

## **Measuring and reporting the impact of tourism on poverty**

**Dr Harold Goodwin**  
**Director, International Centre for Responsible Tourism**  
**University of Greenwich,**

Medway University Campus  
Pembroke,  
Chatham Maritime,  
Kent ME4 4TB  
United Kingdom  
Tel: 01795 532737  
Fax: 01795 539728  
e-mail [harold@haroldgoodwin.info](mailto:harold@haroldgoodwin.info)  
[www.icrtourism.org](http://www.icrtourism.org)  
[www.pptpartnership.org](http://www.pptpartnership.org)

### **ABSTRACT**

The adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) by United Nations agencies, bilateral and multilateral development agencies has encouraged the World Tourism Organization, national tourism administrations and some development agencies to adopt new approaches to tourism development, focusing on local economic impacts and, in particular, on poverty alleviation. In order to demonstrate that tourism can contribute to achieving MDG, and other sustainable economic development objectives, it is necessary to develop some robust methodologies for measuring and reporting the poverty impact of particular initiatives and approaches.

This paper presents a brief review and critique of current ways of measuring and reporting the economic impacts of tourism on national economies in the context of the changing policy environment of tourism and development. As the policy focus shifts towards the local development impact of tourism on local economies and poverty reduction in the developing world, traditional indicators are less useful. International visitor arrivals and spend figures, tourism satellite accounts and multipliers are unable to measure the impact of tourism on local economic development in general and poverty reduction in particular.

Drawing on work on tourism and poverty reduction and responsible tourism in The Gambia, Egypt and Tanzania, this paper presents examples for ways of measuring local economic impact, which can be used to measure change over time. The methodologies presented have all been used in the field and each will be presented with real data and in sufficient detail to permit use of the method in order to generate comparable data. The economic impact measures reviewed and illustrated here include: the economic impact of earnings remitted from tourism development zones to subsistence agriculture areas within Egypt; reporting of the impacts at community and household levels of a coffee farmers initiative in Tanzania; measurement of the impact of changes in organisation and market access on the earnings of groups of poor informal sector workers in The Gambia.

The paper concludes with some suggestions about how these data collecting methodologies can be used to create a repository of comparable data.

**Keywords:** Millennium Development Goals, poverty, impact measurement , pro-poor tourism

## **INTRODUCTION**

At the World Summit on Sustainable Tourism in Johannesburg in 2002, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) launched *Tourism and Poverty Alleviation*. The report argued that tourism is one of the few development opportunities for the poor and constituted a call for action (WTO 2002). In 2001 the WTO had, with UNCTAD, published *Tourism in the Least Developed Countries*. The report sought to “support the development of tourism as one of the driving forces in the refocusing of economic development strategies” of Least Developed Countries. As Frangialli, Secretary-General of the WTO, argued in his foreword to the report it is necessary

“... to redress the traditional and still prevailing or even deepening inconsistencies of the tourism market ... an exceptional goal because, so far, tourism development has largely emerged as a by-product of economic advancement and well-being of societies ... the tourism market has been organized by adapting to the needs of tourism sending, hence economically advanced countries” (WTO/UNCTAD 2001).

The tourism industry has been and remains market driven; it is a buyers' market. Although as Ghimire (2001) has demonstrated, domestic tourism has been of increasing importance in the developing world, if not in the least developed countries, Frangialli's point holds: whether the tourists are international or domestic, tourism adapts to the needs of the economically advanced tourism sending areas whether they be Delhi, London or Manila.

Akama (1999) argues that “tourism development accentuate[s] the economic structure of dependency on an external market demand” and that this leads to an 'alien' development to which locals cannot relate and respond, both socially and economically. Tourism is often used to demonstrate the contemporary potency of dependency theory (Clancy, 1999; Scheyvens, 2002) and there is considerable scepticism amongst academics and development practitioners who point to the negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts, high leakages and the capture of benefits by metropolitan and local elites (Scheyvens, 2002; Harrison, 2001).

## **THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND TOURISM**

At the millennium this was a significant shift of emphasis by the WTO as it sought to address the Millennium Development Goals. The WTO's Global Code of Ethics adopted in 1999 had referred to the fight against poverty and the UN Commission on Sustainable Development in the same year had called on governments to “maximize the potential of tourism for eradicating poverty by developing appropriate strategies in cooperation with all major groups, and indigenous and local communities” (UN 1999).

As de Villiers, Deputy Secretary General of the WTO, asserted at the UNCTAD Conference in 2001, the WTO is “convinced that tourism can make a meaningful contribution to the reduction of poverty, but not without the intervention of the multilateral and bilateral aid agencies and banks”. De Villiers argued that this would

be achieved by engaging in “pro-poor and destination based development projects that would demonstrate the benefits of such strategies” (WTO/UNCTAD 2001).

Demonstrating the benefits of tourism in addressing poverty is a challenge because there is very little data that demonstrates the impact of tourism on poverty. “The industry has been managed for foreign exchange benefits rather than as a pro-poor development strategy.” (WTO 2001) Traditionally, tourism development has been measured and reported in macro economic terms - numbers of international visitor arrivals, contribution to employment and to the balance of payments in foreign exchange earnings. Tourism Satellite Accounts and the multiplier have been used to identify the economic contribution of the industry in world trade and to support assertions about the importance of the tourism industry at the national level (Jamieson et al 2004). It has generally been assumed that, through a “trickledown” process, local communities benefit from employment (direct, indirect and induced) and through the local economic development impact of spending in the destination, but there is little hard evidence to support this view. (WTO 2002)

## **TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT**

Encontre, an UNCTAD economist, has argued that since the Least Developed Countries were identified and labelled in 1971, only one country, Botswana, has graduated out of LDC status – tourism made a significant contribution to that achievement. There have been four potential graduation cases since 1994 - Cape Verde, Maldives, Samoa and Vanuatu – in all of them tourism has been “the single most important factor explaining the socio-economic progress that would induce graduation.” (Encontre, 2001)

In the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) the challenge is to demonstrate positive impacts on poverty, to demonstrate that tourism can contribute to the eight MDGs and that the impacts can be scaled up to make a significant contribution to the eradication of poverty. The targets are not defined in terms of growth; they relate specifically to poverty, for example to reduce by half the number of people who live on less than one dollar per day by 2015 (UN GA, 2000). In this context international visitor arrivals and spend figures, tourism satellite accounts and multipliers have little utility as they cannot be used to measure the impact of tourism on local economic development in general and poverty reduction in particular. In order to increase the poverty reduction impact of tourism development and to demonstrate it to the satisfaction of the development agencies and banks sought as partners for pro-poor tourism development initiatives, it is necessary to demonstrate that tourism can make a significant contribution.

Yunis, (2004) Chief of Sustainable Development at the WTO, argued at a World Bank Conference in Brussels in May 2004 that tourism often plays a major part in the economies of poorer countries. Tourism is growing faster in developing countries than in developed countries and there are many reasons why tourism is particularly well placed to meet the needs of the poor (Yunis, 2004; WTO, 2002; Ashley et al 2001). Yunis (2004) points out that tourism “will not address poverty automatically”. The UNWTO announced at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 that it was going to establish a foundation to use tourism to address poverty and the Sustainable Tourism – Elimination of Poverty (ST-EP) was formally launched in 2006. The purpose of the Foundation is to secure funding for tourism and poverty reduction initiatives; the Foundation will also seek to identify best practise and to

demonstrate impact, monitoring and “validating” the results of particular initiatives is central to this process. (WTO 2002)

In the initial articulation of the case for harnessing tourism for poverty elimination (Goodwin, 1998) it was argued that monitoring and evaluation would be a necessary part of the process of encouraging development agencies and banks to support initiatives in this area. Yunis (2004) points to the importance of “developing simple indicators and systems to measure the impact of tourism on poverty”. Unfortunately there are still very few cases where the poverty impacts of particular tourism initiatives have been researched or monitored and reported. The impact of an SNV initiative in West Humla, Nepal, was retrospectively analysed using a livelihoods approach (Saville, 2001) and in The Gambia poor producers involved in a market access initiative participated in research to identify how much their incomes increased between two seasons (Bah & Goodwin, 2003). The Dutch development agency SNV has engaged in major programmes on three continents, the British development agency DFID has funded some significant initiatives through the Tourism Challenge Fund and latterly the Business Linkages Challenge Fund, the South Africans have funded a programme of poverty alleviation projects linked to tourism, and other banks and donors have funded particular initiatives. Data on the impacts of these interventions have not been published,

## **POVERTY IS MULTI-DIMENSIONAL**

In the Millennium Development Goals a number of targets are set for some of the major dimensions of poverty hunger, access to drinking water, daily income, maternal mortality, education and a range of other priorities (UN GA, 2000; World Bank, 2005).

“Poverty means a lack of basic capacity to participate effectively in society. It means not having enough to feed and clothe a family, not having a clinic or school to go to, not having the land on which to grow one’s food or a job to earn one’s living, not having access to credit. It means insecurity, powerlessness and exclusion of individuals, households and communities.” (IMF & IDA 1999)

Given the multi-dimensional character of poverty, the socio-cultural elements of the definition, and the fact that poverty is a relative concept (Boltvinik nd), the measurement and reporting of tourism impacts on poverty is difficult.

## **PRO-POOR TOURISM**

Recognising that poverty is multi-dimensional, the Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership identified a broad range of strategies for using tourism to address the issues of poverty, from the primarily economic (employment and business development) to mitigating environmental impacts which adversely impacts on the poor and addressing social and cultural impacts. The Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership argues that tourism has a broad range of impacts on the poor, amongst which are financial, livelihood (human, physical, social, natural capital, access to information) and that cultural values, optimism, pride and participation and exposure to risk and exploitation are all aspects which need to be considered. (Ashley et al 2001)

Pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al, 2001; WTO, 2002) is defined as tourism which generates net benefits for the poor - it is neither a product nor sector. Any form of

tourism can be pro-poor. Pro-Poor tourism seeks to unlock economic and other livelihood opportunities for the poor – what constitutes poverty will vary from destination to destination. The pro-poor approach also recognises that measuring net impacts is necessary because in some circumstances there are negative impacts on the poor through, for example, loss of access to resources or land price inflation. These negative impacts should not be ignored. Expanding the tourism industry may assist with achieving pro-poor impacts through tourism, but it is not in itself sufficient. The focus on poverty reduction as a test of the efficacy of the interventions requires that the impacts of the initiatives on the poor be measured; to rely on general assertions about the impact of the multiplier and trickledown is unlikely to secure support for further initiatives.

The UNWTO (2004) has identified seven different ways in which spending associated with tourism can reach the poor.

1. employment of the poor in tourism enterprises;
2. supply of goods and services to tourism enterprises by the poor or by enterprises employing the poor;
3. direct sales of goods and services to visitors by the poor (informal economy);
4. establishment and running of tourism enterprises by the poor (SMMEs or community based enterprises);
5. taxes or levies on tourism revenues or profits with proceeds benefiting the poor;
6. voluntary giving of resources (money, goods, time) by tourists and enterprises in ways which benefit the poor;
7. investment in infrastructure which provides livelihood benefits to the poor.

It is clear, both from the work of the UN WTO and the Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership, that the impacts of tourism on the poor are diverse and that both positive and negative impacts need to be considered.

## **MONITORING IMPACTS**

The challenge is to develop “simple indicators and systems to measure the impact of tourism on poverty”, to develop and use “reasonably robust yet simple indicators of poverty alleviation.” The WTO usefully distinguishes between broad indicators which would track indicators like income per head and quality of life indicators and correlate these with measures of tourism growth and specific indicators relating to particular initiatives, the report goes so far to suggest that “Such reporting may be made a condition of any assistance given.” (WTO, 2004). The broad indicators may demonstrate that tourism growth - domestic or international arrivals and spend - correlates with increases in average per capita income. However, such broad indicators are unlikely to convince decision makers in development agencies, government or industry that particular initiatives have had, or will have, any particular impact on poverty however defined.

Specific indicators linked to particular initiatives are more likely to have utility in demonstrating impacts and identifying best practise in particular circumstances. This information is of most use in demonstrating the efficacy of initiatives and in guiding the identification and replication of best practise. The Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership (2005) argues that an initiative can only be described as pro-poor where it is possible to demonstrate a net benefit for particular individuals or groups, and that the beneficiaries need to be identified so that the net benefit can be measured and reported, as “only in this way can a pro-poor impact be demonstrated, although there may also be some additional, initially unidentified, livelihood benefits.”

Experience suggests that the collection of data is difficult unless this activity is made part of the intervention strategy (Jamieson et al, 2004), in part for resource reasons but most importantly because without baseline data it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure the impact in any reliable way. The desk research undertaken by the Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership and reviews of work in Asia suggest that to “collect reliable and useful data” it is essential “that interventions are focussed on particular poverty impacts and particular individuals and communities.” (Jamieson et al 2004)

This need for focus in order to enable the necessary baseline data to be collected requires that interventions identify the target beneficiaries. This is an additional advantage of the approach. Requiring that the intervention logic is made clear in the project’s logical framework, or that it is renegotiated as the intervention proceeds, means that it will be easier to identify the intended impacts of projects and to measure the impact. This in turn makes it possible to assess the efficacy of interventions and to identify, in particular circumstances, what interventions result in what impacts; a process essential to identifying best practice.

Jamieson, Goodwin and Edmunds (2004) undertook a literature review and identified a number of methodological issues which need to be considered in assessing positive and negative impacts. Funders should expect to see and to evaluate the methodology to be used to assess and report impacts in the project proposal.

#### Positive Impacts

- Care needs to be taken to exclude poverty impacts which may be coterminous with the intervention but not a result of it.
- The methodology chosen needs to address seasonality, lead times and sustainability. The latter is the most difficult to fund as it may require follow-up work two or more years after the intervention is complete.
- Baseline data on the incomes and livelihood strategies of the target group of poor beneficiaries needs to be collected prior to the intervention in order to enable impact to be measured.

#### Negative Impacts

- Attempt to identify the value of losses in natural capital for example by using monetary values or loss of income measures.
- Consider whether any increased conflict resulting from tourism has reduced social capital.
- Consider whether tourism development has increased the vulnerability of the poor in anyway.

This is a preliminary list of considerations; methodology in this field is a work in progress. The scale and significance of the impact of the intervention, positive or negative, on the livelihoods of individuals and households would generally require a livelihoods analysis. This is generally beyond the resources of an intervention project and it is very difficult to secure funding for this kind of research. The views of the poor themselves are of particular importance.

The indicators to be used will be a function of the intended impacts and should be discussed and agreed with the beneficiaries and other stakeholders. There is no one method which can be used to assess impact from a range of very different interventions and approaches in diverse situations. The particular methodology should be designed for the purposes of the specific intervention and the stakeholders

in it – including both beneficiaries and funders. The data generated should be shared with the stakeholders and should be in a form which they can reliably use for evaluation and decision making.

The kind of “reasonably robust yet simple indicators of poverty alleviation” called for by the WTO in 2004 can be used to make the case for interventions and their up-scaling; to identify best practice (and by implication poor practice) and by funders and managers to hold practitioners to account. There is an understandable tendency to argue that the measurement of impact is expensive and fraught with difficulty and that in the circumstances nothing can be done.

The three examples of “reasonably robust yet simple indicators of poverty alleviation” are reported and discussed here in order to raise the question of what can be done. This approach is predicated on the assumption that only by attempting to measure impacts and discussing the results can better methodologies be evolved and best practise identified. The approaches presented here are “reasonably robust yet simple indicators of poverty alleviation” – researchers working primarily on poverty and measurement will point to a wide range of serious inadequacies in the way that poverty is not measured and impacts are reported in a limited way. However, the methods reported and discussed here have the considerable benefit that they can realistically be used in the field to assess defined impacts of tourism on poverty.

In the first case, Egypt, primarily secondary data is analysed to estimate the contribution of tourism to household incomes in the Nile Valley. In Tanzania monitoring data is presented from a coffee plantation project. The location of the project is not revealed because those involved in the project feel that while they are willing to share the methodology, it is early days yet and they do not want publicity. In the third case data from an intervention in The Gambia which reports pre- and post-intervention incomes and employment.

### ***Egypt – the analysis of secondary data***

The development of tourism in South Sinai from 1980 was part of a national strategy to relieve development pressure in the Nile Valley by creating centres of development and population in desert areas, tourism was one of the industries which was identified as a potential source of livelihoods for communities in desert areas, there was also a strategic imperative for the development and population of South Sinai. The impacts were not entirely positive, for example the access of the Bedouin to the sea for fishing declined as the numbers of hotels increased along the South Sinai coast (Ali Dina, 1998).

The staff attracted to work in the tourism sector in Sharm El Sheikh is mainly composed of single or “bachelor” men. Of the population of Sharm El Sheikh 15.5% are reported as Bedouin and 15.5% as permanent residents with family. 39.4% are reported as permanent residents without family and 29.6% temporary residents without family – two thirds of the resident population are composed of “single” males. Most of them live in dormitories and remit some or all of their earnings home (SEAM, 2004b). The shift pattern tends to be 23 days on and 7 days off, with the employer providing transportation home to Cairo or elsewhere in the Nile Valley where the men’s families continue to live. Three quarters of those who work in tourism in South Sinai plan to return home permanently at retirement. The cost of living, water and housing and the lack of social and physical infrastructure all discourage resettlement; migration has tended to be temporary (SEAM 2004a)

Resources were not available for a full labour force survey, so the number of direct employees was estimated using a ration of 1.3 employees per room across all categories of hotels. The average number of staff per room depends to a significant degree upon the number of bars and restaurants maintained within and by the hotel. The ratio was checked with hotel managers and other local experts on tourism. Indirect employment was calculated assuming that indirect employment is an additional 80% of the direct labour, with the same rate of growth as for direct labour (Goodwin & Makary, 2005).

Makary Consulting conducted a survey of all staff in four representative resorts and hotels in Sharm El Sheikh and asked them to estimate the proportion of their earnings being remitted home. Only 23% of employees remitted less than 50% of their earnings to their family elsewhere in Egypt. 53% remitted between 20% and 80% of their earnings and 24% remitted more than 80%. The average was 63%. (Goodwin & Makary, 2005)

The same survey recorded an annual average net salary per employee of 7,500 LE<sup>1</sup> plus tips of 800 LE per annum producing annual average net earnings per Egyptian employee of 8,300LE/1,347 USD. Earnings per employee in indirect tourism employment were estimated at average net earnings of 12,500LE/2,029USD.

**Table 1 Remittances Home by Direct and Indirect Tourism Employees in South Sinai, 2003**

Average Earnings			Remitted Home	
	LE	USD	LE	USD
Direct employees	8300	1,347	5229	849
Indirect employees	12500	2,029	7875	1,278

Source calculations based on estimates by Makary Consulting (Goodwin & Makary, 2005)

**Table 2 Total remittances Home by Direct and Indirect Tourism Employees in South Sinai, 2003**

	Employees	Average Earnings		Total Remitted Home	
		LE	USD	LE	USD
Direct employees	21,600	8300	1,347	112,946,400	29,095,200
Indirect employees	17,280	12500	2,029	136,080,000	35,061,120
				249,026,400	64,156,320

Source calculations based on estimates by Makary Consulting (Goodwin & Makary, 2005)

Calculations based on estimated numbers employed and estimated average earnings of indirect employees and a small sample survey of employees in direct employment were used to determine gross earnings and the average remittance home to the Nile Valley. It was assumed that the average remittance home of 63% of earnings determined for direct employees would also apply to indirect employees.

<sup>1</sup> Egyptian Pounds

The figures can only be regarded as indicative but they provide a broad indication of the scale of the contribution of tourism earnings by internal migrant labour in South Sinai to households in the Nile Valley, a significant impact to poverty. There were not sufficient resources to include in the survey questions about the incomes of the households to which money was remitted. Had this been feasible it would have been possible to draw conclusions about the relative importance of these tourism remittances to households in the Nile Valley and to determine how poor the beneficiary households were.

***Tanzania – monitoring and reporting impacts at individual and household level***

At the request of a coffee co-operative in Tanzania a tourism consultant has worked, under the auspices of the Dutch Green Development Foundation, with the farmers to develop a coffee tour and a campsite. A tour operator has been a partner in the initiative and a relatively small investment has produced significant local incomes. Data from this project are presented here with permission; a condition of the use of the data was that the location of the project should not be revealed. The early results are very good; one third of the investment has been “earned back” in revenue. There is a significant risk of over-visiting; additional capacity is in the process of being developed to meet demand. These results relate to work in progress; they are reported here because of the exceptional quality of the impact monitoring and reporting.

Currently the average sized farm plot of one hectare produces two bags of coffee worth 160-200 USD. This produces an annual income of around 180 USD to support a household – an income of 50c per day for farming coffee. By contrast tour guides gets 5 USD per tour as an additional supplementary income. The tourism income data has been collected from the arrival of the first groups in June which means that there is a complete record of earnings (Table 3)

**Table 3 Revenue from Coffee Tours and Campsite, June to December 2005**

	#	Campsite	Coffee tour	Lunch	Total Sales
Month	Groups	pax	pax	pax	USD
June	3	0	47	12	553
July	12	70	183	64	2,484
August	10	102	164	46	2,264
September	10	81	154	59	2,131
October	11	97	154	44	2,025
November	2	31	30	0	417
December	4	52	52	8	752
<b>Totals</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>10,626</b>

Source: local project records.

Records have also been kept of the distribution of these revenues (Table 4). The majority of the revenues are retained for the Community Development Fund controlled by the producers cooperative (35%) and 22% is used to fund the tourism office of the co-operative.

**Table 4 Distribution of Revenues June – December 2005**

	<b>Total Earnings USD</b>	<b>%</b>
Coffee Co-operative Office,	2383	22
Community Development Fund	3685	35
Tour guides (farmers)	779	7
Food,	967	9
Camp. Maintenance	794	7
Campsite Office	72	1
Camp. Security,	218	2
Miscellaneous. Fund,	28	-
Farmers for visits to their land	31	-
<b>Total distributed</b>	<b>8956</b>	<b>84</b>
Retained undistributed	1670	16

Table 5 presents estimates of net income (income less direct costs) for each of the individuals involved in the tourism initiative. This is significant additional income and supplements the household incomes of coffee farmers.

**Table 5 Estimation of net income accruing to individuals by group**

	Campers	Tour	Group	People	Beneficiaries	net earnings/ individual in USD	Total Individual Net Earnings
Tour Guides	0	5	15	3	6	<b>130</b>	<b>780</b>
Food Preparation	0	15	15	4	12	<b>28</b>	<b>336</b>
Cleaning	1	0	5	2	2	<b>60</b>	<b>120</b>
Campsite Office	3		3	1	1	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>
Security	9		9	3	3	<b>73</b>	<b>219</b>
Chairman	3	3	1	3	1	<b>143</b>	<b>143</b>
Farmers for visits to their land		2	2	3	100	<b>3</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>Total</b>					125		<b>1970</b>

This example demonstrates what can be achieved by recording the impacts of a pro-poor tourism intervention and the way in which it can demonstrate to the funder the return on investment – through simple book keeping, and engaging the producers in the process of recording income and its distribution.

***The Gambia - pre- and post-intervention incomes and employment***

The data presented here were collected as part of a Tourism Challenge Fund project in The Gambia which used a multi-stakeholder approach to improve market access and earnings for a range of informal sector producers in 2001-2002 (Bah & Goodwin, 2003). The juice pressers, fruit sellers, guides and craft market vendors were

engaged in the project which sought to reduce the barriers to market access which reduced their ability to earn from tourism.

In the peak season of the first quarter of 2001, each of the producers was asked to record daily their purchases of inputs and expenditures on rent, as well as sales of goods and services. The total number of people engaged in each producer group was also recorded. The process was supervised by one of their fellow producers and by the local research manager. The data were collated and analysed so that average daily earnings could be calculated for each producer, and the average net weekly earnings was calculated for the ten week. One year later, after the intervention, the process was repeated. This enabled a comparison to be made between average earnings before and after the intervention for each individual and each producer group and to identify any increase in informal sector employment.

One producer group, the female fruit sellers, were unwilling themselves to collect the data and it was decided in consultation with the group to ask the male responsible for collecting together the fruit pressers' data to take responsibility for collecting the fruit sellers' data. When the 2001 and 2002 data were compared, it was apparent that the women had systematically understated their earnings in 2001 and this meant that only estimates were available for the increase in their earnings as a result of the intervention (50-60%).

Had there been any significant change in the number of visitors between the two seasons, the data could have been adjusted to reflect this. In the event, there was no significant change in visitor numbers between the two years in the ten week period covered by the research.

**Table 6 Changes in weekly income of informal sector in The Gambia**

Informal Sector Group	Weekly net earnings in dalasi		% change 2001/2002	Net increase in number of jobs
	2001	2002		
Juice Pressers	333	736	121%	0
Licensed Guides (S)	345	408	18.2%	0
Licensed Guides (K)	285	380	33.3%	0
Craft Market (K)	41.2	122.8	198%	43
Craft Market (S)	162.1	316.9	95.5%	19

(K = Kotu Beach; S = Senegambia) Source: Bah & Goodwin, 2003

There were not sufficient resources to determine how much of household income came from these informal sector tourism sector activities. However, it was clear from the research that tourism was the primary source of income for all of those engaged in the survey. Tourism to The Gambia is highly seasonal and the survey was conducted only in the peak season – the purpose was to determine the scale of the change in earnings from year to year; not to measure total earnings over the year. As with the Tanzania case, the research method was primarily based on book keeping, and engaged all of the producers in reporting their earnings. This has a secondary but important effect in empowering the producers who by participating in the data collection and engaging with the results are in a better position to discuss the benefits and to participate in decision making,

## CONCLUSION

Practitioners engaged in poverty reduction through tourism need to identify intended beneficiaries and impacts in the preliminary stages of their work and to record sufficient baseline data to be able to reliably report impact. It matters less that all the impacts are captured than that impacts are reported in such a way as to permit assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the particular approach. In the last ten years, despite the increasing focus on tourism and poverty reduction, there have been very few reported interventions where any attempt has been made to measure beneficiary impact. With major programmes of intervention underway through SNV and ST-EP there is a pressing need to begin to measure and report impacts.

Given the diversity of approaches and of the target beneficiaries, no single methodology can be used to measure all of them. Agencies, funders and groups of practitioners need to evolve ways of transparently measuring the beneficiary level impacts of initiatives, and of reporting these both to funders and other stakeholders engaged in the particular initiatives - funders and agencies should demand it, practitioners should accept that it is expected of them as good practise, and recognise that only in this way can best practise be identified and the effectiveness of the interventions be maximised. Case studies and progress reports should routinely report data on impacts - it is not sufficient to rely on assumptions about benefits resulting from capacity building, another variant of trickle-down. Practitioners owe it to the funders and those they encourage to commit time and resources to their initiatives, including the poor themselves, to demonstrate significant beneficiary impact.

## REFERENCES

- Akama J (1999) *The evolution of tourism in Kenya* Journal of Sustainable Tourism 7 (1) 567-574
- Ali Dina F (1998) Case Study of Development of the Peripheral Coastal Area of South Sinai in Relation to its Bedouin Community Masters Virginia State University Ashley C, Roe D & Goodwin H (2001) Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work for the Poor ProPoor Tourism
- Bah A & Goodwin H (2003) Improving Access for the Informal Sector to Tourism in The Gambia PPT Working Paper 15.
- Boltvinik J (nd) Poverty Measurement Methods An Overview UNDP
- Clancy, M (1999) *Tourism and Development: evidence from Mexico* Annals of Tourism Research 26 (1): 1-20
- Encontre P (2001) *Tourism Development and the Perspective of Graduation from the LDC Category* in World Tourism Organization and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2001) Tourism in the Least Developed Countries World Tourism Organization Madrid
- Ghimire K B (2001) The Native Tourist, London
- Goodwin H (1998) Sustainable Tourism and the Elimination of Poverty DFID/DETR
- Goodwin H and Makary S (2005) Poverty Impacts of Tourism in South Sinai Supporting Environmental Assessment and Management Programme (SEAM) unpublished
- Harrison D (2001) Tourism and the Less Developed World: Issues and Case Studies CABI

- IMF & IDA (1999) Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper: Operational Issues Washington DC
- Jamieson W, Goodwin H and Edmunds C (2004) Contribution of Tourism to Poverty Alleviation Pro Poor Tourism and the Challenge of Measuring Impacts Transport Policy and Tourism Section, Transport Division UN ESCAP
- Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership (PPTP) (2005) Annual Register Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership, London
- Saville N M (2001) Practical Strategies for pro-poor tourism: case study of pro-poor tourism and SNV in Humla, District, West Nepal PPT Working Paper 3.
- Scheyvens, R (2002) Tourism for Development Prentice Hall
- United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development Seventh Session, 19-30 April 1999, Agenda item 5 E/CN.17/1999/L.6
- SEAM (2004a) Community Consultation Findings South Sinai Governorate Residents & Workers Final Draft SEAM Programme unpublished
- SEAM (2004b) South Sinai Governorate Development and Environmental Action Plan Consultation Document SEAM unpublished.
- United Nations General Assembly (2000) United Nations Millennium Declaration 55/2
- World Bank (2005) World Development Indicators 2005 World Bank Washington DC
- World Tourism Organization *The Least Developed Countries and Tourism* in World Tourism Organization and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2001) Tourism in the Least Developed Countries World Tourism Organization Madrid
- World Tourism Organization (2002) Tourism and Poverty Alleviation, World Tourism Organization Madrid
- World Tourism Organization (2004) Tourism and Poverty Alleviation Recommendations for Action, World Tourism Organization Madrid
- World Tourism Organization and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2001) Tourism in the Least Developed Countries World Tourism Organization Madrid
- Yunis. E (2004) Sustainable Tourism and Poverty Alleviation Brussels