbi clinic, by paying for a western doctor and several subscribed to HIV and AIDS awareness programmes for their staff, often also paying for treatment.

Although some tourists claimed to have had bad experiences whilst visiting the SLNP, especially with regard to the “crowding” of animals at sightings in the Mfuwe area, on the whole tourists seemed to agree with other stakeholders – that in general tourism practice in SLNP is fairly well conducted - with 10.5% of tourists (n=134) even claiming that nothing more needed to be done in the future. Indeed one tourist stated:

“I have been going to South Luangwa for about 12 years, often going as many times as four times a year. I have seen an increase of eco-friendly tourism and a greater awareness of not intruding on animals even if it means unhappy customers.”

The general consensus from speaking with informants from government organisations was the same, “from ZAWA’s point of view it [SLNP] is better
developed than others from a tourism point of view. It is at the level others must be
... the South Luangwa is a success story, it is a good example for other parks.”
Another later added “most [safari operators] are about eight to ten out of ten, with
generally good intentions…”

UK-based tour operators seemed to offer the most praise, with all five questioned
having positive things to say about SLNP and its operators. One summed up their
sentiments when saying “…on the face of it, SLNP is more responsible than
elsewhere that I can think of. Due to the nature of what they do …. The way that
safaris operate, that walking is emphasised, so that you look at everything and not
just the big five – it is a holistic wildlife experience…” another adding that SLNP “…
is an incredible example of a common goal, with competitors working together. They
all have local community efforts, and there are business reasons for that as well as
for charity … it makes massive sense. Historical and geographic factors have led to
this. The fact that not all camps can be open for more than six months means that
they have to be able to be taken down and have minimal environmental impact. It
comes though in game drives and their guides’ training… Working together, there is
a shared good practice, which gets more things done.”

All safari operators interviewed felt that on the whole they operated relatively well
and that SLNP was “more responsible” than other parks in Zambia. Even one
operator deemed by the others as being relatively irresponsible, realised that “it is
our responsibility to entertain tourists and look after natural resources and stop
Zambians raping nature. If nothing is left, then tourists will not want to come here.”

At least one informant from each stakeholder group noted that this apparent
success was due to the vision of Norman Carr, who “started it all. It is not something
that is new. It has matured”… “right from the [19]50s Norman Carr was saying that
the local people need to benefit.”

Despite some criticisms from NGOs of both ZAWA and safari operators, most
seemed to feel that “ZAWA is better here [SLNP]… there is more respect here than
anywhere else…they are more open minded here – especially several of the
lodges.”
However, not all informants shared this general feeling, and many felt strongly that there was still much room for improvement. This was strongly expressed by informants from NGOs. As one put it:

“I think they [safari operators] do well with all these school projects and at the same time trying to run a business, but I hate all these wooden decks – that could be improved upon. And many are still using wood burning boilers….there should be more tree planting, especially when building new lodges, but I understand it is hard.”

One NGO representative felt even more strongly, saying:

"Eco-tourism is a state of mind, a conscious decision to impact as lightly as possible on the environment. I assert that there's not much eco-tourism in this area!!"

It became clear from talking with informants in the area that, although most operators did make conscious attempts to “impact lightly” there were areas where all could improve upon (see section 4.4), and it was claimed that responsible behaviour was not practiced by all operators equally. It was suggested, by more than one informant, that two or three operators were considered not to be making enough of an attempt to operate in a responsible and ethical manner. This was aggravated by the fact that, again, two or three did not share this “common goal” or were not willing to work together.

4.3 Lack of Enforced Regulations

This good practice came despite an apparent lack of any serious enforced regulation of the safari industry. Although it was claimed that there are presently environmental and employment laws, policies and codes of conduct, that apply to safari operations in the area, no one document covered them all, and during interviews there was found to be much confusion by informants from both the government and safari operators as to which current regulations applied and how. This may have been due to a complete lack of any formal regulation in the past and current regulation only slowly being recognised. Some regulations, covering different elements of safari operation, that were mentioned in interviews included:
• **Environmental Council of Zambia Regulations**, including; the Environmental Protection and Pollution Control Act (Government of Zambia 1990).

• **Zambia Wildlife Authority Regulations**, including; the ZAWA Wildlife Act (ZAWA 1998), Procedures and Guidelines for Allocating Lodge sites in Zambia’s Wildlife Protected Areas (ZAWA 2007), ZAWA Park Regulations and Individual Lease Agreements.

• **National Labour and Employment Laws**

• **Luangwa Safari Association Regulations**, including; Constitution and Rules (LSA 1999) and Guides’ Code of Conduct.

One ZAWA official claimed that “there are currently conditions as ZAWA and ECZ that we monitor”, but added “park regulations are only a guide… and the concession agreement is very broad…” However general consensus amongst safari operators was that neither organisation was effective in its monitoring, as one put it, “there is legislation there, but it is not enforced.” Several safari operators added comments backing-up the lack of regulations currently imposed by the authorities on them, one claiming “we [safari operators] also tend to get left alone by the authorities.”

On top of this, there was found to currently be no effective policy in use that covers broader tourism or development planning issues either in or outside the park. Although there is a draft management plan for park (ZAWA 1999), a new version of which several ZAWA informants confirmed was being ratified to come into effect “later” in 2007, it is currently only still a draft and therefore not effectively implemented. Outside the park there is also no land-use plan. One ZAWA informant noted that this problem is compounded by the fact that “there is no control in the GMAs for ZAWA.” This lack of policy was seen by most safari operators as being responsible for many problems:

“Much of the problems stem from a lack of policy…. When running a business is the primary concern, you have other things to think about as well… But the land-use plans for outside the park, for each GMA have never been drawn up – it involves the traditional council and local leaders. It is outside the park that we need to address.”

another safari operators added:
“A land use plan is needed – but the chief vetos it. The area is becoming a magnet – the population is undergoing a huge expansion, with new stores etc. What will happen in the next 10 years?”

Current land-use practice does not favour the local community becoming involved more in tourism either. One NGO informant who had been involved in setting up one of the two community tourism projects in the area told me “with our bush camp experience I can see why no community has ever owned a safari camp. The system currently works against them, but I have been told that the Ministry is trying to address this.” This was confirmed by a government official who informed me that “the government is attempting to create facilities so that communities can set up their own campsites in the GMAs ... the ‘Citizens’ Economic Empowerment Scheme.”

4.4 Areas of Improvement

All stakeholder groups felt that there were areas in which operators could improve. Figs. 1 and 2 show the environmental and socio-economic areas of importance that two stakeholder groups – tourists and safari operators – regarded as key to current and future practice. They show that a wide range of issues were deemed to be important by stakeholders, and that tourists and safari operators appear to give different issues different priority.

Indeed, when asked what issues required attention in the future, tourists mentioned environmental issues 44 times, while socio-economic issues were only mentioned 16 times. However safari operators, when asked the same question, were found to cite environment issues only 18 times, mentioning socio-economic issues far more (44 times). This suggests that the social issues that face the area might be somewhat overlooked by (or not made clear to) tourists, while the link between conservation and human welfare is more obvious to safari operators, as one explained, “if we focus on just wildlife we miss out on half the resource.”

NGOs also thought that environmental issues were a priority, although not dismissing socio-economic ones, stating it was important to focus on both. It was clear that personal opinion on which issues took priority, and were realistic, varied widely between individuals and on individual objectives; as one safari operator put it
when referring to an NGO, who was especially concerned with over use of natural-resources, “we are very, very conscious of the environment, but also have to face reality. They [the NGO] cuts down trees too [for building], but the alternative is bricks and mortar – which is worse?”

Fig. 1 Open Question: What issues do you think are currently being addressed by safari operators in SLNP?” and “…need to be addressed in the future?” (prompted answers as percentages) (tourist surveys and safari operator interviews)

Fig. 2 Open Question: What issues do you think are currently being addressed by safari operators in SLNP?” and “…need to be addressed in the future?” (prompted answers as percentages) (tourist surveys and safari operator interviews)
4.5 Further Challenges Facing Future Responsible Tourism Practice

“Most of us are aware of the issues, but see no way to solve them”

4.5.1 Politics

In interviews with safari operators it was often stated that the current political situation, both national and local, made it hard for them to operate their businesses as they would like. One frustrated lodge owner told me:

“I used to have a different opinion and think that we [safari operators] could make a difference…. but the government’s hands are tied with other things...” adding “I wish we had more say and input in that [responsible tourism], but the government’s views on it are different to ours. Without long term planning this area will become spoilt.”

Her frustration may have been shared by her competitors, some of whom hinted at having similar thoughts, with another adding “ultimately the government is responsible for civic services, but we know that that does not happen” and another feeling that “…corruption is causing it all, but any move to stamp out corruption leads to unpopularity.” Indeed several operators felt that “the best way is to just get out and do it [good practice] yourself.

Many safari operators, NGO and even government informants also criticised the local, traditional political system, where the chief still has great power and say over land use (see section 4.3). It was claimed that there were problems with uncontrolled development and immigration, due to the safari industry, and with new lodges being built in an already over busy area – over which the chief had ultimate control. This general feeling was summed up by one informant;

“The government regrets giving so much power to the chief around here, in areas with no chief it has been easier to advance and move forward – it [the power of the chief] is stopping progress and the protection of the environment.”
4.5.2 Small Businesses

The safari companies operating in the area were generally found to be small and commonly owner-operated. It was often stated that this made it more difficult for those operators to be able to afford to practice at the environmental and ethical levels at which they would like, and to use the most sound and latest technology, especially when it might jeopardise the viability of their business. As one operator put it “we always want to do it [responsible tourism] in theory, but in practical terms it is not always possible.”

These “heart and soul operators”, as one informant call them, “do not have the time or manpower – they are not huge companies and so do not have money to throw around.” But as one tour operator added “these people [safari operators] want to protect their own lifestyle and therefore the environment…. As the main driving force is not profit they tend to care about the environment. In the order of priorities, money is not at the top.” Indeed this sense of personal interest did seem to be shared by the safari operators themselves, one told me “we live here, it is in our own best interest to look after the place” another backed her up saying “it is just a job to him [local member of staff], but not to us [safari operators]. If it was just a job, we would not still be here …”

I was told on numerous occasions that “the safari business here is not for those who want to make money – they [SLNP safari operators] do it because they love it.” However things may be changing, especially with larger companies coming into the area. Many operators did mention that what they saw as being of top priority and responsibility was to keep their businesses profitable and thereby their staff employed. Therefore that “lifestyle approach” might have been in the past. One of the tour operators explained to me that now the “big players [are] coming into the area it is changing the field of play… [they] have money and experience to develop new areas… [they] should improve new areas… they act pretty responsibly. They may set alternative standards in accommodation and bring in more and new clients … and may raise the profile of Zambia.” This might have mixed results on existing operations, who will either be forced to meet these high standards, forced out of business, or forced to offer cheaper services with lower standards.
Indeed the only small, relatively new camp, that it was possible to conduct an interview with, indicated that expense was indeed an issue, claiming that acting more responsibly “is not something we can do. It is for these bigger, richer camps, they can do it. The smaller, new ones from the bridge cannot do it. All our cash is going into building the business, once the ball has started rolling then we will look at it.”

4.5.3 Interpersonal Relationships & Lack of Communication

Interpersonal relationships were considered by stakeholders to be extremely important in such a remote operating environment. However there appeared to be differing opinions as to how these relationships were played out. Despite the feeling from UK-based tour operators that there was great co-operation amongst competing operators for the “common good”, this may have been how things appeared on the surface. Looking more deeply, many complex relationships were at play within and between individuals from different stakeholder groups. During interviews, several informants repeatedly named the same key individuals from ZAWA, safari companies, NGOS and the local community who they identified as being instrumental in either advancing or hindering the situation in the SLNP.

Multi-stakeholder consultation and improved communication was recognised at all levels of the supply chain, as one solution for resolving interpersonal issues. Indeed one tour operator appreciated that “we need to build more bridges and need to be involved in protecting our product. But it involves us all coming together.” One representative from an NGO highlighted the key hurdle that needed to be overcome before this can be done, “we all need to talk to each other, but everyone is too busy to talk.” And during an interview with a representative from FTTSA this need for greater communication in developing responsible tourism practice was also highlighted, “there is the need to share information before regulations are developed. Harmonization is very important.”
5. THE POTENTIAL FOR CERTIFICATION IN THE SOUTH LUANGWA

This chapter presents information gained from tourist questionnaires and stakeholder interviews on their perspectives on certification. It also outlines findings on the demand for certification in the SLNP and explores the potential challenges.

5.1 Stakeholder Perspectives on Certification

The suggestion of introducing a responsible tourism certification scheme was, generally, met favourably by most stakeholder groups, especially tourists, who considered good environmental and ethical practice important when choosing a safari holiday and claimed they would pay more to do so (section 5.2.2), but felt that at present it was not easy to determine a company’s level of commitment to these issues and often relied on recommendations, personal observation or the advice of their travel agent to provide them with this information (section 5.2.2). Indeed, when asked how environmental and ethical practice might be improved in the future one tourist suggested:

“Perhaps by regulating the standards of responsible tourism so that the consumer can see quite clearly exactly how responsible the operator is. Every operator can talk in their brochure about how they help the local school, etc… but it's hard to know.”

Most stakeholder groups agreed that certification schemes can be beneficial, but there was great ambivalence amongst all groups as to how a certification scheme might be established for SLNP, who would set out the guidelines, police them and what effects a scheme might have. One tour operator said:

“The idea of standards is good, but flawed. How is it policed? I am not sure how? Also if it is not policed very well, it leads to a lack of trust. An award in Luangwa would not make any difference.”

Those NGO informants who were asked tended to feel similarly. One said:
“I think that if it were done right then it would be great, but who decides and how would it work? Especially in a small community like this. It needs to be done properly. People really do try, but every now and again they need to be given a kick. It needs to be grounded and something that everyone has decided upon.”

Safari operators, on the whole also thought certification was an interesting way to improve things, but a few were not keen on the idea. One representative from the LSA had the following suggestion:

“ZNTB and LSA should be involved, but it is the operators who are not part of LSA, that will not join, who are the ones who act irresponsibly. Perhaps joining LSA could be a condition for gaining an operating licence from ZAWA, and that way you have to meet minimum standards.”

As one tourist put it “I think those who practise responsible tourism will do so anyway, and those who don't may well not be swayed by an award that they probably wouldn't win.” Several representative from safari companies tended to agree, as did those from the SLNP eco-award body.

Government representatives asked seemed to express confidence toward certification, “it would help ZAWA. ZAWA could design the award or conditions for the award and do the monitoring. This could be financed through membership … ZAWA would do the monitoring with the Tourism Council and ZNTB, through a multi-stakeholder approach… it would work, the country is ready for such a thing.” In a later interview another ZAWA official told me:

“We were discussing something that if you [safari operators] act responsibly then you would get some rebate on your licence fee and it [an award] might even be a condition for the renewal of the lease [for safari camps and lodges] in the SLNP.”

Fig. 3 shows the responses made by tourists asked whether they thought certification was a good way to improve practice. From those that answered it would appear that tourists place most importance on being able to trust a certification scheme, although raising awareness and helping with decision making also appear to be important.
Fig. 3 Open Question: Explain why you think certification is a good way to improve the practice of safari camps (prompted answers as percentages) (tourist surveys, n =134)

5.2 Demand for Certification

5.2.1 Tourist Behaviour & Decision-Making

As mentioned above, tourists appeared to show the greatest keenness towards certification. Of those questioned over half, 63.4% (n=134) claimed that they already used certification when purchasing non-tourism related goods, with the most common products mentioned being; organic, fair trade, cruelty free and sustainable timber goods. They also stated that they paid more for these products (Fig. 4) over non-certified ones.

Despite the fact that 85.4 % of tourists (n=134) stated that they would describe the nature-based holidays they took as being either “always” or “mostly” responsible, the majority of those asked (79.1%) said they did not currently use certification when choosing their nature-based holidays. This may have been because only 23.9% were aware that such schemes existed for the travel industry. However the majority (85.8%), said they would choose a safari camp because it had an environmental/ethical award, if an award existed, and even more (93.3%), said that they thought certification was a good way to improve responsible tourism practice, although some qualified this by adding that it would not be the sole basis for their decision.
Fig. 4 Amount extra tourists claimed they paid for non-travel goods holding environmental/ethical certificates (n=134)

5.2.2 Business & Marketing Advantages

As previously mentioned there was a common realisation amongst safari operators that acting responsibly made sense. As one put it “market forces are important, it is pure business. The wilderness is part of our product.” But most who commented said that they did not feel that they currently advertised what they did in respect of responsible tourism, however many were keen to and saw the marketing potential. As one tour operator explained:

“At the moment we do not really promote what we do [in terms of responsible tourism] to our clients, but we want to in the future… it is becoming more important in client decision-making. If you had two identical companies I think people are more likely to book with the one that appears more ethical… but people are not yet willing to pay more. It just might give a competitive edge to have environmental credentials.”

While many tour and safari operators regarded certification and marketing responsible tourism as somewhat of a “gimmick”, several NGO representatives considered the marketing advantage a strong incentive for safari operators to use certification, one noting:
“Competition is becoming more and more [in the SLNP], which is good, especially ‘cos there are such small profits to be made. It is only now that they are thinking that they can use such things [responsible tourism] for marketing benefits – as they were already doing them.”

Some tour and safari operators were conscious of the concern that, if not done in a correct, trustworthy manner, a responsible tourism award might be seen by potential tourists in a negative light. One tour operator stated:

“There should be better accreditation. It seems everyman and his dog has a scheme. That is not a problem, but at some point there needs to be a grouping to make them more trusted.”

The problem of confusion from having too many schemes and a lack of trust in small organisations, that are not well recognised, was noted by several of the safari operators:

“There are too many of these things – cynically that results in people not really not knowing what they mean. It would be good to have something, but it has got to be done the right way.”

However other results from tourists questioned seem to show more promise for certification. Of those asked whether they would “pay extra for a holiday they saw as being responsible” an overwhelming 87.9% said “yes”, and of those 68.1% claimed they would pay more than 5% extra (see Fig. 5). This compares with Fig. 4, where 41% of tourists asked claimed they already paid more than 5% for certified non-travel goods. Whether this is due to a difference in reported behaviour and aspirations or due to a genuine willingness to pay more for responsible travel over other goods is unclear.
Fig. 5 Amount extra tourists claimed they would pay for a holiday they saw as being “responsible” (n=134)

Figures 6 and 7 give an insight into what factors tourists deemed important when booking a safari. Unlike claims made by tour operators cost appears not to be the most important factor in their decision making, with most issues mentioned being related in some way to responsible tourism. Of note is the importance to tourists of a knowledgeable guide, abundant wildlife and small camps with few other people around (especially shown in Fig. 6). Indeed 72.1% of tourists (n=134) asked to rate “how important environmental and ethical issues were to them when choosing a holiday”, stated that the ethical/environmental approach of the company they chose to travel with was the “most important” consideration. Also of note is the importance that the advice of a travel agent or tour operator appears to have had, along with recommendations and reputation, on influencing tourists decisions when visiting the SLNP (Fig. 7).
Fig. 6 Open Question: What factors are important to you when you are booking a safari? (prompted answers as percentages) (tourist surveys, n =134)

**REASONS FOR CHOOSING A CAMP**

- **Other** 5.2%
- **Special Interest Activity** 1.5%
- **Price/Cost** 2.2%
- **Guiding** 3%
- **Wildlife** 3%
- **Ethical/Environmental Issues** 3.7%
- **Other Walks** 5.2%
- **Previous Experience** 7.5%
- **Websites/Brochures/Guidebooks** 10%
- **Small Camp/Atmosphere** 15%
- **Tour Operator/Travel Agent** 24%
- **Recommendation/Reputation** 24%

Fig. 7 Open Question: Explain why you chose the particular properties you visited in SLNP. (prompted answers as percentages) (tourists survey, n =134)

### 5.2.3 Increased Awareness & Encouraging Best Practice

Many informants, especially tourists and safari operators, complained of a current lack of information with regard to environmental and ethical issues or what was considered to be best practice, and who practiced it. A representative from Fair
Trade Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) emphasised in an interview that during the development of the FTTSA scheme “awareness raising was the initial objective of the project” and added “we discovered the need to educate people first, which takes time. Then you can develop a scheme.”

When asked whether they were made aware of the environmental and ethical issues, for example through guidelines, faced by their safari operator, less than half (45.5%, n=134) of tourists asked stated that they had been made aware of them. Much (35% of cases) of this awareness was stated to have come from their guides and staff, not guidelines, with only 2% tourists stating they had been made aware of any guidelines. The question prompted one tourist to say:

“I think that a safari operator has a very difficult job, and runs a great risk at times between educating the tourist, and alienating some individuals who may not really care about all of the implications of their mis-guided behaviours.”

Although some safari operators did comment on the importance of educating their clients, on the whole they did not comment on whether certification might help to increase awareness of responsible behaviour amongst their clients. However several thought it might help them conduct best practice. The Director of one safari company told me:

“I would like something that advises me and makes me think about the issues …for example where to put the pipes when I am building the camps …”

5.3 Setting Standards

It became clear at the initial stages of planning the research that determining the standards to use for certification would be difficult. Given the varying priorities of different stakeholder groups for different environmental, ethical and social issues to be addressed (discussed in section 4.4) this could only add to the challenge of reaching a consensus. Tour operators were the first to note that, “with an industry that spans the whole world, even setting national standards must be tough. It must be global, then that would mean something, but things vary, another added “tourism is very difficult to standardise… it’s just not coffee.”
During my research proposal meeting with ZAWA, one official pointed out another area of potential conflict in establishing agreed upon standards when he asked “what about wildlife management? If hippo culling is taking place near a camp that has received the award – tourists might not think that is responsible.”

Concerns were also raised by representatives from safari operators, who were worried that standards set without proper consultation may be too high, thus putting people off attempting to meet them. As one NGO representative explained “people have their own ideas, which leads to problems and they do not agree.” This was realised by another NGO representative who had been tasked by the SLNP eco-award group with investigating other countries’ awards and felt that the approach of the Australian Nature and the Ecotourism Accreditation Programme (NEAP) scheme was “a bit too comprehensive!” and decided instead to adopt the more flexible, tiered approach of the Ecotourism Society of Kenya (ESOK), which was geared more towards the type of businesses in SLNP. For these reasons a consultative approach was agreed upon by the eco-award working group, who stated that the development of criteria “needs to be a multi-stakeholders approach with both environmental and social criteria…but it needs to be appealing...” one ZAWA representative added “the problem is incentives, we need to get people to sit down and brainstorm, we need to involve them too.”

5.4 Further Challenges Facing Certification

5.4.1 Lack of an Independent Body

The importance of independent auditing and trust was made clear by one tourist:

“As long as the certifying organisation is completely independent and if criteria are sufficiently rigid...."

However, as mentioned earlier (section 4.3) it appeared that there was a lack of trust by the safari operators of government organisations in their ability to do the job of monitoring effectively. Informants from operators, government organisations and other NGOs, did however seem to place trust in SLCS and especially the LSA. However the safari operators were responsible for these organisations’
establishment and are directly involved with both, with several directors and employees of safari companies being on their boards. Should an award be established and overseen by LSA, it could be seen not to be “completely independent,” especially as it was mentioned to me several times by safari operators that the LSA had been criticized in the past for “attempting to get involved in regulation.” Thus a trusted, truly independent body is lacking.

5.4.2 Policing

As mentioned in section 3.3 I had wanted to conduct field visits to each property with a checklist of issues, however I was advised at an early stage, by one NGO, that this was unlikely to work, as it was felt that I would not be welcome by many operators. This attitude was shared by the SLNP eco-award working-group:

“To avoid any potential antagonism … the organisers would not inspect or indeed ask to inspect any establishment without prior application for the award and even then plenty of notice would be given for any visits or inspections.”

These concerns were largely found to be justified when speaking with operators, who welcomed the idea of establishing guidelines, although they did not want to have them forced upon them. One safari operator said:

“It is better we police ourselves … a document would be a better idea, we do not want outside people telling us what to do…” another added “I suppose you could set minimum standards, but can you force someone to support a school?”

5.4.3 Differentiation

Many safari operators were conscious of the fact that an award is a form of standardization and may in fact damage their business, as it could reduce differences amongst companies, and thus lessen the current diversity amongst the camps and lodges. During interviews with tourists, tour and safari operators it became apparent that a key factor used to attract tourists to SLNP was the variety of experiences and properties on offer. When asked for his thoughts on establishing a scheme in SLNP one lodge manager replied:
“We [safari operators in SLNP] all have different ethics in each lodge. To come up with the same ethics, is it possible? They [the award standards] might not be seen to be genuine if we are all different…. That is what the tourist wants – not that we are all the same.”
6. DISCUSSION

This thesis has so far attempted to provide an overview of the current situation in the SLNP and the issues and challenges facing improvement and the development of a tourism certification scheme. This final chapter attempts to illustrate how these findings relate to the literature, and suggest what steps might be taken to try to overcome some of these problems in the future.

6.1 The Demand for Certification

Tourism in the area is considered to be practiced to a high level of responsibility, although this behaviour might have only recently become evident. Previous studies seem to highlight that tourism had some way to go to fulfil sustainability criteria (see Butler 1996, Mvula 2001, Zimba 2006). Indeed general concurrence amongst stakeholders was that there was still room for improvement. There was agreement amongst stakeholders that one way of achieving this might be through establishing an award scheme, however the best way to go about doing this was not clear. It is maintained (Font & Buckley 2001, Sasidharan et al. 2002) that certification has the potential to provide tourists with suitable, reliable information on responsible tourism practice, information that some tourists to SLNP currently feel is not provided. And yet despite the study finding that there was a stated desire by tourists to purchase responsible nature-based holidays and a willingness to pay more when doing so (section 5.2.2), the current sentiments of several of the UK-based tour operators, were found to be in conflict with this. Whether tourists truly are willing to pay more is crucial, especially when it has been claimed that consumer demand will be the key to encouraging businesses to join tourism certification initiatives (Synergy 2000).

Other findings from this study appear to agree with reports (Buckley 2001, Rainforest Alliance 2003) that suggest that consumer awareness of tourism certification is low. However, these tourists currently use certification to make purchasing decisions for other, non-tourism products, and claim to pay more when doing so (section 5.2.1). There therefore appears to be potential demand from tourists for tourism certification, however, certified products bought by them generally hold globally recognised eco-labels, such as Fair Trade, Soil Associations and Forest Stewardship Council, thus suggesting that for a certification scheme to
be accepted it needs to be overseen by a well recognised organization.

The current situation appears to be similar to that described elsewhere in the World, that tourist demand is not driving certification, or at least that tourist demand is not strong enough to do so. One report (Rainforest Alliance 2003) concludes that, at present, “tourist demand for sustainability has not been a significant leverage for changing industry behavior”. However in the SLNP, at least, their appeared to be some recent realization of this demand, hence the establishment of an “SLNP eco-award working group” and the desire by several safari operators to make more use of the marketing potential of their responsible tourism efforts. However, not all safari operators shared this realization, nor did UK-based tour operators (section 5.2), who, as Buckley (2001) states, saw certification as “a marketing scheme from which they would gain no particular advantage”.

Although some have argued that there is no evidence to suggest that the increase in the popularity of more responsible tourism is related to the emergence of green consumerism (Sharpley 2001), others have begun to suggest that consumer trends are resulting in a globalizing “audit society,” in which social activities are increasingly being redefined and regulated in terms of market certification (Vivanco & McLaren 2006). Thus standardization might slowly and inevitably be creeping into all industries and western consumer behaviour at large.

### 6.2 The Development of Criteria for Certification

It is a widely held belief that certification programmes should focus on the broad range of issues embraced by sustainable tourism, rather than narrowing their focus to environmental issues alone (Synergy 2000, Honey 2002, Rainforest Alliance 2003, also see Appendices 7 and 8). This seems to be the conclusion reached by stakeholder groups in this study who felt the need to tailor criteria to fit the particular situation in the SLNP. The ability for stakeholders to participate locally in the decision-making process came through in interviews as being crucial to ensuring that any scheme was well received and effective, something that has been recognized in other reports (Mohonk Agreement 2000, Rainforest Alliance 2003, Responsible Travel 2006, Linsheng et al. 2007).
That having been said the study also found that different stakeholder groups hold different priorities when it comes to which issues are seen to be important, making reaching a consensus challenging (section 4.4). The fact that tourists appear to highlight environmental issues, while safari operators see socio-culture issues as requiring more urgent attention may be explained by, amongst other things, the fact that North-South priorities differ. Thus the environmental concerns of the North versus the more pragmatic developmental needs of the South should also be considered in the establishment of any certification scheme (Font & Bendell 2002, Sasidharan et al. 2002, Rainforest Alliance 2003).

6.3 Overcoming the Challenges

Given the challenges facing tourism and certification in the SLNP it is clear that the current situation makes it hard both for safari operators to improve their practice and for an effective certification programme to be developed. Some of these challenges and their solutions go beyond the scope of this study, and are entwined in the wider socio-political fabric of the area's tourism industry. Issues such as policing, politics, tradition and inter-personal relationships are too complex to be discussed at length here. It would however seem that these issue are interconnected and could, perhaps be, to some extent, resolved by the establishment of an independent body to oversee responsible tourism practice and its certification.

The current lack of a completely independent regulator body, negates one of the criteria set out by Buckley & Font (2001) for a successful certification programme. By establishing such a body, which could provide third party assessment (Toth 2002), the process of certifying the SLNP safari industry should become more effective. This body, with multi-stakeholder involvement, could then be involved in establishing a set of area specific 'best-practice guide-lines', which are likely to also form many of the criteria used for certification. Such a bottom-up approach should help to build consensus, encouraging participation and, through increased communication, ensure that all issues are considered and that any scheme be better received by stakeholders at all levels. It is vitally important though that this stakeholder involvement does not result in bias (Sasidharan & Font 2001). For the independent body to appear more credible to consumers and stakeholders at all levels, it must have sound criteria backed by sound evaluation and monitoring.
procedures that are transparent and open to public scrutiny and ideally that are relied upon by government (Font & Buckley 2001, Buckley 2001). Effectiveness might also be improved if it were associated with, or overseen by, an organisation that was already widely trusted (Sasidharan et al. 2002, Font et al. 2003, Rainforest Alliance 2003).

Amongst safari operators at least, the development of a certification scheme raised concerns over its standardizing affect. Many expressed the concerns pointed out by Pina (2004), that differentiation is a dominant competitive strategy in the generally low-margin tourism industry, and that the development of an award means sharing a standard with every other business. Thus backing up the argument against a certification scheme providing companies with a marketing edges, especially if all competitors share it. This standardising effect of certification seems hard to escape.

Although it could be argued that “corporate responsibility” might currently appeal to many of the SLNP safari operators’ sense of ethics, it is likely that businesses may become "unblinkingly committed to their own self interest" (Pina 2004) in the future as the industry grows and changes. Any certification programme, should therefore be promoted as “central to profitability and long term business successes” (Synergy 2000). On the other hand, this approach could favour the larger multi-national tourism enterprises and provide them with a marketing edge over small-scale companies, making certification “nothing more than marketing gimmicks for large-scale enterprises of a growing tourism industry” (Sasidharan et al. 2002).

It is important to note that several other issues need to be addressed before a certification scheme might prove to be effective. Stakeholders felt that certification was by no means the only option, nor was it thought to be a solution to all problems relating to current tourism practice. As Buckley (2001) argues it would seem that “eco-labels alone are unlikely to be effective instruments of environmental policy”, but “may however be an effective component of a ‘policy bundle or pyramid’, if they are coupled with environmental regulations, with certified products providing and optional best-practice add-on”. Indeed certification is more likely to be only on element of a much wider, on-going process of improving practice in the area. Thus the issues of policy, regulation and planning need also to be addressed.
6.4 Recommendations

The options available to tourism in SLNP appear to be:

1. maintain the status quo
2. develop a local SLNP award scheme
3. develop a national Zambia wide certification scheme
4. develop a regional Southern Africa certification scheme, or
5. for government to set and enforce more regulations.

Options 2 to 4 could later be accredited by a globally recognised scheme or indeed over time one option might lead to another or a combination of options. Currently option 2 is being discussed by a number of stakeholder groups in the area in the SLNP eco-award working group, although option 4 was mentioned as another possibility during an interview with a FTTSA representative. Option 5 was not raised in interviews with government representatives who instead tended to prefer the idea of certification, most likely at the option 3 level.

If some form of award were to be developed which covered tourism practice in the area, the findings from this study suggest that in so doing the following recommendations be considered:

- an independent body be established – with multi-stakeholder support – to oversee the sustainability of the Zambian tourism industry
- the full status of tourism in the South Luangwa (and the rest of Zambia) be assessed
- the ecological and socio-economic issues that need addressing, be established through a participatory process
- area specific best-practice guidelines be established (with accommodation specific criteria i.e. to differ for hotels, lodges, camps etc.)
- awareness building and education on best practice guidelines takes place
- elements of both process and performance be incorporated into guidelines, but with emphasis on performance
- the market potential of certification be assessed further
- the policy and political issues, that currently stand in the way of better practice be addressed along with land-use and tourism management issues,
• a bottom-up approach to all the above is adopted, with multi stakeholder consultation wherever possible

6.5 Conclusion

The situation in the South Luangwa is a complicated one. Although the findings appear to show that safari operations can be conducted to a relatively high environmental and ethical standard without enforced regulations or agreed-upon ‘best-practice guidelines’, stakeholders still felt that improvements in the South Luangwa were necessary. At present operators do not feel that they receive the marketing advantage or full recognition for the high standards they set, but instead, that “good-practice” has been inspired by personal ethics and interests, and not financial gain. As tourism grows and the situation changes in SLNP with more, larger, commercial companies coming into the area, there is the possibility that these new operators may not identify so much with the area. This, coupled with the fact that not all companies currently conducting safaris in SLNP were thought to be meeting these high standards, and given the current lack of comprehensive policy, highlights the need for increased regulation. Therefore establishing some kind of certification scheme could be one effective way of implementing such regulations, however several challenges need first to be overcome.

Despite tourists suggesting that they currently use certification as a way of identifying other environmental and ethically sensitive products, current tourism certification schemes suffer from a lack of recognition and trust. Indeed the demand for ‘green consumerism’ and for existing tourism certification schemes are not felt by operators to be effective in altering practice, especially if it incurs costs. However all stakeholder groups saw the potential of certification, but also saw the difficulties of effective implementation. The importance of establishing trusted, transparent standards that are independently monitored by a well recognised body was also found to be key. Neither these standards, nor an independent body currently exists in the SLNP, or Zambia, or indeed Africa. Should either become established, it is vitally important that in order to maintain the sense of ownership and responsibility that currently exists in the SLNP, a bottom-up, consultative, participatory approach, which reaches realistic standards, must be adopted.
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APPENDIX 1

Semi-structured Interview Checklist

Tourism Practice

1. Probe thoughts & feelings about responsible/ethical tourism, the terms used & what the main issues are.

2. Probe about the company’s responsible/ethical practices. Ask to complete form. (Appendix 2)

3. Who do you think should take the lead in being “responsible for being responsible”? Whose responsibility is it?

Zambia

4. Probe for their thoughts on responsible tourism in the Luangwa and how it compares with the rest of Zambia/Africa.

Awards/Certification schemes

5. Probe about their thoughts on the use of awards in tourism and how effective they are.

6. Probe about such a scheme being set up in Zambia/South Luangwa. Who should be in charge?

Final

7. Anything else you would like to add?
APPENDIX 2

Additional Questions Asked to Safari Operators

Please give as many points as possible

A. Please list the ways that your company currently practices Responsible Tourism (i.e. addresses environmental, social & ethical issues)

B. Please list the ways that you think the area as a whole (e.g. safari operators with ZAWA, NGOs etc) currently addresses environmental, social & ethical issues with respect to tourism.

C. Please list the ways that your company would like to improve future Responsible Tourism practice (i.e. addresses environmental, social & ethical issues)

D. Please list the ways that you think the area as a whole (e.g. safari operators with ZAWA, NGOs etc) could improve environmental, social & ethical issues with respect to tourism in the future.
APPENDIX 3

Online Tourist Questionnaire

https://survey.kent.ac.uk/sltts

---

**South Luangwa Tourism Survey**

Please complete the survey below, there are only 21 questions, all on this page.

You can save your answers and complete them later by clicking on the **FINISH LATER** button at the bottom of the page. Please note that once you have clicked on the **CONTINUE** button your answers are submitted and you can not return to review or amend your answers.

Questions are mandatory unless marked otherwise.

### Personal Details

1. Sex
   - Male
   - Female

2. Age
   - < 18
   - 18 - 25
   - 26 - 35
   - 36 - 45
   - 46 - 55
   - 56 - 65
   - 66 - 75
   - 75 +

3. Nationality
   - Select an answer
   - If you selected Other, please specify: ________________

4. What is your total household annual income?
   - prefer not to say
   - < £15,000
   - £15,000 - £24,999
   - £25,000 - £39,999
   - £40,000 - £69,999
   - £70,000 - £149,999
   - £150,000 +

### Travel Details

5. How many times have you visited the South Luangwa?
   - Select an answer

6. When did you last visit the South Luangwa?
   - Select an answer
7. When visiting the South Luangwa which lodge(s) &/or camp(s) did you stay at?

- Kafunta Safaris = KS
- Norman Carr Safaris = NCS
- Remote Africa Safaris = RAS
- Robin Pope Safaris = RPS
- Shenton Safaris = SS
- Star of Africa = SoA
- The Bushcamp Company = BCC

(select all that apply)

- Billimungwe Bushcamp (BCC)
- Chamilandu Bushcamp (BCC)
- Chichele Presidents Lodge (SoA)
- Chikoko Camp (RAS)
- Chindeni Bushcamp (BCC)
- Croc Valley Camp
- Crocodile Camp (RAS)
- Flatdogs Camp
- Kafunta River Lodge (KS)
- Kalinga Camp (SS)
- Kakuli Bushcamp (NCS)
- Kapamba Bushcamp (BCC)
- Kapani Lodge (NCS)
- Kawaza Village (RPS)
- Kuyenda Bushcamp (BCC)
- Island Bushcamp (KS)
- Lion Camp
- Luangwa House (RPS)
- Luangwa River Lodge
- Luwi Bushcamp (NCS)
- Mchenja Bushcamp (NCS)
- Mwamba Camp (SS)
- Mfuwe Lodge (BCC)
- Mushroom Lodge
- Nkwali (RPS)
- Nsolo Bushcamp (NCS)
- Nsefu (RPS)
- Puku Ridge Camp (SoA)
- Robin's House (RPS)
- RPS Mobiles (RPS)
- Tafika (RAS)
- Tena Tena (RPS)
- Track & Trails River Camp
- Wildlife Camp
- Wilderness Safaris - Kalamu Tented Camp
- None
- Other (please specify):
Please explain why you chose this/these particular lodge(s)/camp(s): (Optional)

---

Responsible Tourism

8. What factors are important to you when you are booking a safari?

---

9. What does the term responsible tourism mean to you?

---

10. Would you describe the nature-based holidays that you take as responsible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):

What information do you use to determine this? (Optional)

---

11. What ethical &/or environmental issues do you think a safari operator should consider?

---

Were you made aware of such issues, for example by the provision of guidelines, by your safari operator (mentioned in Q.7)? (please give examples if appropriate) (Optional)

---

12. How important do you consider the ethical/environmental approach of the company you choose to travel with when booking a nature-based holiday?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1 being the least important &amp; 5 being the most important)</th>
<th>Please comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Level of importance

---

13. How do you think ethical/environmental practice might be improved in the future in the South Luangwa (if you think it needs to)? (Optional)
14. Would you pay extra to take a holiday you see as being responsible?
- Yes  - No

If YES, how much extra?
- would pay less  - same  - 0 to 1%  - 1% to 2%  - 2% to 5%  - 5% to 10%  - 10% to 15%  - 15% to 25%  - more than 25%

Certification

Certification is a way of awarding products that meet certain standards, enabling consumers to make purchasing decisions based on this, often using logos.

15. Can you think of any products that you purchase that use such certification schemes based on ethical and/or environmental standards?
- Yes (please give details below)  - No

   a. Please give details: (Optional)

   b. If YES, how much extra do you pay for these products over non-certified products?
- pay less  - same  - 0 to 1%  - 1% to 2%  - 2% to 5%  - 5% to 10%  - 10% to 15%  - 15% to 25%  - more than 25%

16. Are you aware of any such schemes in the travel industry based on ethical and/or environmental standards?
- Yes (please give details below)  - No

   Please give details: (Optional)

17. Do you use such certification schemes when choosing your nature-based holidays?
- Yes  - No

   Please give details: (Optional)

18. Would you choose a safari camp because it had an ethical/environmental award?
- Yes  - No

   Please explain why: (Optional)
19. Do you think such schemes are a good way to improve responsible tourism practice?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please give your reasons: (Optional)

20. Please give any further thoughts or comments you might have on the issues mentioned above: (Optional)

Optional Contact Details

21. If you would like to receive information on the results of this survey please fill your email address below: (Optional)
## APPENDIX 4

### Overview of Government & NGO Stakeholders Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>OVERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Environment &amp; Natural Resources (MTENR)</td>
<td>is charged with providing a policy framework for the management and development of Zambia's tourism, heritage, natural resources and the environment to contribute to sustainable socio-economic development of the country (ZNTB, ZAWA &amp; ECZ are departments within it) (MTENR 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia National Tourism Board (ZNTB)</td>
<td>is an autonomous statutory body that implements all government policies on tourism, promotes Zambia, facilitates all tourism operators, is responsible for the licensing of tourism enterprises, &amp; claim to formulate, review and enforce operating standards of tourism enterprises. (ZNTB 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA)</td>
<td>has a mandate to manage Zambia’s wildlife estate. It is a corporate body which controls, manages, protects and administers National Parks in Zambia. Within its mission it stipulates to “promote and develop tourism, enhance the recognition of the economic value of wildlife resources amongst public and private stakeholders and educate the general public.” (ZAWA 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environmental Council of Zambia (ECZ)*</td>
<td>is the statutory body mandated to protect the environment and control pollution and to regulate and coordinate environmental management, promote awareness, in support of sustainable development. (ECZ 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Luangwa Conservation Society (SLCS)</td>
<td>is a recently established local NGOs, that was set up by the safari operators in &amp; around SLNP &amp; now works with ZAWA &amp; assists in the conservation effort of SLAMU. With an HQ in Mfuwe some of its programmes include; snare clearing, chilli fence projects, anti-poaching patrols, village scout training, conservation education &amp; work with safari companies (SLCS 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipembele Wildlife Education Trust</td>
<td>is a locally registered charitable trust that runs contemporary learning facility for Zambian children, focusing on wildlife, environmental and conservation issues. Its education centre is located on the banks of the Luangwa River. (Chipembele 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitisation &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No representative from ECZ was consulted
| **Education through Kunda Arts (SEKA)** | participatory theatre to sensitize and educate communities & tourists on various important social and environmental issues. (SEKA 2007) |
| **Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS/COMACO)** | is an American conservation NGO that has worked in conjunction with ADMADE on a variety of conservation projects focusing on the community & livelihoods. Projects include alternative livelihood training, poacher fire arm surrender, and the development of a community owned safari operation. Their Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) programme aims to build trading relationships within rural communities (WCS 2007). |
| **African Wilddog Conservation Zambia (AWDC)** | is a research NGO set up to understand the plight of the African Wild Dog and to ensure its survival in the region. Work is currently centred on establishing a large population of wild dogs in Eastern Zambia, in partnership with the ZAWA. (AWDC 2007) |
| **Luangwa Safari Association (LSA)** | is a non-profit organisation set up to encourage the development of tourism within the Luangwa, maintain & encourage improvement in the standards of service offered, promote a balance between this and environmental impact & the well-being of the community, provide safari operators in the area with a seat in the Tourism Council of Zambia. (LSA 1999) |
| **Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA)** | is an NGO that encourages and publicises fair and responsible business practice by South African tourism establishments, by awarding a trademark to tourism establishments that meet stringent criteria. (FTTSA 2007) |
APPENDIX 5

List of Other Stakeholders Consulted

Inbound Safari Operators

Croc Valley
Flatdogs
Kafunta Safaris
Luangwa River Lodge
Mfuwe Trails
Mushroom Lodge
Norman Carr Safaris
Remote Africa Safaris
Robin Pope Safaris
Wilderness Safaris

UK-Based Outbound Tour Operators

Aardvark Safaris
Discovery Initiative
Expert Africa
Wildlife Worldwide
APPENDIX 6
Socio-Economic Data from Tourist Survey

Table 2: Sex of Tourists Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=134

Table 3: Age of Tourists Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=134

Table 4: Nationality of Tourists Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=134

Table 5: Income of Tourists Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME (£)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not say</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-70,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-150,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+150,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=134
### Table 6: Number of Times Each Tourist Surveyed had been to SLNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF VISITS TO SLNP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twice</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four or more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=134

### Table 7: Year Tourists Surveyed last visited SLNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST VISIT TO SLNP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=134

### Table 8: Number of Tourists Surveyed who had visited the following properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LODGES INSIDE SLNP</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CAMP INSIDE SLNP</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichele Lodge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bilimungwe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfuwe Lodge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chamilandu</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushroom Lodge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chikoko</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chindeni</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaingo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LODGES &amp; CAMPS OUTSIDE SLNP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kapamba</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croc Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kuyenda</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatdogs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Island Bushcamp</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafunta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lion Camp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapani</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Luwi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaza Village</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muchenja</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luangwa House</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mwamba</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luangwa River Lodge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nsolo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marula</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nsefu</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkwali</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Puku Ridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins House</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RPS Mobiles</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafika</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tena Tena</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Camp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCS Bushcamps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 7

Process & Performance Based Criteria:

The majority of programmes are more detailed on environmental and management requirements than on social and economic criteria, although this is possibly due to the fact that with many European programmes environmental criteria are paramount. In a developing country programme however, it is more likely that the social and economic criteria would be more extensive.

Process-based (management) criteria can include:

- Sustainable/environmental/community policy or code of ethics.
- Resources allocated to environmental protection (human, financial, communication, overall organization).
- Quality of the environmental analysis performed by the business.
- Identification of carrying capacity limits.
- Quality of the environmental or sustainability programme implemented.
- Evidence of implementation of environmental or sustainability strategies and/or plans.
- Sustainable and/or Environmental Management System introduced and/or implemented.

Performance-based criteria can include:

**Environmental**

- Waste: solid and water (consumption-reduction-recycling-disposal).
- Energy (consumption-reduction-efficiency).
- Water (consumption-reduction-quality).
- Appropriate building materials.
- Hazardous substances (reduction-handling-use of nature friendly cleaning products).
- Noise (reduction).
- Air quality (quality-improvement).
- Transport (public transport- green alternatives provided).
- Habitat/eco-system/wildlife maintenance and enhancement.
- Environmental information/interpretation/education for customers.
- Overall environmental protection.
- Specific standards for impacts specific to diving, golf, beaches and other sub-sectors.

**Economic**

- Creation of local employment.
- Supply chain management through green and sustainable purchasing policies.
- Creation of networks of ‘green businesses’ within a given destination.
- Use of locally sourced and produced materials and food.
- Use of organic food.

**Social accountability**

- Community (relations-welfare).
- Community (participation-organization-involvement).
Cultural

- Emphasis and conservation of local/regional culture, heritage and authenticity.
- Maintaining aesthetics of physical development/architecture.

Quality

- Customer satisfaction.
- Health and safety.
- Services and facilities provided (environmentally friendly and/or for environment/wildlife observation/enjoyment).
- Employee capacity building/education/qualifications.
- Overall business competence.

(Source: Font and Bendell 2002)
APPENDIX 8

Mohonk Agreement: Summary

The Mohonk Agreement is a document that contains a set of general principles and elements that should be part of any sound ecotourism and sustainable tourism certification programmes. It strongly recommends to base any international standards and accreditation criteria on the following principles included in the agreement:

Sustainable Tourism Criteria

According to this agreement, sustainable tourism is tourism that seeks to minimize ecological and socio-cultural impacts while providing economic benefits to local communities and host countries. In any certification programme, the criteria used to define sustainable tourism should address at least minimum standards in the following aspects (as appropriate):

Overall

- environmental planning and impact assessment, considering social, cultural, ecological and economic impacts (including cumulative impacts and mitigation strategies);
- environmental management commitment by tourism business;
- staff training, education, responsibility, knowledge and awareness in environmental, social and cultural management;
- mechanisms for monitoring and reporting environmental performance;
- accurate, responsible marketing leading to realistic expectations; and
- a requirement for tourism businesses to obtain consumer feedback regarding quality of the tourism experience.

Social/Cultural

- impacts upon social structures, culture and economy (on both local and national levels)
- appropriateness of land acquisition/access processes and land tenure;
- measures to protect the integrity of local community is social structure; and
- mechanisms to ensure rights and aspirations of local and/or indigenous people are recognized.

Ecological

- appropriateness of location and sensitivity towards sense of place;
- biodiversity conservation and integrity of ecosystem processes;
- site disturbance, landscaping and rehabilitation;
- drainage, soils and stormwater management;
- sustainability of energy supply and minimization of use;
- sustainability of water supply and minimization of use;
- sustainability of wastewater treatment and disposal;
- noise and air quality (including greenhouse emissions);
- waste minimization and sustainability of disposal;
- visual impacts and light;
- sustainability of materials and supplies (recyclable and recycled materials, locally produced, certified timber products etc.);
- minimal environmental impacts of activities.
Economic

- requirements for ethical business practice;
- mechanisms to ensure labor arrangements and industrial relations procedures are not exploitative, and conform to local laws or international labor standards (whichever are higher);
- mechanisms to ensure that negative economic impacts on local communities are minimized and preferably there are substantial economic benefits to local communities;
- requirements to ensure contributions to the development/maintenance of local community infrastructure.

Additionally, any *ecotourism* certification program’s standards should address the same areas as for *sustainable tourism* certification plus at least minimum standards in the following aspects:

- focus on the visitors’ personal experiences of nature to lead to greater understanding and appreciation;
- interpretation and environmental awareness of nature, local society and culture;
- positive and active contributions to conservation of natural areas or biodiversity;
- economic, social and cultural benefits for local communities;
- fostering of community involvement, where appropriate;
- locally appropriate scale and design for lodging, tours and attractions; and
- minimal impact on and presentation of local (indigenous) culture.

(Source: *Mohonk Agreement 2000*)