



## Chapter 10

### Review of tourism management models

October 2010



*Republic of Botswana*



**Report details**

This report is part of the Project Development of a Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan (MFMP) prepared for the government by the Department of Environmental Affairs in partnership with the Centre for Applied Research.

This report is authored by Prof. Joseph E. Mbaiwa, Okavango Research Institute, University of Botswana, Maun.

**Citation**

Authors, 2010, Chapter title. In: Centre for Applied Research and Department of Environmental Affairs, 2010. Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan. Volume 2, technical reports, Gaborone.

## Table of Contents

List of tables .....	4
Abbreviations .....	4
Executive Summary .....	5
1. Introduction .....	6
2. Detailed Study Activities .....	6
3. Methodology .....	6
4. Conceptual Framework .....	6
4.1 Sustainable Tourism Framework .....	7
4.2 Community-Based Natural Resource Management Paradigm .....	7
4.3 Ecotourism Framework .....	8
5. Tourism models .....	9
5.1 Community-Based Tourism Models .....	10
5.1.1 CBNRM Tourism Model .....	10
5.1.2 The Ecotourism Model .....	13
5.2 Private Sector Investment and Operational Model .....	14
5.2.1 High-end/Up-Market Tourism Model .....	14
5.2.2 Community Public Private Partnerships .....	15
5.3 The Role of BTO in CBNRM .....	15
5.4 Government Tourism Model .....	16
5.4.1 Government Campsite Model .....	16
5.4.2 Government-Private Sector Partnerships .....	16
5.4.3 Government-CBNRM Partnerships .....	17
5.5 Donor and Development Agency Model .....	17
6. SWOT Analysis of the Tourism Models .....	18
6.1 SWOT Analysis - Ecotourism .....	18
6.2 SWOT Analysis – Community-Based Tourism Models .....	19
6.3 SWOT Analysis - Private Sector Investment and Operation Model .....	20
6.4 SWOT Analysis - Government Tourism Model .....	21
6.5 SWOT Analysis – Donor and Development Agency Model .....	22
6.6 Conclusions from SWOT Analysis .....	22
7. Management model recommendations for tourism development areas .....	23
8. Conclusions and recommendations .....	25
10. References .....	27

## List of tables

Table 1: Proposed Tourism Models for MFMP area .....	10
Table 2: Key legislation, policies, acts and regulations for CBNRM in Botswana .....	10
Table 3: CBOs, Type of Tourism Activity and Partnership .....	12
Table 4: Registered CBOs in the MFMP .....	12
Table 5: Potential Visitors and Tourist Activities in the Makgadikgadi Pans .....	22
Table 6: Tourism Sites and Tourism Models for MFMP area.....	23

## Abbreviations

BCCT	Bukakhwe Cultural Conservation Trust
BOGA	Botswana Guides Association
BTB	Botswana Tourism Board
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CECT	Chobe Enclave Conservation Trust
CHA	Controlled Hunting Area
CI	Conservation International
DWNP	Department of Wildlife and National Parks
GoB	Government of Botswana
HATAB	Hospitality and Tourism Association of Botswana
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JVP	Joint Venture Partnership
MFMP	Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan
NES	National Ecotourism Strategy
NME	Ngoma Management Enterprise
OCT	Okavango Community Trust
OWS	Okavango Wilderness Safaris
STMT	Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
WTO	World Tourism Organisation

## Executive Summary

This report provides a review of the possible tourism operation models and their suitability for the ten selected tourism potential spots in the Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan (MFMP) Area. This was a desk top study guided by the following objectives:

- a. Review and assessment, for example Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the existing tourism operation models in Botswana and the region (private sector, government, CBNRM and various other partnership models);
- b. Based on the characteristics of the pans and communities, recommend and elaborate tourism management and operation models for the project area in general and for ten high potential tourism sites in particular.

A review of the tourism models indicate that there are four broad tourism models which can be divided into several forms of partnerships in Botswana. These models can also be useful in tourism development in different parts of the MFMP area. These models are:

- a. Government Tourism Models
  - *Government-Private Sector Partnerships*
  - *Government-CBNRM Partnerships*
  - *Government Campsite Model*
- b. Private Sector Investment and Operational Models
  - *High-end Tourism Model*
  - *Community Public Private partnerships*
- c. Community-Based Tourism Models
  - *Ecotourism Model*
  - *CBNRM Tourism Model*
- d. Donor-Development Agency Models
  - *Eco-lodge development Approach*
  - *Alternative Tourism Enterprise*

A SWOT analysis for each of these tourism models indicates that all the models can be applicable in different parts of the MFMP area. For example, the Community-based tourism model is favourable in areas between national parks where there are human-wildlife conflicts mainly because of two factors:

- a) To minimise human-wildlife conflict and increase in natural resource conservation,
- b) To improve rural development and local livelihoods.

The Government Private Sector Partnership Model is suitable in national parks since it opens up camping grounds for the middle income tourists and mobile safari operators. The private sector investment and operation model is applicable in most areas because of its potential to increase tourism revenues to citizens, government and private sector as stipulated in the Tourism Policy of 1990. The private sector investment and operational and community-based tourism models are also ideal in that they both encourage sustainability in the use of natural resources and local participation in tourism development. These approaches are in line with the principles of sustainable tourism.

## 1. Introduction

Wildlife and – to a lesser extent – wilderness, are Botswana’s biggest tourist products for holiday makers. Wildlife-based tourism in Botswana is carried out in national parks and game reserves. Most of these protected areas are located in the northern parts of the country in areas such as the Okavango Delta, Chobe and the MFMP area. While the Okavango Delta and Chobe region are known for wildlife-based tourism, the MFMP area has additional tourism products which are largely undeveloped. Such products include the vast salt pans, flamingo birds, local culture and crafts.

Tourists’ arrivals in the MFMP area are generally not accurately recorded due to the vastness of the area and the lack of gazetted entry points. However, Makgadikgadi and Nxai Pans National Park (MNPNP) has a few thousands tourists visiting the protected area each year. There has been an increase in tourist numbers in the MFMP area in recent years. Growth not only in tourist numbers but also in facilities, infrastructure, aircraft operations, and tourism services in the MFMP area are leading to a booming tourist economy built around what is perceived internationally as a “new” and “exotic” destination. The growth of tourism and the need to diversify it from wildlife-based to include pan landscape and culture suggest that appropriate management strategies should be developed for the MFMP area. The objective of this study therefore, is to review the possible tourism operation models and their suitability for the ten selected tourism potential spots in the MFMP area.

## 2. Detailed Study Activities

- a. Review and assessment (e.g. SWOT) of the existing tourism operation models in Botswana and the region (private sector, government, CBNRM and various other partnership models).
- b. Based on the characteristics of the pans and communities, recommend and elaborate tourism management and operation models for the project area in general and for ten high potential tourism sites in particular.

## 3. Methodology

This was a desk top study on the review of the possible tourism operation models and their suitability for the ten selected tourism potential spots in the MFMP area. The main data sources used include research reports; policy documents and journal articles on tourism and wildlife management reports, and reports of the CBNRM projects in Botswana and Southern Africa. A SWOT analysis was carried out for each of the proposed tourism models, namely: Government Tourism Model, Private Sector Investment Model, and Community-Based Tourism Model (Ecotourism and Community-Based Natural Resource Management).

## 4. Conceptual Framework

Tourism models discussed in this report have their foundation in three broad interrelated conceptual frameworks. These frameworks include the following:

- Sustainable tourism framework;
- Community-Based Natural Resource Management Paradigm; and
- Ecotourism Framework.

#### 4.1 Sustainable Tourism Framework

Botswana has adopted concept of sustainable tourism framework to guide all forms of tourism development in the country. The MFMP should therefore comply with the principles of sustainable tourism in guiding tourism development in the wetland. The World Tourism Organization (WTO, 2001) defines sustainable tourism as development that:

*Meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems.*

From the above definition, sustainable tourism refers to all kinds of tourism development that meets the needs of host populations, tourists and operators. Similarly, this form of tourism is carried out without compromising the ability of future generations (hosts, tourists and operators) to satisfy their own needs and desires from the same resources. According to Mbaiwa and Stronza (2009), sustainable tourism should fulfil the following principles in tourism destination areas:

- Minimize negative economic, environmental, and social impacts;
- Generates greater economic benefits for local people and enhances the well-being of host communities, improves working conditions, and access to the industry;
- Involves local people in decisions that affect their lives and life chances;
- Makes positive contributions to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, to the maintenance of the world's diversity;
- Provides more enjoyable experiences for tourists through more meaningful connections with local people, and a greater understanding of local cultural, social, and environmental issues;
- Tourism should be culturally sensitive, engenders respect between tourists and hosts, and builds local pride and confidence;
- Tourism should accelerate not only national economic growth, but also regional and local economic growth. This growth must be shared fairly across the social spectrum;
- Tourism should achieve the above principles indefinitely without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own need.

Sustainable tourism is part of the parental concept of sustainable development. As a result, sustainable tourism should contribute to the objectives of sustainable development. The basic principle of the concept of sustainable development is inter-and intra-generational equity. This implies that the MFMP should address issues of economic development, environmental matters, social factors, and the structure of the international tourism system in order for tourism development in the areas to be in line with the principles of sustainable tourism.

#### 4.2 Community-Based Natural Resource Management Paradigm

The Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) framework is the bases upon which community-based tourism models in Botswana are built. The CBNRM is a development approach that uses tourism to achieve rural development and conservation. The approach can be appropriate in other parts of MFMP area where there rural communities. CBNRM is best described by participatory and community-based approaches which are currently being heralded as the panacea to natural resource management initiatives worldwide (Twyman, 2000). In eastern and southern Africa, these participatory approaches began in the late 1980s through the implementation of CBNRM. CBNRM aims at achieving conservation and rural

economic development through local community participation in natural resource management and tourism development (Leach *et al.*, 1999; Tsing, *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000).

The CBNRM paradigm is built upon common property theory. Common property theory argues that common pool resources can be utilized sustainably provided certain principles are applied. According to Ostrom (1990) and Bromley (1992), these principles include the autonomy and the recognition of the community as an institution, proprietorship and tenurial rights, rights to make the rules and viable mechanisms to enforce them, and ongoing incentives in the form of benefits that exceed costs. The CBNRM paradigm in Botswana is based on the understanding of these principles. That is, central to the CBNRM paradigm is the theory and assumptions underlying the political decentralization of natural resources.

Decentralization of natural resource management implies a process of redistribution of power and the transfer of responsibilities from the central government to rural communities in resource management (Boggs, 2000). This is a shift from the so-called top down to a bottom-up approach in natural resource management. CBNRM is thus a reform of the conventional "protectionist conservation philosophy" and "top down" approaches to development which discourages open access resource use but rather promotes resource use rights for local communities. The assumption is that the decentralization of natural resources to local communities will not only increase local power and control over resources but it will also improve resident attitudes towards the sustainable natural resource utilization. Decentralization is assumed to have the potential to increase the ability of local groups to form networks with government and the private sector to positively benefit from tourism development.

CBNRM argues that the management of resources by the central government has experienced frequent and chronic declines in the past several decades (Boggs, 2000). As a result, the decentralization of resources to local communities has the potential to promote conservation and rural development. Conservationists and scholars perceive the decentralization of natural resources as a remedy to the chronic resource decline (e.g. wildlife) resulting from the central government's failure in resource management. Local institutions should be actively involved where local people have a role to play in resource management and derive benefits from such resources. As such, CBNRM is based on the premise that local populations have a greater interest in the sustainable use of natural resources around them more than centralized or distant government or private management institutions (Tsing *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000). This means CBNRM credits the local institutions and people with having a greater understanding of, as well as vested interest in, their local environment hence they are seen as more able to effectively manage natural resources through local or traditional practices (Leach *et al.*, 1999; Tsing *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000). CBNRM assumes that once rural communities participate in natural resource utilization and derive economic benefits, this will cultivate the spirit of ownership and the development of positive attitudes towards resource use will ultimately lead them to use natural resources found around them sustainably (Tsing *et al.*, 1999; Twyman, 2000; Leach *et al.*, 1999).

Theoretically, CBNRM principles of conservation and rural livelihoods should guide tourism development in the MFMP area. There are several communities living within and around the MFMP area, these communities can significantly benefit from tourism development in the area. They can also have the opportunity to make informed decisions on natural resource conservation in their local environment. Local participation in tourism development and natural resource conservation is thus in line with the ideals of sustainable tourism and sustainable development.

### 4.3 Ecotourism Framework

In recent years, a specific type of nature-based tourism has been developed to further promote the ideals of sustainable tourism development. This type of tourism is known as "ecological tourism" or



“ecotourism”. Ecotourism has many definitions, for example, the International Ecotourism Society defines ecotourism as:

*Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and sustains the well-being of local people.*

On the other hand, the International Union of the Conservation of Nature (IUCN, 1996:20) defines ecotourism as:

*Environmentally responsible travel and visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas, in order to enjoy, study and appreciate nature (and any accompanying cultural features—both past and present). It is a type of tourism that promotes conservation, has low visitor impact and provides for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local populations.*

The theme that runs across most of these definitions is that which describes ecotourism as nature-based tourism that includes an educational component, promotes the socio-economic well being of local people and is managed on sustainable basis. Ecotourism is thus seen as an alternative to mass tourism due to its small-scale infrastructure development and its ability to minimize environmental impacts. Botswana adopted the National Ecotourism Strategy in 2002. The goal of Botswana’s National Ecotourism Strategy (NES) is to create an environment in which all elements of tourism development planning and management facilitate, promote and reward adherence to the key ‘principles’ of ecotourism by all of those involved in the tourism industry. Botswana’s NES is guided by five main principles which are:

- Minimising negative social, cultural and environmental impacts.
- Maximising the involvement in, and the equitable distribution of economic benefits to, host communities and citizen entrepreneurs.
- Maximising revenues for re-investment in conservation.
- Educating both visitors and local people as to the importance of conserving natural and cultural resources.
- Delivering a quality experience for tourists (without which tourists will not continue to visit, and so the benefits to conservation and development will not be sustained).

The MFMP area is endowed with a variety of natural resources. As a result, the various communities in the MFMP area are expected by government to benefit from tourism development as envisaged by the NES.

## 5. Tourism models

There are several tourism models which can guide tourism development in the MFMP area. As shown in Table 1, these models include Private Sector Investment and Operational Model, Government Tourism Model and the Community-Based Tourism Models.

**Table 1: Proposed tourism models for MFMP area**

Model	Key Characteristics
Government Tourism Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Government-Private Sector Partnerships</i></li> <li>• <i>Government-CBNRM Partnerships</i></li> <li>• <i>Government Campsite Model</i></li> </ul>	Photographic tourism activities
Private Sector Investment and Operational Tourism Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>High-end/Up-Market Tourism Model</i></li> <li>• <i>Community Public Private partnerships</i></li> </ul>	Photographic Safari hunting
Community-Based Tourism Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ecotourism Model</i></li> <li>• <i>CBNRM Tourism Model</i></li> </ul>	Small-scale eco-lodges Photographic Safari hunting
Donor and Development Agency Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Eco-lodge development Approach</i></li> <li>• <i>Alternative Tourism Enterprise</i></li> </ul>	Photographic tourism Other tourism enterprise

Each model is discussed in more detail below.

## 5.1 Community-Based Tourism Models

There are several forms of Community-Based Tourism Models that exist in Botswana and Southern Africa. These include the following:

### 5.1.1 CBNRM Tourism Model

The CBNRM Tourism Model in Botswana has a history of around 20 years. There are several legislative instruments and acts (Table 2) that have shaped CBNRM in its development.

**Table 2: Key legislation, policies, acts and regulations for CBNRM in Botswana**

Year	Legislation, Policy, Act	Comments
1986	Wildlife Conservation Policy	Called for demarcation of wildlife areas into Wildlife Management Areas and Controlled Hunting Areas
1990	Tourism Policy of 1990	Called for local community participation in tourism
1999	Joint Venture Guidelines, revised in 2002	Provides guidelines for joint venture partnerships between communities and tourism companies
2003	National Strategy for Poverty Reduction	CBNRM recognized as one of the methods to be used to reduce poverty in wildlife areas
2003	Botswana National Ecotourism Strategy	A strategy to guide communities living in wildlife areas to become involved in ecotourism development
2006	Agricultural Resources (Utilization of Rangeland Products) Regulations	Provides a checklist of some of the declining rangeland products in the country (e.g. thatching grass). It also provides methods that communities can apply to achieve conservation at harvesting
2007	CBNRM Policy	CBNRM policy accepted in parliament making CBNRM an official program.

The CBNRM Tourism Model is carried out in demarcated areas of land units known as Controlled Hunting Areas (CHAs). Government leases out CHAs to local communities to enable them participation in conservation and tourism development. As a result, in areas where CHAs are not demarcated, ecotourism projects may be ideal to implement. In most CBNRM projects in Botswana, CBNRM activities

are carried out following Joint Venture Partnerships (JVPs). The Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP)'S JVP booklet defines a JVP as:

*A business activity undertaken between two or more partners for their mutual benefit. Partners in a community joint venture will be rural people who have user rights to the natural resources occurring in the area, and established private sector companies that recognise an area's potential for business development (DWNP, 1999: i).*

The DWNP notes that there are two options in JVPs which the private sector and rural communities can make. These include the following:

- a) Option 1: Joint Venture Agreements – “These are agreements between a community and a private sector companies that do not involve the merging of either partner’s assets” (DWNP, 1999:12).
- b) Option 2: Joint Venture partnerships – this “Joint Venture partnership involve the merging of portions both parties’ assets” (DWNP, 1999: 13).

Most rural communities especially living in wildlife areas have opted for Option 1. This option does not allow merging of either partner’s assets. As such, most of the communities involved in CBNRM lease land from Land Board and in turn sub-lease specific areas with resources contained therein to a company or companies which pay an annual rental fee. In return, the community benefits from rental income and employment opportunities as well as the development of associated enterprises and services (DWNP, 1999). Local communities prefer JVPs because tourism development is a new economic activity in the country hence most communities lack the necessary entrepreneurship skills and experience in managing tourism enterprises. JVPs with safari companies are preferred under the assumption that there will be a transfer of entrepreneurship and managerial skills in tourism business from companies to local communities.

Communities involved in CBNRM have local institutions known as Community-Based Organizations (CBOs). CBOs are headed by an elected Board of Trustees composed of 10 members. The Board of Trustees is the supreme governing body of CBOs. CBOs are guided by a constitution which specifies, *inter alia*, the memberships and duties of the trusts, powers of the Boards of Trustees, nature of meetings, and resource governance and sanctions of the trusts. CBOs membership has powers to elect representatives to the Board of Trustees or to be elected into the Board. The Board of Trustees conducts and manages all the affairs of the Trust on behalf of its members. These affairs include signing of legal documents such as leases and contracts with safari companies, and maintaining a close contact with the trust lawyers. It also keeps trust records, financial accounts and reports and makes presentations of these records to the general membership at annual general meetings. The establishment of the CBOs in Botswana among other issues indicates an organized institutional arrangement aimed at involving local people in resource management and tourism. Communities allocated CHAs around MNPNP can develop CBNRM projects in their leased areas.

#### Case Studies of JVPs

As shown in Table 3, community trusts in the Okavango Delta such as Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust, Khwai Development Trust, Mababe Zokotshama Trust have opted for Option 1 where there is no merging of either partner’s assets. In these agreements, communities lease land from the Land Board and in turn sub-leases it to private companies. These communities sub-lease hunting and photographic land-user and management rights in their concession areas or CHAs to private tourism companies. Communities therefore receive annual land rentals from these companies. Communities also sell an annual wildlife quota to safari hunting companies, operate campsites, and sell meat to their communities.

Joint Venture Agreements opted by communities in Table 3 began at the time when CBNRM was being started in Botswana. As a result, most of the CBNRM communities involved in this kind of partnership have their tourism business focusing on wildlife utilization by communities to achieve conservation.

**Table 3: CBOs, Type of Tourism Activity and Partnership**

Name of Community Trust	Tourism Activity	Type of JVP Partnership
Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust	Hunting and photographic	No merging assets, community receive land rentals and quota fees
Okavango Community Trust	Hunting and photographic	No merging assets, community receive land rentals and quota fees
Cgaegae Tlhabololo Trust	Hunting and photographic	No merging assets, community receive land rentals and quota fees
Okavango Kopano Mokoro Community Trust	Hunting and photographic	No merging assets, community receive land rentals and quota fees
Mababe Zokotsama Development Trust	Hunting and photographic	No merging assets, community receive land rentals and quota fees
Khwai Development Trust	Hunting and photographic	No merging assets, community receive land rentals and quota fees

Source (Mbaiwa, 2004)

#### CBOs in Makgadikgadi Pans

There are several registered CBOs in the MFMP area which are either operational or planning to be operational very soon (Table 4). The failure to operate by some CBOs may be a result of the fact that there are several demarcated CHAs in the MFMP area, which have never been allocated to particular communities.

**Table 4: Registered CBOs in the MFMP**

Name of CBO	Villages	CBNRM Activities	Remarks
Xhauhwatubi Development Trust	Phuduhudu	Hunting and Photographic	Community using NG 49.
Gwezotsha Natural Resources Trust	Gweta, Zoroga, Tsokatsha	Morula processing marketing	Trust reported to be dormant
Gaing-O Community Trust	Mmatshumo	Photographic tourism at Lekhubu Island Management of a campsite, selling crafts and firewood	Trust not operational
Ngade Trust	Khumaga	Sale of morula sweets, planned activities are: photographic activities, cultural village, campsite, lodge and fish farming.	Trust is operational
Gumakotsha Conservation Trust	Mosu	Planned activities are: game farm, fish farming, cultural village and lodge or motel	Trust not operational
Nata Conservation Trust	Nata, Sepako, Maposa, Manxotae	Photographic tourism, craft production and campsite. A lodge is planned	Trust operational
Mokopi Conservation Trust	Mopipi, Mokoboxane	Planned activities include: fish farming, game farming, campsite and tree planting	Trust not operational
Lenao la Kwalabe Conservation Trust	Kedia	Planned activities: game farm at Hima Ranches	Trust not yet operational

The various CBOs and their associated tourism activities will have to conform to the recommendations of the MFMP. Different parts of the MFMP area should have a specific tourism model allowed in it. As a result, particular tourism and CBNRM activities should be allowed in different parts of the wetlands.

### 5.1.2 The Ecotourism Model

The Ecotourism Model and CBNRM Tourism Model are different models. The two are separated by hunting activities. While CBNRM has safari hunting as one of its tourism activities, ecotourism does not involve it. Ecotourism concentrates on eco-lodges and conservation. Some of the ecotourism companies and ecotourists are opposed to hunting tourism in wilderness areas. There are a few examples that demonstrate ecotourism ventures in Botswana where the community and the private sector have formed partnerships in ecotourism development. These include the following:

- a. The Okavango Wilderness Safaris (OWS) and the Okavango Community Trust (OCT) in the Okavango Delta. The OCT is formed by five villages, namely: Seronga, Gudigwa, Gonitsoga, Beetsha and Eretsha. The OCT has a head lease over for two concession areas (NG 22 and 23) from the Land Board. The tenure of a community head lease for these concession areas is 15 years, and it is renewable after every five years. The OCT has thus sub-leased NG 22 and 23 to OWS. The OWS is photographic tourism company. The company operates a total of five photographic lodges. Since the OWS is a photographic tourism company, there are no hunting activities in NG 22 and 23. The OCT benefits from partnership with OWS include:
  - The Okavango Wilderness Safaris (OWS) and the Gudigwa Community in the development of Gudigwa Lodge (Gudigwa Lodge collapsed 3 years ago). The Gudigwa community formed the Bukakhwe Cultural Conservation Trust (BCCT). After Gudigwa Lodge was constructed through donor funding, the OWS signed a marketing and a service agreement with the BCCT. According to Mbaiwa (2005), the partnership agreements included the following:
    - OWS seconded the general manager to Gudigwa Lodge and agreed to provide relief managers whenever the other the general manager is away on leave or so.
    - All bookings were made by Wilderness Safaris in South Africa and in developed countries where OWS market itself. All guests staying at Gudigwa camp should first stay in one of the OWS camps or lodges.
    - OWS agreed to market Gudigwa Camp as part of its tourism product. Tourists were to pay OWS which in turn would pay the money back to Gudigwa.
    - Services provided by the OWS to the BCCT included the following: communication and management services, staff services, employment and training services, operational services, purchase, supply and dispatch services, and management services. As consideration for the provision of these services, BCCT paid the OWS 7.5% of turnover, plus the amounts actually incurred such as refreshments for guests, phone, fax and e-mail charges etc.).
    - A number of Gudigwa staff were placed in OWS camps for training prior to the opening of the camp.

Despite all these efforts made by OWS to work with the Gudigwa Community to run the lodge, the lodge burnt down in 2007. Despite its collapse, the partnership between the OWS and the BCCT in the development eco-lodges provides lessons on how the private sector and communities can develop eco-lodges in community areas. This approach can be adopted in community areas in the MFMP area. Eco-lodges can be constructed in areas where hunting is marginal but only photographic tourism activities are feasible.

## 5.2 Private Sector Investment and Operational Model

The private sector investment in tourism development in Botswana is mainly undertaken in concession lands known as CHAs, in national parks and game reserves and in related wildlife-based areas. Although the private sector is involved in safari hunting, the majority of the activities are characterized by the construction of accommodation facilities. The private sector involvement in tourism development is a priority for the Government of Botswana. Government recognizes that the private sector will own and operate tourism businesses, engage in joint venture partnerships, employ and train tourism workers and derive profits from tourism enterprises. Government commitment to private sector investment in the tourism industry is demonstrated in the Tourism Policy of 1990. Through the policy, government wanted to diversify and expand Botswana's economy through private sector investment in wildlife-based tourism. Based on the approach adopted by the Tourism Policy, on private sector investment into tourism, several forms of models have been developed under the umbrella of private sector investment and operational model. These include the following:

### 5.2.1 High-end/Up-Market Tourism Model

The high-end/up-market tourism model in Botswana is characterized by permanent accommodation facilities. Prices paid for services in these facilities are generally very high. The high-end/up-market tourism model has a long history of roughly 20 years. That is when the Tourism Policy of 1990 was adopted to guide tourism development in Botswana. The high-end/up-market tourism model is driven by private companies which have partnerships with other private companies or operate as sole companies.

The high-end/up-market tourism model developed in the 1990s. This is because at the time, government concern was that Botswana's wilderness areas which are also the main tourist attractions largely attracted casual campers who were in the lower end of the tourist market. The high paying tourists who stay in permanent accommodation were visiting wilderness areas in small numbers even though they contributed most of the tourist revenue in Botswana. This concern is shown in Section 2.2.5 of the Tourism Policy which notes:

*"...the 20 percent occupying permanent accommodation accounted for over 80 percent of the expenditures by tourists in Botswana. The situation with respect to campers was, of course, the inverse: 80 percent of the tourists were campers but they accounted for less than 20 percent of the total expenditures" (GoB, 1990, 3).*

The concern with backpackers and casual campers is also illustrated in Section 2.2.7 of the policy which states:

*"Foreign tourists who spend much of their time but little money in Botswana are of little net benefit to the country. Indeed, they are almost certainly a net loss because they crowd the available public facilities such as roads and campsites and cause environmental damage" (GoB, 1990:2).*

Government's position was that unless policy changes were made about casual campers, substantial growth in the number of tourists coming to Botswana would probably offer very few if any economic benefits to the country and could cause substantial degradation of the fragile ecology on which tourism depends. Therefore, the motive for adopting the Tourism Policy in 1990 was profit-making driven by the private sector investment in up-market tourism ventures. Section 2.2.7 of the policy illustrates this goal as follows:

*One of the major issues that Botswana's tourism policy must address is...to shift the mix of tourists away from those who are casual campers towards those who occupy permanent accommodation. Encouraging*

*the latter while discouraging the former through targeted marketing and imposition of higher fees for the use of public facilities are obviously among objectives to be pursued (GoB 1990: 3).*

Therefore, some parts of the MFMP area are well suited to support private sector investment particularly up-market tourism accommodation facilities. Particular areas within the MFMP area will thus need to be identified and be designated for private sector investment. Areas such as Meno-a-Kwena, MNPNP can be developed for up-market tourism ventures.

### 5.2.2 Community Public Private Partnerships

The Botswana Government supports partnerships between local communities and the private sector. Such partnerships are developed through shareholding agreements between the communities and private tourism companies. As a result, recent developments indicated that some communities are entering into shareholding agreements with private companies. In this new arrangement, communities and private companies share profits from the tourism business. Examples of shareholding in Botswana so far include the following:

- The Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust (STMT) which entered into a shareholding agreement with Lodges of Botswana for the development of Santawani Lodge. Santawani is a small ecotourism lodge in NG 33 in the Okavango Delta. NG 33 is a photographic tourism concession. No hunting is allowed in the area.
- The Chobe Enclave Conservation Trust (CECT) in the Chobe District recently entered into a shareholding agreement with a private company known as Ngoma Management Enterprise (NME). The shareholding between CECT and NME involves NME constructing the lodge in a community concession area. However, all the property is 100% owned by the community. NME will manage the tourism business and pay retainer and rental fees to the community.
- Nata Conservation Trust also entered into a shareholding agreement with Hedgerow Management. The shareholding approach is known as "Sliding Scale". This is so called because at the initial stage of the business, Hedgerow will be the main shareholder but at intervals of 5 years, Nata Conservation Trust will increase its shares until it buys out Hedgerow Management in a period of 15 years. What is interesting in this business deal is that in the initial stages of the business development, Hedgerow Management will build two lodges of which one will be owned by the community but managed by Hedgerow. In this lodge, issues of community capacity building will be addressed.

These new venture arrangements based on shareholding can be applicable between communities and interested private companies in the MFMP. The Botswana Tourism Organisation (BTO) has played a major role in facilitating some of the agreements between the CECT and, Nata Conservation Trust and the respective private companies.

### 5.3 The Role of BTO in CBNRM

The BTO does not have any form of partnerships with CBOs and private companies. Instead, it facilitates the development of partnerships particularly the shareholding between the private sector and CBOs. The Vision of BTO Investment in CBNRM is:

*Diversified tourism through economically sustainable initiatives and an empowered and secure rural communities, deriving maximum economic benefits through facilitation by BTO (BTB, 2009: 17)*

The goal of BTO participation in CBNRM projects throughout NDP10 can thus be summarized as follows:

*To realise BTO's mandate of broadening the tourism base and empowering rural communities to maintain and improve their livelihoods, whilst also protecting and maintaining the biodiversity and ecological integrity of the area (BTB 2009, 17).*

The role of BTO in CBNRM projects is not only to promote investment but to incubate, plan, scope and develop the projects to later commercialize in order to realize the objective of broadening the tourism, diversifying the tourism product geographically and empowering local communities. As a result, of BTO role in CBNRM, BTO notes some of the critical success factors which include the following:

- Registration of holding companies with BTO and Trusts as shareholders;
- Holding company to decide on operational management per project;
- More funds required for development of the projects;
- Need for operational budget of the projects;
- BTO taking a leadership role for projects that it is implementing, but with assistance of the technical expertise of Technical Advisory Committee (TACs) as and when required.

#### **5.4 Government Tourism Model**

The main role of government in tourism development should be to provide an enabling environment for tourism growth, a business friendly regulatory regime, fair opportunities for all citizens, appropriate infrastructure, easy tourism access, and a sound environmental resource base. However, the Botswana Government has for years been involved in tourism activities directly or indirectly. As such, Government Tourism Model in Botswana includes the following:

##### **5.4.1 Government Campsite Model**

The Government Campsite Model is found in national parks and game reserves run by the Government of Botswana. These tourism activities are carried out through the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP). DWNP operates a number of campsites in protected areas. At the moment, a total of 17% of Botswana's surface land is reserved as national parks and game reserves. Apart from one private lodge in Chobe National Parks and three leased camps in Moremi Game Reserve, there is no private sector investment in national parks and game reserves. The DWNP has a mandate to protect and preserve natural resources in national parks and game reserves (GoB, 1986). This explains why private sector investment is not allowed in national parks and game reserves.

In the case of MFMP area, DWNP can manage campsites within the MNPNP. However, the Government of Botswana has been shown to be very poor in running campsite in Moremi Game Reserve as a tourism business (Mmopelwa *et al.*, 2006). As such, the government tourism model is not always the best in running an efficient and successful tourism venture.

##### **5.4.2 Government-Private Sector Partnerships**

In an attempt to address the limitation of DWNP or government's direct involvement in tourism development, DWNP recently leased out some campsites in national parks and game reserves to the private sector. For example, some of the camp sites in Nxai National park have been leased out to the private sector. Apart from camp sites, there are lodges and boating companies in protected areas such as Moremi Game Reserve which have been leased out to private sector tourism development. This form of tourism partnership between government and the private sector in protected areas can also be extended to certain parts of the MNPNP.



The Hospitality and Tourism Association of Botswana (HATAB) and the Botswana Guides Association (BOGA) are organizations formed by the different tourism companies. HATAB members are private tourism companies which own or operate tourism businesses such as accommodation, restaurants and travel agents. On a similar note, BOGA is an association mostly formed by local companies that provide professional guiding in wilderness areas. Both HATAB and BOGA have campsites reserved for them by DWNP in protected areas such as Moremi Game Reserve and the Chobe National Park. This type of partnership between DWNP on the one hand and BOGA on the other can be useful in the MNPNP. This is particularly so when considering that BOGA is largely composed of local small-scale tourism companies. Granting BOGA particular camp grounds in MNPNP will increase citizen participation in tourism development. In addition, it shows that the MFMP area is capable of accommodating a diversified tourism market. This market includes both up-market tourists, mobile tourists and tourist from the lower end of the spectrum such as self-drives.

### 5.4.3 Government-CBNRM Partnerships

The Government-CBNRM Partnership Model is largely carried out in wildlife areas considered buffer zones between protected areas and human settlements. The model involves government providing a wildlife quota to a CBO who in turn see it to safari hunting companies (Refer to Section 5.1.1).

## 5.5 Donor and Development Agency Model

The Donor and Development Agency Model involve donor and development agencies funding a community project at the initial stages of development. When the project is established, the donor and development agency withdraws leaving the community to manage the project at a profit. The Donor and Development Agency Model is applicable in areas where a community wants to establish a tourism activity like eco-lodge, sanctuary or any other related tourism project. Case studies of the Donor and Development Agency include the following:

- a. Gudigwa Lodge owned by Gudigwa Village
- b. Santawani Lodge owned by Sankuyo Village
- c. Khama Rhino Sanctuary

### *Gudigwa Lodge*

The construction of Gudigwa Lodge was a result of donor funding sourced by Conservation International (CI) on behalf of the Gudigwa Community. Conservation International-Botswana Office with the technical and financial assistance of CI's Ecotourism Division in Washington-DC (USA) mobilized the Gudigwa community to form a legal entity known as a trust (i.e. the BCCT) that would legally ensure that the community participates in an ecotourism development in NG 12. With the Trust formed and the OWS agreeing to market ecotourism products at Gudigwa on behalf of the Gudigwa community to potential clients, the stage was set for the Gudigwa ecotourism lodge to be built. Donor funding amounting to USD 651,415 was used to build Gudigwa lodge/camp and construction was completed in 2003. With CI-Botswana writing proposals on behalf of Gudigwa community, donor funding was sourced from Conservation International-Washington-DC, European Union Micro projects, Swift Foundation (USA), Bancker-Williams Foundation, Mulago Foundation-Healthy Communities Initiative (USA), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, United Nations Development Programme/Botswana's Department of Environmental Affairs and Kalahari Management Services and the people of Gudigwa (Mbaiwa and Rantsudu, 2003).

*Santawani Lodge*

Santawani Lodge, owned by the people of Sankuyo or the Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust was also constructed through the assistance of donor funding. Funding was provided by the Africa Wildlife Foundation.

*Khama Rhino Sanctuary*

The Khama Rhino Sanctuary is also an example of a project that was established with donor money until such a time when it could sustain itself. In the MFMP area, such an approach can be applicable especially in Southern part of Sua Pan where a Flamingo Sanctuary has been established.

## 6. SWOT Analysis of the Tourism Models

A SWOT analysis of the tourism models as applicable in the MFMP area is provided below. The analysis assesses the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of each tourism model as applied in different parts of MFMP area.

### 6.1 SWOT Analysis - Ecotourism

*Strengths*

- Ecotourism projects are likely to attract ecotourists who are environmentally friendly as compared to up-market tourists whose needs may generate huge waste material resulting in mass tourism and its negative environmental effects.
- The ecotourist also interacts more with the local community hence increasing local participation in the tourism business.
- Cultural knowledge and experience being exchange between visitors and local people.
- Ecotourism promotes small-scale tourism facilities which can easily be managed by local communities with little knowledge and experience in the tourism industry.

*Weaknesses*

- Low levels of skilled people in the ecotourism business among local communities in the MFMP area.
- Ecotourism is a new phenomenon to local people, as such, it is likely to be received with mixed feelings especially when hunting is excluded.
- Marketing of the tourism products at MFMP area is likely to be poor due to lack of local skills by communities.

*Opportunities*

- Ecotourism does not have the hunting component, this approach stands to favour photographic companies in that they will be encouraged to form joint venture partnerships with local people.
- Local capacity can be developed either through a joint venture partnership, short courses and employment of a manager who will provide on the job training.
- The GoB is willing to finance ecotourism projects (e.g. chalets etc). Therefore, communities in MFMP area stand to benefit from government credit schemes if they take up tourism as business to venture on it.
- MFMP area has great potential to attract both domestic and international tourists due to its unique geological formation and culture which can serve as tourist products.
- The ecotourism projects around MFMP area are likely to be environmentally friendly in that small-scale structures like chalets are proposed in ecotourism ventures.

- Ecotourism at MFMP area is likely to be more attractive to domestic tourists. Domestic tourism is more reliable than international tourism which gets affected by fluctuations of currencies and other global economic effects and social constraints e.g. diseases, terrorism etc.

#### *Threats*

- Noise pollution from surrounding villages might scare away some of the birds species like flamingos if environmental impacts assessments are not carried out for eco-lodges owned by communities.
- Littering in community campsites and lodges is likely to occur and might destroy the aesthetic beauty of MFMP area.
- Lack of local skills in the ecotourism business remains a threat in the sustainability of ecotourism projects in the MFMP area.

Based on the SWOT analysis presented above, ecotourism appears to have more strengths and opportunities than weaknesses and threats. As such, ecotourism is a viable and suitable tourism approach for communities living in the MFMP area.

## **6.2 SWOT Analysis – Community-Based Tourism Models**

#### *Strengths*

- Communities living around MNPNP can participate in community-based tourism projects.
- Participation in the decision-making process of natural resource management by communities living around MNPNP.
- CBNRM has potential to increase the socio-economic benefits in the form of employment opportunities and income generation to communities living around MNPNP.

#### *Weaknesses*

- Communities involved in CBNRM in Botswana lack tourism business skills (i.e. entrepreneurship skills, marketing and management skills).
- Internal conflicts caused by ethnic differences can cause a community tourism based project to collapse.

#### *Opportunities*

- The MFMP area has a diversity of tourism product (e.g. wildlife, culture, birding etc) which communities living in the area can take advantage of and benefit from tourism development.
- MFMP area is centrally located where transport is better. As a result, communities can take advantage and indirectly participate in tourism (e.g. sell their agricultural produce in the tourism market).
- Reduction of human-wildlife conflicts as communities begins to realize socio-economic benefits from wildlife resources around them through tourism development.

#### *Threats*

- The lack of tourism business skills creates an environment for mismanagement and misappropriation of funds generated from community based tourism projects.
- Likelihood of some local groups beginning to rely on tourism as the sole livelihood option might be risky since tourism is seasonal and relies on global stability.

### 6.3 SWOT Analysis - Private Sector Investment and Operation Model

#### *Strengths*

- Investment is not determined by government but by private investors who are not limited to promote investment to the maximum due to budget constraints as is the case with government. That is, the private sector can stretch its resources to meet the tourist demand.
- The Private Sector is efficient in service delivery. That is, there is likelihood that service delivery in MFMP area in terms of tourism services would be higher when compared to that of other sectors.
- The private sector can bring investment in areas where government would otherwise fail to do so. In this regards, socio-economic benefits such as employment opportunities, income generation and tax revenue would be increased in private investment.
- Key services in a private sector investment area are often provided which would otherwise not be provided if private investment in tourism development was not available i.e. infrastructure development (e.g. airports, roads etc), communication system etc.
- The private sector is efficient in marketing its tourism product both nationally and internationally despite the budget limitations the sector may have. In a private sector, marketing is one of the priority areas where resources are often channelled despite the budget limitations.
- Private sector often promotes skill development within a limited time scale to suit its demands and needs.

#### *Weaknesses*

- Private sector has a tendency of promoting enclave tourism i.e. an exclusive form of tourism developed which would otherwise cause tension and resentment with local people who might find themselves denied access to particular areas in their local environment.
- The organization of the private tourism sector in Botswana is such that a great bulk of revenue leaks from the country to other countries. This is generally not healthy for the local economy and for Botswana as a whole.
- The enclave approach that often results due to private sector tourism models is such that it forms weak linkages with other sectors of domestic economy. For example, much of the foods in the private tourism sector is imported from other countries. This failure to link tourism development and the local agricultural economy stifles agricultural development within the country.
- The private sector puts much attention into profit than environmental management issues. As a result, MFMP area is likely to suffer environmental problems (e.g. poor waste disposal) if measures are not put in place to safeguard the environment.
- The organization of the private tourism sector in Botswana creates insignificant benefits such as tax revenue and related fees accruing to Botswana.

#### *Opportunities*

- MFMP area has a diversified product different from water-based and wildlife-based products offered in the Okavango Delta and Chobe regions.
- MFMP area is located within the central part of Botswana where the road network is good.
- MFMP area is a virgin land for tourism development. The area has a lower human population hence conflicts with the tourism sector are likely to be minimized.
- MFMP area has some of the beautiful scenic areas unique only to that particular environment in Botswana e.g. pans, baobab trees, flamingo birds etc.
- MFMP area is well situated to meet the Botswana Government desire to diversify tourism from reliance on wilderness products.

*Threats*

- Local people and citizens of Botswana are likely to resent the development of enclave tourism in the MFMP area.
- Tourism operators often lack adherence to environmental management in pursuit of profit and short-term gains.
- Human-wildlife conflicts are likely to increase in the advent of increased tourism development in the MFMP area.
- The current economic downturn makes tourism investment in the MFMP area is a less viable enterprise.

**6.4 SWOT Analysis - Government Tourism Model***Strengths*

- Government has the potential to achieve its mandate of resource preservation in protected areas like MNPNP.
- Government policy is that there should be no safari hunting inside national parks. This therefore is an advantage in the development of photographic and non-consumptive forms of tourism development.
- Land in the form of MNPNP is available for tourism development.

*Weaknesses*

- Governments all over the world, including the Botswana Government, have proved to be inefficient in running the tourism business e.g. the failure to effectively manage campsites in national parks and game reserves. Government often lacks the necessary skills, staff, equipment and facilities to run viable tourism enterprises.
- Government often has a poor marketing strategy when compared to the private sector.
- Because government is often not worried about competition in running campsites services, such facilities are not well maintained and there is often limited space for tourists.
- Government's preservation approach to resource management in protected areas often cause antagonistic relations with surrounding communities.

*Opportunities*

- Government has control over all the natural resources in the MFMP area. As a result, government determines policy issues in the use of all natural resources including tourism products.
- Government has full access and control of all the natural resources including tourism products in the MFMP area.
- The MNPNP is big hence standing at an advantage to maximize commercial and leisure opportunities in the area.
- Wildlife products in the MNPNP can be packaged with other products in the surroundings to maximize economic returns e.g. local culture.

*Threats*

- Governments are generally poor in customer service in tourism development as demonstrated in the management of campsites in protected areas.
- Governments are poor in product marketing and development within the tourism sector.

## 6.5 SWOT Analysis – Donor and Development Agency Model

### Strengths

- Local communities can have access to funding. Funding can result in communities establishing tourist facilities like eco-lodges, sanctuaries and other related tourism enterprises.

### Weaknesses

- Donor and Development Agencies can dictate the type of tourism enterprise for the community which in essence might not be the accepted project.
- Donor and Development Agencies have a short life span over a project. As a result, the possibility of the project collapsing once the donor moves out is high.
- Local capacity building might be slow in matching the skills needed in the project during the project development stage.

### Opportunities

- Donor and Development Agencies prefer working with the disadvantaged members of the community (e.g. women, children and marginalized ethnic groups). All these groups exist in the MFMP area hence the high potential for donors to be interested in investing money in the area.
- Government currently aims at diversifying tourism from being wildlife based to include other tourism products. As a result, the MFMP is likely to get donor-government support.

### Threats

- There is a high potential that projects which are donor driven collapse after the donors withdraw due to lack of local capacity to manage projects.

## 6.6 Conclusions from SWOT Analysis

The SWOT Analysis described above for the different tourism models provides insights into potential opportunities and constraints in developing tourism in different parts of the MFMP area. The SWOT Analysis shows that different tourism approaches are applicable to different parts of the wetland. As a result, the analysis shows that MFMP area is capable of holding all the different tourist visitors. As shown in Table 5, potential visitors at MFMP area can be categorized into non-consumptive (e.g. photographic) and consumptive (e.g. trophy hunters) visitors. Photographic tourists include: independent (private), mobile, high cost (fixed lodge) and day visitors while consumptive tourists include safari hunters (trophy hunters).

**Table 5: Potential Visitors and Tourist Activities in the MFMP area**

Type of Tourist	Tourist Activities	Remarks
High cost or fixed	Game drives, night drives, walking trails, boating, bird watching, fishing, canoeing	High paying tourists, pay for visit as a package in countries of origin, stay in 2-3 camps for 2-3 nights (total 6-8 nights)
Mobile	Game drives (at times boating), bird watching, fishing, canoeing	Stay in private and public camps, spend 5-21 days, pay for visit as a package in country of origin, second highest paying tourists
Self-drive (independent, low cost)	Game drives, bird watching, fishing	Stay in public campsites, spend 8-10 days, drive own or rent vehicles, least spending tourists
Day Visitors	Game drives, boating, bird watching, canoeing	These are day visitors. They travel in the morning and come back in the evening
Safari hunters (sport or trophy hunters)	Hunting (some combine it with photographic activities as in high cost tourists)	Some combine hunting with photographic activities hence classified as high cost tourists.

Source: Mbaiwa, 2009.

The ability for the MFMP area to accommodate the different income groups indicate that a diversified tourism approach from the high-end or up-market clientele should be the approach followed in the wetland. As a result, mobile operators, self-drive tourists and up-market tourists can be pursued in different parts of the wetland. Knowing the different tourism categories should enable decision makers to manage the socio-economic and environmental impacts caused by each group.

## 7. Management model recommendations for tourism development areas

Tourism development areas were ranked based on tourism product and its ability to attract tourists. From the ranking the ten sites with the highest potential were selected. These sites are listed in Table 6 below and particular tourism models are recommended for each of the sites.

**Table 6: Tourism Sites and Tourism Models for MFMP area**

Proposed Tourism Site	Rank	Recommended Tourism Model
Nata (e.g. Nata Sanctuary, and CT 5)	1	Nata Tourism Area – Any model Nata Sanctuary Area CBNRM Tourism Model Community Public Private Partnership
Gweta (e.g. Gweta Area, Zoroga area, CT 7, CT 11)	2	CBNRM Tourism Model in CT11 area Ecotourism Model in CT Area Community Public Partnership
Khumaga, Meno a Kwena, Leruo la Tau (Boteti)	3	CBNRM Tourism Model High-end/up-market model Community Public Private Partnership
Mosu Escarpment, Southern Sua Pan area	4	CBNRM Tourism Model Ecotourism Model
Nxai National park	5	Government Private Sector Model High-end/up-market model Government Campsite Model
CT 11	6	CBNRM Tourism Model
Mea Pan, Mokobilo Area	7	Ecotourism Model Community Public Private Partnership
Kubu Islands, Nkokhwane Pan	8	Ecotourism Model Community Public Private Partnership
Makgadikgadi National Park	9	Government Private Sector Model High-end/up-market model Government Campsite Model
Rysana Pan, Txzbaka, CT 10, Lake Xau)	10	Ecotourism Model Community Public Private Partnership

As shown in Table 6, some of the sites will require more than one tourism model. As a result, the recommended 10 sites and the proposed tourism models to be considered for each site are discussed in detail below.

### *Nata*

This area includes Nata area, Nata Sanctuary and CT 5. In the Nata area, mass tourism can be developed, as a result any tourism model might be feasible based on a particular tourism enterprise. In the Nata Sanctuary area, two types of tourism models are recommended, that is the CBNRM Tourism Model and the Community Public private Partnership. The Nata Sanctuary area is an environmental sensitive area due to the presence of the flamingo birds and other fragile ecosystem. It is also owned by the community hence the two models are appropriate.

*Gweta*

This area includes Gweta Area, CT 7 and CT 11. CT 7 and CT 11 are buffer zones between the Gweta Village and Eastern MNP. There are human-wildlife conflicts in the area. Best tourism models in wildlife buffer zones designed to minimize the conflicts is the CBNRM Tourism Model. The assumption is that once local communities derive economic benefits from wildlife and other natural resources found in the area, they will be a reduction in conflicts as communities begin to receive tourism benefits which in theory should exceed the costs of livestock and crop farming. In the Gweta Village area, both the Ecotourism and the Community Public Private Partnership models are recommended. The reason is that local communities who may not have the skills in tourism business will learn from such partnerships.

*Khumaga and Meno a Kwena (Boteti Area)*

This area includes the Khumaga Village area, Meno a Kwena and Leruo la Tau area. The Khumaga area is characterized by human-wildlife conflicts due the existence of Makgadikgadi Pans National Park. The CBNRM Tourism Model is suitable in addressing the human-wildlife conflicts. In the Meno a Kwena and Leruo la Tau area, a private sector investment and operational model characterized by high-end and up-market tourism development is recommended. This is because the area is has little human-wildlife conflicts and is not used by community per se.

*Mosu*

This covers the Mosu Escarpment area. This area is close to the Orapa-Francistown road and has fewer wildlife species. The area also has landscape that can be tourist attractions and is claimed by the Mosu community. These characteristics make the Ecotourism Model to be suitable for development in the area. In the Southern part of Sua Pan where a Flamingo Sanctuary has been gazetted, the CBNRM Tourism Model and the Donor and Development Agency Model are recommended. Although the Sanctuary has already, been established, there is potential for donor funding to further develop the Sanctuary. The donors could leave the project once it is fully developed and the community is fully capable of operating without external assistance. The CBNRM Tourism Model as is the case with Khama Rhino Sanctuary becomes useful once the sanctuary is fully operational.

*Nxai Pan National Park*

This is a protected area and state land. In the park, different categories of tourists (e.g. up-market, mobile and self drive) may visit the area. These tourist segments require different services that may require different facilities. In addition, the fact that Nxai Pans National park is owned and controlled by the Botswana Government, government partnership models are suitable for it. These include the following: Government Private Sector Model, High-end/up-market model, and Government Campsite Model. The Government Private Sector model should allow particular areas within the park to accommodate mobile tourists especially those from HATAB and BOGA. Some areas within the park can also be set aside for up-market tourism activities like lodges hence the High-end/up-market model is suitable. Finally, government can also manage campsites in particular areas.

*Mea Pan*

The area is in proximity to Mokobilo Village. The people of Mokobilo may have claims to the Pan. As a result, a community tourism develop approach is suitable. Therefore, the Ecotourism Model and Community Public Private Partnership models are appropriate for the area.

*Kubu Island*

The area is includes Kubu Islandsand Nkokhwane Pan. The landscape and birds are the main tourist attractions in the area. The area also has a high community influence. As a result, the Ecotourism Model and Community Public Private Partnership are appropriate for development.



*Makgadikgadi Pans National Park*

Like Nxai Pans National Park, the Makgadikgadi Pans National Park is a protected area and state land. As a result, in parks, different categories of tourists (e.g. up-market, mobile and self drive) may visit the area. These tourist segments require different services that may require different facilities. That MPNP is owned and controlled by the Botswana Government, government partnership models are suitable for it. These include the following: Government Private Sector Model, High-end/up-market model, and Government Campsite Model. The Government Private Sector model should allow particular areas within the park to accommodate mobile tourists especially those from HATAB and BOGA. Some areas within the park can also be set aside for up-market tourism activities like lodges hence the High-end/up-market model is suitable. Finally, government can also manage campsites in particular areas.

*Rysana Pan and Txabaka*

This area includes Rysana Pan, Txabaka, CT 10 and Lake Xau. The landscape in the area is an important part of the tourism attraction. By virtue of it being a community area, community-based tourism approaches are necessary. These include the Ecotourism Model and Community Public Private Partnership.

## 8. Conclusions and recommendations

A review of tourism models indicate that there are four broad tourism models that can be applicable in the MFMP area. These are: Government Tourism Model, Private Sector Investment and Operational Model, and Community-Based Tourism Model and the Donor and Development Agency Model. These models have several sub-models that can be suitable for the different parts of the area. A SWOT analysis for each of these tourism models indicates that all can be applicable in different parts of the wetland. However, the government tourism model is less favourable mainly because governments are generally poor in running efficient and successful tourism businesses. Governments are also poor in product marketing and development. This suggests that viable tourism models in the MFMP area are the private sector investment and community-based tourism models. Community-based tourism model is necessary to achieve two main goals, namely: a) reduction of human wildlife conflict and increase in natural resource conservation, and, b) increase rural development and local livelihoods. On the other hand, the private sector investment model is critical in increasing tourism revenues and related economic and environmental benefits as stipulated in the Tourism Policy of 1990. The private sector investment and community-based tourism models both encourage sustainability in the use of natural resources and local participation in tourism development. This approach is in line with the principles of sustainable tourism which are driving tourism development in Botswana.

There are also general recommendations resulting from assessment of the different tourism models reported in this study. These include the following:

- The MFMP area has a diversified tourism product. As a result, it provides an opportunity of diversifying Botswana's tourism industry from the high-end tourism approach to include other tourist segments. This includes groups such as up-market tourists, mobile tourists, self-drive tourists, and cultural tourist. In this regard, the Makgadikgadi Pans should be developed such that up-market, middle income and the lower-end tourists are catered for.
- Local communities in the MFMP area lack the necessary financial resources for the development of tourism enterprises. In addition, local communities lack the capacity building and marketing capital. Even though there are government financial schemes (e.g. CEDA, Conservation Fund and credit facilities from commercial banks), local communities often fail to have access to such facilities. As a result, ways should be

developed that would enable communities access credit facilities to develop tourism enterprises in their local area.

- The role of BTO in CBNRM is positive development more especially that it promotes shareholding between local communities and private companies. This is a better approach that can benefit local communities as compared to the lease agreements between local communities and safari companies (i.e. Option 1 of the JVP Guidelines). The shareholding approach is recommended because it is a move towards truth joint venture partnerships between local communities and the private sector.

## 9. References

- Boggs, L.P. (2000). Community Power, Participation, Conflict and Development Choice: Community Wildlife Conservation in the Okavango Region of Northern Botswana. Discussion Paper No. 17, IIED, Maun, Botswana.
- Botswana Tourism Board (2009). BTB CBNRM Strategic Framework. BTB, Gaborone, Botswana. Unpublished Report.
- Bromley, D. 1992. Making the Commons Work. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- DWNP 1999 (page 10) JVP document.
- Government of Botswana. (1990). Botswana Tourism Policy. Government Paper No. 2 of 1990 Government Printer, Gaborone.
- Government of Botswana. (1986). The Wildlife Conservation Policy. Government Paper No. 2 of 1986 Government Printer, Gaborone.
- IUCN, 1996:20 (page 9).
- Leach, M., Mearns, R., and Scoones, I. (1999). Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *World Development* 27(2), 225-247.
- Mbaiwa (2009). Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis of the Okavango River Basin: The Status of Tourism Development in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. Unpublished Report Prepared for OKACOM.
- Mbaiwa, J.E. and Stronza, A.L. (2009). The Challenges of Sustainable Tourism and Ecotourism in Developing Countries. In: Jamal, T. & Robinson, M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Tourism Studies*, London: Routledge, pp 329-349.
- Mbaiwa, J.E. (2005). Prospects of Cultural Tourism and Sustainable Livelihoods at Gudigwa Village in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Pula: Botswana Journal of African Studies*. 19(2):142-157.
- Mbaiwa, J. E. And Rantsudu, M. (2003) A Socio-economic Baseline Study of the Babukakhwe Cultural Conservation *Trust in the Okavango Delta*. Conservation International-Botswana and Harry Oppenheimer Okavango Research Centre, Maun, 71pp.
- Mmopelwa, G., Kgathi, D.L., Molefhe, L. 2007. Tourists' perceptions and their willingness to pay for park fees: A case study of self-drive tourists and clients for mobile tour operators in Moremi Game Reserve, Botswana. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1044–1056.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsing, A.L., Brosius, J.P. and Zerner, C. (1999). Assessing Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *Ambio*, 28, 197-8.
- Twyman, C. (2000). Participatory Conservation? Community-based Natural Resource Management in Botswana. *The Geographical Journal*, 166(4), 323-335.
- World Tourism Organization-WTO. (2001). *Tourism Market Trends, Africa: 1999*. WTO, Madrid, Spain.