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What are we doing today?

Gyan Nyaupane, Arizona State University
Discusses how communities can be linked with protected areas using ecotourism and non-consumptive outdoor recreation as an alternative economic opportunity.

Robert Burns, West Virginia University
Comparing Brazilian protected areas with those in the United States and Central Europe to try and shed light on the reasons for different management methods for ecotourism and outdoor recreation.

Matthew Brownlee, University of Utah
Examine management frameworks utilized in outdoor recreation for their utility in ecotourism; including but not limited to, LAC/VIM/VERP, carrying capacity, displacement, and substitutability.

Kelly Bricker, University of Utah
Explore the application of the GSTC Criteria for sustainable destinations to protected areas and Gateway Communities.

Deb Kerstetter, The Penn State University
Eloquent and coherent summary of the above!
Finding Common Ground: Synergies in Ecotourism and Outdoor Recreation Research

Protected Areas and Surrounding Communities

Gyan P. Nyaupane, Ph. D.  
Arizona State University
Definitions

• Recreation + Outdoor => Outdoor Recreation
• Tourism+ Ecology=> Ecotourism

Common:
• Resource-based
• Protected Areas/Natural Areas
• Challenges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature-based tourism</th>
<th>Adventure tourism</th>
<th>Alternative tourism</th>
<th>Sustainable tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature tourism</td>
<td>Cultural tourism</td>
<td>Appropriate tourism</td>
<td>Non-consumptive wildlife tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature travel</td>
<td>Resource based</td>
<td>Responsible tourism</td>
<td>tourism Environmental-friendly tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature-oriented tourism</td>
<td>Drifter tourism</td>
<td>Ethical tourism</td>
<td>Environmental pilgrimage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife tourism</td>
<td>Rural tourism</td>
<td>Soft tourism</td>
<td>Community-based tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green tourism</td>
<td>Village tourism</td>
<td>Special interest tourism</td>
<td>Gentle tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological tourism</td>
<td>Safari tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-impact tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural history tourism</td>
<td>Jungle tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilderness tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ecotourism

• “Tourism that involves travelling [to] relatively undisturbed or uncontaminated areas with the specific objectives of studying, admiring, and enjoying scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural manifestations (both past and present) found in these areas.” (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1987, p. 25).

• “Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment, sustains the well-being of the local people, and involves interpretation and education” (TIES, 2015).
Protected Areas
Growth of Protected Areas

Source: IUCN and UNEP-WCMC (2012).
Appreciative Inquiry

• Strength-based participatory action research (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987).
• Based on positive psychology
• Rural people’s knowledge, needs, priorities without alienating them from research (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Nyaupane & Poudel, 2011).
• Applied in organization behavior, community development, health, and education.
Appreciative Inquiry Steps

Grounding Phase

Mini-Assessive Inquiry
Community Level

Appreciative Inquiry Summit
Regional Level

Preliminary Field Visit
Community Asset Mapping
Appreciative Interviews

Discovery
Discovering strengths

Destiny
Sustaining change

Design
Co-constructing future

Dream
Envisioning future

Strengths
Assets
Community Capital Framework

Adapted from Flora, 2005
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The Issue

What is the role of enabling legislation and other variables related the management of parks/protected areas?
United States Context

- Most US federal agencies use an outdoor recreation framework designed by US researchers and tested/implemented in US parks and forests (Graefe, Kuss & Vaske, 1990; Manning, 1999; Manning, 2007; National Park Service, 1997; Stankey et al., 1985; Zarnoch, English & Kocis, 2005).
  - Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)
  - Visitor Impact Management (VIM)
  - Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC)
  - Visitor Experience and Resource Protection (VERP)
## Visitor Capacity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bias</strong></td>
<td>Eco-centric</td>
<td>Eco-centric</td>
<td>Eco-centric</td>
<td>Anthropocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Frameworks</strong></td>
<td>Very few applications</td>
<td>No applications</td>
<td>Very few applications</td>
<td>Heavily relied upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What drives research</strong></td>
<td>Ecological needs</td>
<td>Ecological needs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settings of parks and protected areas</strong></td>
<td>Mostly developed to highly developed</td>
<td>Mostly developed to highly developed</td>
<td>Wilderness remote to highly developed</td>
<td>Wilderness remote to highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools used</strong></td>
<td>Cameras and visitor counters</td>
<td>Cameras and visitor counters</td>
<td>Few tools used</td>
<td>Visitor counters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Basis</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Brazil -pilot test</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature conservation law at federal state level; national forest law Natura2000, EU directives</td>
<td>Nature conservation law at national and federal state level; national and federal state forest law Natura2000, EU directives</td>
<td>Nature conservation law at federal state level; national forest law</td>
<td>Wilderness Act NEP Act Wild Rivers Act Organic Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| International Guidelines Integrated in National | IUCN /UNESCO recommendations partly integrated into nature conservation law at federal state level (for national park and biosphere reserve planning) | IUCN /UNESCO recommendations integrated in law | IUCN/UNESCO | Little or no integration with international guidelines |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorities for Planning Management</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Brazil -pilot test</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized administrative bodies</td>
<td>Federal state administrations Protected area administrations such as national parks, biosphere reserves</td>
<td>National level, federal state administrations local/regional governments, protected areas national parks administrations</td>
<td>National level, federal state administrations local/regional governments, protected areas national parks administrations</td>
<td>EPA, Service, NPS, BLM, ... (Protected area administrations such as national parks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Land Use Plan Types | Federal state and regional land use plan, community land use plan forest function plan | Landscape programme (state level); landscape structure plan (regional level); landscape plan (community level) forest function plan | Park management plans. Others? | Land and resource management plan, state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan (SCORP) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences in Planning Issues (Cont.)</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Brazil -pilot test</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Landscape planning</td>
<td>Landscape planning</td>
<td>Inter-disciplinary tourism, geography, landscape architecture etc</td>
<td>Recreation planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan types</td>
<td>zoning plan for protected areas landscape plans on local and regional levels</td>
<td>zoning plan for protected areas landscape plans on local and regional levels</td>
<td>zoning plan for protected areas landscape plans on local and regional levels</td>
<td>ROS, zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and management frameworks</td>
<td>no official recreation planning frameworks;</td>
<td>official planning frameworks for landscape plan creation, but not for the site-specific management of recreational activities</td>
<td>Some use of ROS and other frameworks</td>
<td>LAC, ROS, VERP, VIM, VAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area management</td>
<td>management plan required for national parks and biosphere reserves, conservation plans for other protected areas that might include recreational activities</td>
<td>management plan required for national parks and biosphere reserves, conservation plans for other protected areas that might include recreational activities</td>
<td>Management plans (many not complete)</td>
<td>management plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in Planning (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is responsible for planning</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Brazil -pilot test</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal state administrations Protected area administrations such as national parks, biosphere reserves</td>
<td>National level, federal state administrations local/regional governments, protected areas national parks administrations</td>
<td>National level, federal state administrations local/regional governments, protected areas national parks administrations</td>
<td>National Park System, US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary focus of recreation planning</td>
<td>Avoidance of ecological impacts from recreation</td>
<td>Avoidance of ecological impacts from recreation</td>
<td>Avoidance of ecological impacts from recreation</td>
<td>Avoidance of social and ecological impacts from recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of recreation infrastructure</td>
<td>Provision of recreation infrastructure</td>
<td>Provision of recreation infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion points

- US federal agencies tend not to use ecotourism models when managing their parks and protected areas.
- What are the implications of this?
- What principles of ecotourism must Brazil resource managers learn? From whom?
- Ecotourism has a set of definitions—these must be learned by Brazil resource managers.
- Need to have an agreed upon set of principles related to ecotourism in ICBMio from Brasilia to local units.
- National parks and nearby communities can develop Ecotourism, but should avoid mass tourism--implications.
Discussion points

With a low number of resource managers this will be difficult.

Ecotourism can be implemented through partners who adhere to the park mandates and requirements.

Partners will need clear guidance about mandates and other requirements.

- Ecotourism is commonly used to manage protected areas, typically outside of the US.
- Can we combine ecotourism values into existing management planning documents?
Obrigado!
Thank You!
Thoughts and notes. Ecotourism has its own set of definitions, so we will focus on the principles of ecotourism/sustainable tourism. National parks and nearby communities sometimes use these principles as a method of managing. With the low number of resource managers, perhaps the challenge is in finding partners who can help ICMBio move toward an eco-tourism or sustainable tourism centric model—in other words, can we implement the principles of ecotourism as they apply in certain places? An additional challenge is that these partners would need specific guidance and need to understand the requirements of the protected areas. This also may be a challenge…as ICMBio managers may or may not be familiar with Ecotourism principles and training. Are these principles in place at the headquarters levels? If not, how can they be implemented into the local level? Might need a series of principles that may work in specific contexts or locations. May need to rely upon faculty from local universities to assist in the effort
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Ecotourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature based</td>
<td>Nature based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to balance the social, physical, and managerial potential for proenvironmental-social-cultural outcomes</td>
<td>Attempt to balance the social, physical, and managerial potential for proenvironmental-social-cultural outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation to and use of protected areas</td>
<td>Visitation to and use of protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale: Site vs. Region</td>
<td>Scale: Site vs. Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within and beyond borders</td>
<td>Within and beyond borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing identities</td>
<td>Developing identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural paradigms</td>
<td>Cultural paradigms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strong and successful synergies

• Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (Brown & Driver, 1979; Clark & Stankey, 1979) and Ecotourism Opportunity Spectrum (Boyd & Butler, 1996)
• Specialization (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Zhao et al., 2007)
• Place attachment (Gross et al., 2008; Kyle et al., 2004)
• Proenvironmental attitudes and behaviors (Higham & Carr, 2001; Larson & Whiting, 2011)
• Evaluation of biophysical impacts (Farrell & Marion, 2002) and perceptions of impacts (Chin et al., 2000)
Some synergy

- **Management by objectives**: Indicators and standards (Lawson et al., 2010; Moore & Polley, 2007)
- **Limits of Acceptable Change** (LAC; Jenkins & Pigram, 2007; Roman et al., 2007)
- **Social and physical carrying capacity** (Dong et al., 2004; Manning, 2007)
- **Economic valuation and impact** (Kiss, 2004; Loomis, 2002)
Opportunities for synergy

- Outcomes Focused Management: Supply and demand approach (Driver, 2008)
- Natural Resource Matrix: Linking desired benefits to site characteristics (Bruns et al., 2008)
- Transportation: Sustainable Transportation Model and Levels of Service (Manning et al., 2014)
- Displacement and substitutability (Needham et al., 2013)
- Linking overall management strategies and practices (Manning & Anderson, 2012)
Opportunities for synergy

- Sustainable destination planning (Clifton & Benson, 2006)
- Tourism trails and linked experiences (Tsaur et al., 2006)
- Travelers’ Philanthropy (Barnes & Eagles, 2004)
- Climate Indices and seasonality (Yu et al., 2009)
- Indigenous communities (Butler & Hinch, 2007)
Discovery and integration of information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice (NAS, 2012)

Multi-disciplinary management
Interdisciplinary research and management

Barriers

- Time
- Influx of resources
- Multiple languages and cultures
- Nonlinear approaches
- Evolving outcomes
- Paradigms and realities
- ‘Bureaucratic glaciation’
Interdisciplinary research and management

Solutions

- Leadership
- Clear vision
- Common goal, common enemy
- Individual drivers
- Language and listening
- Institutional support
- Funding alternatives
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Finding Common Ground…
Destination Stewardship and Sustainable Tourism
Tourism in the world: Impacts

- 9% GDP
- 1/11 jobs
- US$1.3 trillion in exports
- 6% of world's exports
- 6% exports of least developed countries

From 25 million international tourists in 1950 to 1,087 million in 2013

1.8 billion international tourists forecast for 2030
Synergies with Tourism in the Green Economy

- Green tourism has the potential to create new jobs
- Investing in greening of tourism can reduce costs
- Tourists are demanding the greening of tourism
- The private sector can, and must be mobilized to support green tourism
- The development of tourism is also accompanied by significant **challenges**:

- Energy and GHG emissions
- Water consumption
- Waste management
- Loss of biological diversity
- Effective management of cultural heritage
We emphasize that well designed and managed tourism can make a significant contribution to the three dimensions of sustainable development, has close linkages to other sectors, and can create decent jobs and generate trade opportunities.

We underline the importance of establishing appropriate guidelines and regulations in accordance with national priorities and legislation for promoting and supporting sustainable tourism.
The Global Sustainable Tourism Council

The leading global authority in setting standards for what can be called “sustainable” in travel & tourism
Global Support

- United Nations: UNWTO + UNEP
- NGO’s: IUCN, Rainforest Alliance, Universities
- Private Sector: TUI Travel, Sabre
- Travel Trade Associations: PATA, ATTA, ASTA

Advocacy for sustainable tourism, and for ST’s place in international conservation and development activities
Global Sustainable Tourism Council’s Criteria

- Created with the input of worldwide expert NGO’s, academics, private sector, public authorities.

- Define sustainable tourism in a way that is actionable, measurable and credible.

- A minimum standard of sustainability for tourism businesses and destinations across the globe.
37 criteria for hotels & tour operators
41 criteria for destinations
based on these 4 pillars

- Sustainability Management
- Social & Economic
- Cultural
- Environmental
GSTC Sustainability Criteria

• Worldwide applicability
• Suitable for developed and developing countries
• Tour operations, accommodation, destinations
• For urban, rural, and natural areas
• Considers traditional and indigenous communities
Destination Criteria

- View a destination as a unified entity of communities, tourism-related activities, and the cultural and ecological surroundings
- Considers cumulative impacts of all tourism activities
- Emphasize the role of destination management organizations in planning, voluntary initiatives, and regulation
A: Demonstrate sustainable destination management

Destination management organization

The destination has an effective organization, department, group, or committee responsible for a coordinated approach to sustainable tourism, with involvement by the private sector and public sector. This group is suited to the size and scale of the destination, and has defined responsibilities, oversight, and implementation capability for the management of environmental, economic, social, and cultural issues. This group’s activities are appropriately funded.
Local career opportunities

The destination’s enterprises provide equal employment, training opportunities, occupational safety, and fair wages for all.

B: Maximize economic benefits to the host community and minimize negative impacts
Visitor management
The destination has a visitor management system for attraction sites that includes measures to preserve, protect, and enhance natural and cultural assets.
D. Maximize benefits to the environment and minimize negative impacts

Energy conservation

The destination has a system to encourage enterprises to measure, monitor, reduce, and publicly report energy consumption, and reduce reliance on fossil fuels.
Water Management

The destination has a system to encourage enterprises to measure, monitor, reduce, and publicly report water usage.
Example Indicators...

Indicators for Criteria B2 – Local Career Opportunities

- **B2.a.** Legislation or policies supporting equal opportunities in employment for all, including women, youth, disabled people, minorities, and other vulnerable populations
- **B2.b.** Training programs that provide equal access to all, including women, youth, disabled people, minorities, and other vulnerable populations
- **B2.c.** Legislation or policies supporting occupational safety for all
- **B2.d.** Legislation or policies supporting fair wages for all, including women, youth, disabled people, minorities, and other vulnerable populations
In the public domain...in many languages
Lessons from Destinations

- Differentiate their product
- Meet emerging consumer demands
- Support environmental conservation
- Support community well-being
- Save money – coordination, efficiencies
- Help tourists/visitors make more educated travel decisions
- Build a sustainable future
Destination Adopter Criteria

Benefits

• Establish the long-term sustainability of the activities and products of ecotourism
• Bringing the community together to “elevate” ecotourism
• Help businesses, agencies increase efficiency and save money
• Differentiate product from others
• New Private / public partnerships emerge

Perceived Challenges

• Cost, time, and expertise
• Lack of awareness
• Competing policies
Discussion
It has been 25 years since TIES was started, it was important to re-visit three principles found in the literature – that ecotourism:

- is **NON-CONSUMPTIVE / NON-EXTRACTIVE**
- creates an ecological **CONSCIENCE**
- holds eco-centric values and **ETHICS** in relation to nature

TIES hopes this gives clarity to those activities that are considered **CONSUMPTIVE / EXTRACTIVE** and which cause behavioral and psychological impacts on non-human species.

TIES considers non-consumptive and non-extractive use of resources for and by tourists and minimized impact to the environment and people as major characteristics of **authentic ecotourism**.

With respect to the TIES Principles, since 1990, when TIES first created the principles, we now know much more about the tourism industry through scientific and design related research, and we are also better informed about environmental degradation and impacts on local cultures and non-human species. It is important that this knowledge is reflected by these principles.

Ecotourism is about uniting conservation, communities, and sustainable travel. This means that those who implement, participate in, and market ecotourism activities should adopt the following ecotourism principles:

- Minimize physical, social, behavioral, and psychological impacts.
- Build environmental and cultural awareness, and respect.
- Provide positive experiences for both visitors and hosts.
- Produce direct financial benefits for conservation.
- Generate financial benefits for both local people and private industry.
- Deliver memorable interpretative experiences to visitors that help raise sensitivity to host countries' political, environmental, and social climates.
- Design, construct and operate low-impact facilities.
- Recognize the rights and spiritual beliefs of the Indigenous People in your community and work in partnership with them to create empowerment.