From Philanthropy to Business Models: A Case Study of
Tourism and Horticultural Supply Linkages in Serengeti
National Park Region, Tanzania

by

Petronila Michael

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Political Science

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© 2011

Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-83086-4
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-83086-4

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

This thesis focuses on Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) theory and its proposed shift away from philanthropic interventions to adopting business models. This shift has been presented as an ideal strategy for realizing net benefits for the impoverished people in tourist -frequented destinations. However, this thesis shows that embracing business models is a more challenging process than the theory suggests, thus its practicability should be problematized. This argument is advanced through the case study of the tourism and horticulture industries in the Serengeti National Park (SENAPA) in Tanzania. Eckstein's Discipline Configurative case study approach of enquiry is adopted to reveal the opportunities and challenges surrounding the demand and supply relationships of the two industries at the regional context. The field research was conducted through 84 qualitative interviews from February to April of 2011. The main conclusions of this study are that, with time, the proposed shift, if well planned and managed, could make a significant contribution to poverty alleviation efforts in SENAPA. This would require much attention, time and resources devoted to the transition period if any meaningful change is to be attained. Real change is therefore, largely dependent on massive co-operative efforts and commitment of the involved stakeholders in harnessing the required resources, guiding the interventions, and coordinating and managing the entire transition process.

Key Words: Pro-Poor Tourism, Horticulture, Philanthropy, Business Models, SENAPA, Discipline Configurative Case Study

Acknowledgement

For we are God's masterpiece, by his act we were given existence in Christ Jesus to do those good works, which God has ordained for us, so that we might successfully accomplish them (Eph. 2:10).

It is an honor for me to thank my supervisor, Dr. Chris Brown, for his continual support, guidance and advice throughout the writing process. This thesis would have been impossible without your valuable comments. Your thorough effort and time in reading my thesis is very much appreciated. Thanks Chris. I owe my deepest gratitude to Dr. Blair Rutherford for his encouragement and critical comments on my thesis. Sharing my enthusiasm about this topic made me feel that I am doing something important. Thanks for your feedbacks when I was on my fieldwork in Tanzania. I would like to thank Professor Daniel Osabu-Kle, my graduate supervisor, for his encouragement, support and confidence in my abilities. Your courses gave me significant background knowledge and ideas for this thesis. Thanks very much Daniel.

I appreciate the support of all research participants, especially TAHA and Round Table Africa for enriching the data for this thesis. I would like to show my gratitude to Stephen Talmage, Carleton retired Professor for his endless generous support from the time I germinated this topic as a thesis proposal. Thanks for enduring my intense conversations about PPT.

I am heartily thankful to my friends Heather, Lisa, James, Fatuma, Jerrie, Eunice, Mervis and Regina. Your ever presence in my life made my writing burden lighter. Heather and Lisa, your continual support in editing my drafts is sincerely appreciated. James, thanks for your help on the table of content and the bibliography.

I am ever grateful to my mom, dad and siblings. Thanks for your prayers, love, care, support and encouragement. I especially thank my darling husband Deogratius whose love, care, support, encouragement and patience kept me strong throughout the research process. Your constant communication made such a great contribution. Thanks for the text messages darling!

Lastly, I extend my sincere gratitude and blessings to all of those who supported me in any respect during the completion of this study. May God bless you all!

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Acronyms	vii
 Chapter 1: Introduction	 1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Introduction to Pro-Poor Tourism.....	2
1.2.1 PPT Proposals	3
1.3 The Shift from Philanthropy to Business Models.....	3
1.4 Research Problem	6
1.4.1 Deficiencies in the Existing Literature.....	8
1.5 Specific Thesis Questions.....	9
1.6 Thesis Statement	10
1.7 Thesis Structure	11
 Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework.....	 12
2.1 Introduction.....	12
2.1.1 Background	12
2.2 Perspectives in Tourism and Poverty Alleviation.....	13
2.2.1 The Dependency Critique.....	16
2.2.2 The Political Economy Account	17
2.2.3 Alternative Approaches.....	18
2.3 The Emergence of Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT)	20
2.3.1 Perspectives on PPT	21
2.3.2 Positioning PPT in the Current Development Paradigm.....	22
2.3.3 The Enabling Environment for PPT and the International Support.....	24
2.2.4 PPT “Branding” Approaches	25
2.3.5 PPT Distinguishing Principles, Strategies and Mechanisms.....	27
2.4 Linking PPT with Agriculture/ Horticulture.....	29

2.4.1 Feasibility of Horticulture in the Tourism Market.....	30
2.4.2 Demand and Supply Issues	31
2.5 Conclusion	33
Chapter 3: Research Design.....	34
3.1 Objective.....	34
3.2 Review of Related Literature.....	34
3.3 General Framework of Inquiry	35
3.4 Case Study Strategy of inquiry	36
3.4.1 Single, Discipline-Configurative Case Study.....	37
3.5 Unit of Analysis and Sampling.....	38
3.6 Sample Selection Framework	39
3.6.1 Subsector Analysis	39
3.7 Data Collection Methods	40
3.7.1 Observation and Field Visits.....	40
3.7.2 Interviewing	41
3.7.3 Focal Group Discussions (FGDs)	43
3.7.4 Desk Study	44
3.8 Overall Limitations	44
3.9 Conclusion	45
Chapter 4: Background of the Case Study Region	47
4.1 Introduction.....	47
4.2 National Context.....	47
4.2.1 Agriculture and the Tanzanian Economy.....	48
4.2.2 Organizing Agricultural/ Horticultural Farming	49
4.2.3 Trends and Current Status of Horticulture	50
4.2.4 Horticulture and the National Policy Environment.....	51
4.3 Tourism.....	52
4.3.1 National Tourism Policy, Trends and the Current Status.....	53
4.4 Specific Case Study Context: Serengeti National Park	54
4.4.1 Horticultural Demand in the SENAPA area	55

4.4.2 The Current Procurement System	58
4.5 Local Sourcing: Potential Supporting Organizations	59
4.6 The Regional Context: Mara Region	63
4.6.1 Potential Horticultural Supply Initiatives in Mara	63
4.7 Conclusion	67
Chapter 5: Case Study Findings and Analysis.....	69
5.1 Introduction to Findings.....	69
5.2 Summary of Key findings.....	74
5.2.1 SENAPA's Central Procurement System	74
5.2.2 Perspectives on SENAPA Horticultural Procurement System	75
5.2.2.1 Development Practitioners and Political Representatives Perspective.....	76
5.2.2.2 Business Operators Perspective.....	77
5.2.2.3 Producers Perspective.....	77
5.2.2.4 Key Informant Perspective	78
5.2.2.5 Tour Operators Perspectives.....	86
5.2.3 The Feasibility of Shifting to Local Sourcing.....	89
5.2.4 Critical Success Factors	92
5.3 Discussion.....	95
5.3.1 The Poverty Alleviation Perspective.....	96
5.3.2 Feasibility of Horticulture in the Tourism Market:	98
5.3.3 Supply Constraints versus Demand Requirements	100
5.3.4 Organizing and Operating the Supply Linkages: Stakeholders' Roles	101
5.4 Conclusion	103
Chapter 6: Implications, Conclusions and Recommendations	104
6.1 Implications of the study for PPT Theory.....	104
6.2 Implications for PPT Practice	107
6.3 Recommendations.....	111
6.3.1 Avenues for Further Research.....	111
6.3.2 Suggestions for the Way Forward.....	112
6.4 Concluding remarks.....	114

Bibliography	115
Appendices.....	132
Appendix I: PPTP Revised PPT Principles.....	132
Appendix II: The UNWTO Principles	133
Appendix III: PPTP Strategies for realizing the PPT Approach.....	134
Appendix IV: UNWTO Mechanisms for implementing the Strategies	135
Appendix V: The Subsector Map.....	136
Appendix VI: Specific Interview Framework and Questions	137
Appendix VII: List of Interviewees and Respondents	140
Appendix VIII: Arusha-Based Production and Market Actors	141
Appendix IX: Contextual Model for the Case Study Region.....	142
Appendix X: SENAPA Tourist Enterprises	143

List of Acronyms

ACT	Agricultural Council of Tanzania
COP	Grumeti Community Outreach Program
DFID	UK Department for International Development
GHOMACOS	Grumeti Horticultural and Marketing Co-operative Society
HODECT	Horticulture Development Council of Tanzania
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
MSHP	Mara Smallholders Project
ODA	Official Development Assistance
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PPT	Pro-Poor Tourism
PPTP	Pro- Poor Tourism Partnership
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
SEDEREC	Serengeti Development Research and Environmental Conservation Centre
SEFA	Serengeti Farmers' Association
SENAPA	Serengeti National Park
SGR	Singita Grumeti Reserves
SAPs	Structural Adjustment Programs
ST-EP	Sustainable Development Eliminating Poverty
TAHA	Tanzania Horticultural Association
TANAPA	Tanzania National Park Authority
UNWTO	United Nations World Tourism Organization
WB	World Bank

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

International tourism is increasingly a growing and a profitable business in the contemporary world. Linking tourism and poverty alleviation has been considered valuable by international organizations, national governments, NGOs and other development practitioners. The underlying idea for this focus in recent times is called Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT). Given its explicit focus on a poverty alleviation perspective, the idea has gained much relevance in developing countries. This is because decades of operation of tourism projects has not contributed in significant ways to reducing poverty and improving well being of those inhabiting these spaces.

Tanzania is one example of a poor country in Africa with major tourist destinations. Natural beauty, distinctive cultures and famous wildlife conservation parks contribute to Tanzania's prominent touristic status. Tanzania regards tourism as a valuable sector for 'sustainable development' (Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, 2009). It is one of its fastest growing economic sectors and a major source of foreign exchange, accounting for about 40% of the country's total export earnings (Mamadi, 2004; Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, 2009; World Bank Group/ NIGA, 2005). Tourism receipts were US\$ 1,037 million in 2007. Earnings went up by 11.3 % in 2010, totaling about US\$1.28 billion (World Bank, 2010; Central Bank of Tanzania, 2010).

Tanzania dedicates 25% of its land to Wildlife National Parks, covering a total of 14 wildlife viewing centres. Amongst the 14 National Parks, Serengeti National Park (SENAPA) is the biggest and most visited destination, comprised of about 40 privately owned tourist enterprises

(hotels, lodges and camps) and surrounded by 15 of the 31 protected areas¹ in the country (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010; Ankunda, 2011). It is a world renowned site for seeing wildlife, and is one of the best known protected areas in the world, described by foreigners as a destination that provides “unique wildlife viewing experiences” (Kaltenborn et. al., 2008, World Bank Group/ NIGA 2005). In general, this tourist destination is home to some of the most profitable tourism businesses in the country, with a high potential to contribute to the development of neighbouring communities.

Surprisingly, recent studies on the impact of tourism on communities in and around SENAPA conclude that people in these communities reap limited benefits from the businesses, and they remain fairly poor (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010; SEDEREC, 2009; SNV, 2009). This is so despite the fact that tourist enterprises have been making considerable donations, often for the purpose of delivering social amenities in surrounding communities. For instance, contributions have been made in education (building classrooms, donating books, etc.), water supply (constructing wells and boreholes) and health (constructing hospitals, dispensaries and other medical service facilities). Yet, poverty and inequality rates in Mara, the region within which SENAPA is located, remain quite high.

1.2 Introduction to Pro-Poor Tourism

PPT is an approach that aims to generate net benefits for the poor, including unlocking opportunities for their direct economic gain, such as employment, other intangible livelihood benefits, as well as political empowerment – all through tourism (Ashley et al., 2001:1). One of

¹ The Wildlife Protected Areas are managed by the National Wildlife Management Authority (WMA) under the Tanzania Tourism Authority (TANAPA).

the underlying principles of the PPT theory is *participation by the poor*, including spending on goods and services from poor people (Ashley et al., 2000).

1.2.1 PPT Proposals

PPT proposals can be summarized in the following interrelated ways: i) the local poor in tourist-frequented areas should sustainably reap net benefits, including economic gains that count towards their poverty reduction. The target is especially on poor people in the tourist centres' vicinities, since they are the traditional land-owners of these places, in addition to living near these locations and being primary hosts to tourists. ii) A strategy for ensuring the realization of these benefits would require a shift from philanthropy to business-oriented interventions. Discouraging overdependence and interference in tourist business operations requires serious changes that would require the poor to stand as active participants in their own development, rather than being passive recipients as they have traditionally been. iii) This shift suggests the diversification and improvement of traditional livelihood means, rather than their total replacement. Given the relevance of agriculture/ horticulture in most developing countries' economies, and considering the significance of food in tourism businesses, agricultural/horticultural supply linkages are widely accepted as an entry point in realizing the proposed strategy.

1.3 The Shift from Philanthropy to Business Models

It is arguable that one of the reasons why philanthropy has not been working is that it is simply an ineffective mechanism for achieving poverty reduction. Or, it may be due to mismanagement of the philanthropic money, including its being diverted to other uses. Regardless of where the problem lies, philanthropic interventions, just like aid-led development more broadly, have been

widely criticized and discouraged, leading to the dominance of market-driven approaches to development. “Development” aid is being negatively connoted as “dead/ failed” assistance in the contemporary scholarship implying that it has been a misguided strategy and overall a dysfunctional approach to poverty alleviation. This critical viewpoint questions both the utility and management of aid, and overall considers it as a failure, thus calling for more market-oriented interventions as alternative approaches (Moyo, 2009; Ayitey, 2003; Easterly, 2006; Collier, 2007).

It is still too early to take sides on whether or not market-oriented proposals are an ideal approach to poverty alleviation. Available research on the actual shifting process and its impacts on the local poor is still limited to building the evidence. Much of the existing PPT literature and research tend to focus, at least broadly, on justifying the potentiality of tourism to effectively alleviate poverty by institutionalizing business interventions. Arguably, the potentiality might exist but the feasibility question pointing to the actual transformation by business interventions remains unaddressed.

The transition period, while crucial for understanding the actual realization of this proposal, has not been researched to the required extent. Does the proposed shift, even if it was easy to attain, *necessarily* serve the interests of the “local poor”? Evidently, tourism may generate a wide range of employment and business opportunities. What these opportunities may mean for poverty alleviation and the consideration of what does it take to build the business environment in a traditional philanthropic-oriented background are important questions that challenge the optimism of this proposal. While appreciating the general thinking of PPT, particularly its new strategy, this study will investigate the challenges surrounding the transition period as well as the actual process of substituting philanthropy with business practices. What are the conditions, if

any, under which the proposed alternative could be realized? Clearly, this shift would require considerable resources to set up the business interventions. This need, in turn, raises considerations about the immensity of the task of implementing the proposal. Where could the required resources come from? Should philanthropy be abandoned completely and the money be rechanneled into the new business interventions? Or should the donations be kept, but complemented with assistance from elsewhere? How feasible is either of these options? The shift is undoubtedly associated with substantial new changes that the local communities have to learn and adapt. How would the proposal be internalized in local communities and who is responsible for addressing potential issues that may arise within the initial phase of operation? What incentives could be put behind the will to take such responsibilities?

These questions are shaped by the understanding that implementation is a process, and more importantly, one that involves many actors with varying interests and perspectives. It is important to be aware of some potential difficulties that may arise in the process. While the focus of PPT is on alleviating poverty through tourism, local initiatives such as food supply linkages involve intermediaries/ middlemen. These people play a vital role in the process as they bridge the gap between tour operators and local impoverished people. The intermediary actors always focus on their own business opportunities and potential profits. While the theory on paper puts the people at the centre of PPT initiatives, the intermediaries often focus on the feasibilities of the generated business opportunities, from a commercial viability perspective. Already here there is an emerging gap between the two actors. This gap becomes even wider when the requirements of the tour operators, who are the third key actors, are taken into account. Given that the tour operators are driven by stringent requirements, such as quality, quantity, and variety, it does not seem viable to compromise their standards for the sake of the poor.

While voices of development practitioners push forward the poverty alleviation agenda, poverty realities are often in conflict with business objectives. Arguably, cash constraints may continue to penalize the poor by disconnecting them from the potential business opportunities. Addressing this problem would require seeking financial support in combination with knowledge-based interventions such as social enterprise, entrepreneurship and partnership formation. This may be an ideal recommendation for reducing inequalities that may arise as different actors strive to defend their interests.

1.4 Research Problem

This thesis attempts to incorporate the above posed questions in an assessment of the PPT theory in practice. As some development scholars have observed, the novelty of the theory requires that more studies be done in order to identify challenges and suggest plausible strategies for its implementation (Okech 2010). Drawing from a case study of horticultural supply linkages to tourist enterprises in and around Serengeti National Park (SENAPA), this thesis assesses the magnitude of the task of implementing PPT proposals, especially on the ‘shifting beyond philanthropy’ proposal, and uses the key challenges emerging from the case study to question and problematize the naïve optimism that may arise from PPT theoretical assumptions.

SENAPA was chosen for this study because it possesses many of the suitable characteristics that are embedded in PPT thinking. Considering that SENAPA communities are agro-pastoralists², the study focuses on agricultural-based initiatives. Specific attention is placed on horticultural supply linkages, i.e. supply of fruits, vegetables and herbs to hotels, lodges, camps and canteens in and around the SENAPA. This is because development practitioners in the area consider food-

² These are people depend on a mixture of crop cultivation and livestock herding as core livelihood means.

related interventions as plausible linkages, given the traditional means of livelihoods in the area. This focus is also informed by the increasing demand for horticulture within the region and even globally. Furthermore, because tourists are considerably wealthier than the general population in destination areas, they can afford to pay higher food prices.

It is surprising that SENAPA has a notable reputation for its profitable tourism businesses nation-wide and even world-wide, yet its profitability is minimally reflected in its neighbouring communities. Tourism in SENAPA generates business opportunities that can presumably be optimized by the local people living close to the park. Development practitioners are making considerable efforts to organize and link local goods and services to these enterprises, mainly through the formation of farmers' co-operatives, associations, and marketing networks. Currently, there is a substantial number of newly created horticultural-based producer groups, spread throughout all the four districts of the Mara region, marking the case for a localized food procurement system. Yet, these people remain weakly connected to the tourism industry and are inadequately benefiting from its businesses. If PPT, in a real sense, enables local people living near tourist destinations to optimize the market opportunities that the tourism business generates, why are local people neighbouring SENAPA still inadequately benefiting?

One reason may be that theoretical arguments generate naïve optimism, which eventually makes practitioners underestimate the task of implementation. Secondly, it may be that practitioners tend to be preoccupied with the opportunities offered by the market, thus not taking time to assess the situation on the ground, e.g., potential threats that might hinder local initiatives. Thirdly, it may be that actors involved in the implementation have different foci and interests. For instance, while PPT proponents emphasize poverty reduction, business people (intermediaries/middlemen), usually the integral part of the proposed system, are interested in

maximizing their own profit. The tour operators, on the other hand, focus on realizing good business practices and tend to rely on middlemen rather than on local smallholder horticultural growers. The three explanations further beg the question of where exactly the problem lies.

Whether the problem is at the conceptual level or the practical level is one of the issues that this thesis aims to address. Wherever the problem lies, the experience of the SENAPA people can understandably generate pessimism and arouse skepticism concerning both the premises and the promises of the PPT theory, particularly on its proposal to adopt business strategies. The present thesis, however, suggests that since this theory is still new, this experience should be seen as a lesson-generating scenario for future PPT practices. Along these lines of thinking the following will be incorporated as aspects of the ‘lesson-generating scenario’: (i) reassessing the theory as a whole, in terms of its background, debates, proposals, principles, strategies, and mechanisms (as detailed in chapter 2); (ii) reconsidering the critical success/failure factors surrounding PPT implementation (advanced in the findings and discussions, chapter 5) and (iii) understanding the need for (appropriate) resources in the process, while (iv) raising ideas for developing plausible interventions for future implementation of PPT initiatives (as summarized in the last chapter).

1.4.1 Deficiencies in the Existing Literature

The claim that PPT focuses “explicitly” on the perspective of the poor appears not to be clearly defined and defended in the literature. Given that the overall PPT idea does not originate from within the impoverished people’s perspective, but from scholarly theories, it is imperative that the idea be backed up with the input of the targeted population and other important “on the ground” actors who govern market behaviors, such as tour operators. The novelty of this theory warrants further examination to gather an informed viewpoint, which is significant in building

and challenging the theory. This study attempts to contribute to this observed need by bringing together voices of the ‘local’ people including impoverished local farmers, development practitioners, government representatives, tour operators, intermediary actors and other relevant stakeholders. This thesis will therefore identify key perspectives, subsequent gaps and draw recommendations for further studies and PPT practices.

1.5 Specific Thesis Questions

Essentially, this thesis asks what the shift to business models means for the local poor in the SENAPA context. Specific guiding questions include,

1. What do the local people think about the PPT proposal for adopting business models and avoiding overdependence on the tourism industry? What are their primary concerns in this regard?
2. What are the key issues surrounding the realization of the proposal from other perspectives such as those from the tourism industry, local government and business operators? Which of the perspectives is the strongest and which is the weakest?
3. Are there any initiatives in place to facilitate the realization of this proposal? What are the surrounding challenges?
4. From all the involved perspectives, what are the desired changes/ proposals for enhancing plausible interventions?
5. What is the overall relationship between these perspectives? Are there any emerging gaps? What could be done to bridge the gaps if any?

These questions are important as they reveal the realities surrounding the proposal to embrace business interventions, which are important in assessing and challenging both the particular underlying proposal and PPT in general.

1.6 Thesis Statement

This thesis argues that despite the belief and efforts by stakeholders, especially development practitioners, the actual transition and the realization of pro-poor agricultural-based linkages for tourism is more difficult than the theory suggests. This is so because the transition from philanthropy towards market-oriented strategies is a long-term process that may fail to be attained easily and quickly, especially given the attitudes, circumstances and processes embedded in relationships between the poor in tourist destinations and their respective tourist enterprises. In addition, the poverty alleviation goal should be considered a consequence of gradual step-by-step actions that would eventually be realized within a considerable length of time, and with a considerable amount of resources, rather than an ultimate goal that can swiftly be realized. This thesis therefore argues for, firstly, *problematizing the implementation of PPT*, with consideration given to the immensity of the task of putting its ideas into practice. This will be done in light of implementation barriers from the supply and demand levels. Barriers to supply include: cash constraints, knowledge gaps, information and communication problems, market access barriers (poor infrastructure and inability to meet quality requirements), socio-cultural attitudes, and climatic problems such as seasonality and water scarcity. Demand barriers venture into quality and quantity requirements such as consistency, reliability and sufficiency of supply. Secondly, this thesis will suggest *modification* of the PPT rather than its *abandonment*. It will argue that it is desirable, and hopefully possible, to shift beyond philanthropic relationships

and employ business oriented relations in tourist destinations, albeit with more things being taken into consideration.

1.7 Thesis Structure

This introduction provides a brief overview of the thesis. Chapter 2 presents the detailed theoretical framework, which underpins the thesis. It covers the historical development and debates around PPT, and assesses the theoretical considerations for moving beyond philanthropic approaches to adopting business-based strategies. In addition, the literature and debates around agricultural/ horticultural supply linkages will be discussed. Chapter 3 will present the research design and its underlying rationales. It will elaborate the choice and the rationales for the following: overall research design; case study strategy of inquiry, and incorporated methods of data collection and analysis. The data analysis will be based on comparing emerging themes from the case study with those arising from the PPT literature. Chapter 4 presents the background of the case study region. In this chapter the geographical setting along with the social-political and economic contexts of the research area will be described. Chapter 5 presents the findings and their analysis, drawing from the key perspectives involved in the case study. Central to this chapter is the discussion on the identified opportunities, challenges and proposals from the real experiences of the SENAPA people, in relation to key themes from PPT literature. In Chapter 6, key findings will be summarized in the light of their implications for the theory and practice. This will be followed by recommendations for further research and for the way forward and finally end with some brief concluding remarks.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on poverty alleviation through tourism. The following arguments underpin this chapter: i) Despite its potential negative effects, tourism can be used as a tool for poverty alleviation in host destinations. ii) Poor people surrounding tourist centres can benefit through three main ways: direct (employment); indirect (inter-sectoral linkages); and beyond the two (political empowerment / policy reforms). iii) Although the inter-sectoral linkages proposal central to this thesis may take different forms, agricultural/horticultural supply linkages are particularly relevant in a developing country context. To note, the literature suggests that approximately 30% of tourism revenue is spent on food. Since agricultural/ horticultural marketing depends on consumers' income level, and given that tourists are generally wealthier than local populations, it seems rewarding to set up local supply linkages. This can be an important substitution for the highly criticized food importing trend, whilst, in effect, realizing a pro-poor impact.

2.1.1 Background

The idea of using tourism as a poverty reduction tool arose within the context of the emerging broader development paradigm. Marking this shift was Harry S. Truman's (1949) influential inauguration speech, which stated that the situation of poverty in "underdeveloped areas" is miserable and that this is a threat both to "them" and to "more prosperous areas". The speech attracted the interest and engagement of rich countries in addressing development issues in poor countries. Within the speech, "stagnancy and primitiveness" were regarded as key causes of underdevelopment, and Truman called for "scientific advances and industrial progress" as

solutions. This set forth the modernization and aid-oriented approach to development/poverty alleviation. Potential sectors for aid intervention were identified, among which tourism was included. Active interventions in the tourism sector began to take place in the 1960s with the World Bank (WB) assuming the responsibility of managing the financial flows to tourist host governments. This was done through the prominent development agenda of the time, namely World Bank (WB) Official Development Assistance (ODA)³. The main priority of ODA was to enhance the quality of tourist destinations, focusing on the accommodation and infrastructure sectors (Holden, 2005:116). A series of debates around the use of tourism as a poverty alleviation tool developed alongside these early initiatives. These debates have different concerns and foci and tend to shift as agendas in the broad development realm change, focusing on various dynamics of development, namely: grassroots versus national level; end versus means; and on questions of development measures.

2.2 Perspectives in Tourism and Poverty Alleviation

It is debatable whether or not developing the tourism industry, in terms of advancing the quality of the industry or expanding the sector to attract arrivals and foreign earnings, is in itself good for the poor people living near tourist centres. Scholarly debates around this subject date back to the 1970s, with De Kadt's (1979), "Tourism: Passport to Development" which begins the discussion of both positive and negative impacts of tourism on the development of the host destinations. Further discussions expand from De Kadt's influential seminal work.

³ ODA is defined as administered financial flows, targeting economic development and welfare of poor countries. The flows are from either donor country (bilateral ODA), or multilateral institutions (multilateral ODA) to recipient countries (OECD, 2010a & b).

One side of the debate argues that there are significant reasons why tourism is a potential tool for development, thus its growth should be promoted. Tourism is a labour intensive industry and an amalgam of various sectors, thus it has a high potential for reducing poverty as it offers a wide range of job opportunities to the neighbouring communities. In addition, it contributes to balance of payments; foreign currency earnings; multiplier effects (Bryden 1973); social rewards such as education and health; infrastructure such as transport and communication; as well as improving quality of life (Khan, 1997: 988).

The opposing side of the debate holds critical views concerning these benefits, pointing out some negative socio-cultural, economic and environmental impacts of the tourism business on the local population. It is widely arguable that although tourism brings different cultures together, allowing for cultural exchange and growth of multiculturalism, which influence the preservation of local cultures in destination areas, it also generates some fairly destructive changes in host communities. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) notes that, on the one hand, tourism is appreciated for preserving cultural values so that they remain “unique”, given that tourists travel to see what is “different” from their home countries. On the other hand, tourism is accused of generating destructive changes that erode cultural values in destination areas. “Developments” in tourist centres allow for operations that lead to commodification of culture, weakening of cultural identities and standardization of behaviours, attitudes and overall lifestyles of the host communities, in the course of accommodating tourists’ demands or imitating visitor’s ways of life (UNESCO, 2006).

Both direct and indirect interaction of the local community with the tourism industry in general and the tourists in particular have a great influence on many aspects of local cultures. Changes in housing, eating habits, languages, beliefs, and dress codes, to name a few, can erode local

traditions and values. A common example of accusation within these lines of thinking relates to sexual relationships such as commercial sex in particular and sexual life styles in general. Marking these examples are phenomena such as *organized sex tourism* and *child sex tourism* (UNICEF, n.d). One vivid example is the current debate on legalization of same-sex marriage in Nepal. Nepal, which is primarily known for Mount Everest and for being the birthplace of Buddhism, surrounded by conservative Hindus and Muslims, has recently legalized gay marriage. While some analysts relate this act to the country's ambition to expand its tourism industry, others strongly criticize the idea for jeopardizing Nepalese cultural identity, as manifested in rejection to performing such weddings in the traditional religious temples/ mosques (Adhikari 2011)⁴.

Notwithstanding the cultural concern, scholars raise important concerns about the impact of tourism on the local economy and environmental. In Africa, tourism is often practiced in remote places, which are often inhabited by the poor. The cultural and natural environments of such places are what make them so attractive to tourists. However, in the course of advancing the quality of these destinations to meet the tourist demand, there is a potential danger of bringing changes that would compromise the preservation of these attractions. One particular change may be urbanization leading to overpopulation, increased crime rates and increased living expenses (DeKadt 1979). Additionally, tourism growth contributes to the decline of other economic sectors, such as agriculture, because of the industry's reliance on imported food (Britton, 1982). Furthermore, expanding the tourism industry may lead to over-consumption of resources, among which some are non-renewable, such as land, water and energy (Sawker et al., 1998). The environmental account is, however, somewhat controversial as it can be argued that tourism, and

⁴ See also: <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2083711,00.html>

especially wildlife tourism, promotes preservation of species and surrounding environments (UNEP, 2006). Arguably, overemphasis on the conservation goal can create conflicted relationships with local communities. Often the local population is prevented from accessing resources that traditionally belonged to them, and from killing or driving away animals that destroy their crops. If the preservation goal is strictly emphasized, it may induce the impoverished local people to spoil the environment (Kalterborn et al., 2008). For instance, they can “illegally” extract food, by hunting; energy, by collecting firewood; and building materials, by deforestation.

2.2.1 The Dependency Critique

In the 1970s scholars with nationalistic concerns, namely dependency theorists, raised their criticisms focusing on the national level impacts. They perceived the support that the tourism sector was receiving from ODA as a replication of colonialist and imperial structures. These scholars were preoccupied with national sovereignty concerns, basing their pessimism on the fear of countries losing their national power and autonomy by inviting foreign powers into their economy.

In their analysis of aid-led tourism development, Milne and Ateljevic (2001) argue that communities and individuals that depend on tourism are faced with an overarching challenge of how the industry can be developed, while at the same time ensuring that local quality of life is maintained. They ask: *how can local economies thrive, and unique socio-cultural and environmental resources survive, in a globalized environment?* Akama (1996) adds that tourism growth “accentuates the economic structure of dependency on external market demand”, leading to “alien” development, which cannot be both socially and economically optimized by local populations. Similarly, local voices such as that of Dr. Shivji from Tanzania add that, “since the

success of tourism depends primarily on our being accepted in the metropolitan countries, it is one of those appendage industries which gives rise to a neo-colonialist relationship and causes underdevelopment” (Shivji, 1973 cited in Mowforth and Munt, 2009: 56). In these lines of thinking, “tourism must be viewed as a transaction process which is at once driven by the global priorities of multi-national corporations, geo-political forces and broader forces of economic change, as well as the complexities of the local environment, where residents, visitors, workers, governments and entrepreneurs interact at the industry’s coal-face” (Milne and Ateljevic, 2001:4). Thinking of tourism as such would allow for the understanding that inequalities in respect to power over resources may increase with the involvement of foreign interests into the poor countries’ economies. As a result, foreign companies reap more benefits as they minimize unit costs by generating economies of scale, while destinations end up receiving simply increased visitor numbers. This helps tourists to fulfill their desire to travel cheaply and efficiently, while the locals end up receiving few economic benefits, and have to carry the costs of rapidly increasing tourist numbers. Unfortunately, as Milne and Ateljevic observe, “the high costs associated with the inevitable rise of mass tourism provide both the communities and localities that rely on it with little prospect for local control and limited potential to achieve more sustainable forms of local development” (Milne and Ateljevic, 2001:6).

2.2.2 The Political Economy Account

The political economy approach complements the dependency view by questioning the means through which tourism businesses are operated, pointing to ownership, structure, and organization aspects. It argues that both tourism businesses and aid were inadequately managed, leading to “aid/state” failure. This was manifested by appropriation of the tourism revenue by a few local and foreign elites. In his “Conceptualizing Tourism Place in Development”, John Lea

(1988) distinguishes the “functional approach” versus the “political economy” approach to tourism-led development. He argues that the functional approach looks at only one aspect of tourism, namely that of “many economic functions and their consequent economic gains to the poor,” without regard to any political overtones. On the other hand, the political economy approach views the tourism business as perpetuating many existing inequalities. While inclined to the political economy approach, Lea criticizes the functional approach for being too optimistic; for underestimating the real impacts of tourism in host destinations; and for attempting to put forward a neutral viewpoint in a situation where it is very difficult not to take sides (Lea, 1988:1). He is in favour of the political economy approach because it: “probes beneath the surface characteristics of the industry in its search for the causes of problems” and highlights the need to look at the organization of the industry and the distinctive structure of Third World economies. It allows for assessment of the actors’ interests and enables the examination of systems of operation and organization of the industry. Such analyses are crucial because they reveal structural and systemic drawbacks surrounding destination areas, such as: unequal trade relationships and decreased ability to control their own visitor industry (Lea, 1988).

2.2.3 Alternative Approaches

In the 1980s, alternative measures were devised in response to the “aid/state failure” concerns. Emphasis was on pursuing a minimalist role of the state and an increased reliance on the private sector and confidence in the market. Featuring within the broader development paradigm, Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) measures were adopted in tourism-based development, including: trade liberalization; devaluation of currency; downsizing public service; import tariffs cuts; increased export production; and reduction of subsidies (Mowforth and Munt, 2009). Their impacts include: removal of import quotas; budget reforms; dissolution of state marketing

boards; privatization of public enterprises; promotion of export business; and multi-national trade bloc formation (Sharpley and Telfer, 2002:4).

From the ‘rich countries’ perspective, the adoption of SAPs is beneficial because it leads to fewer restrictions to trade and human movement as well as increased business and leisure travel (Mowforth and Munt 1998). However, the poor countries’ perspective holds that the reduced state intervention in tourism businesses can be destructive as it allows for international chains of tourist hotels and resorts, which may replicate the ownership problem discussed previously by political economists (Mowforth and Munt, 2009: 305). For example, this is done by encouraging foreign investment, which ties recipient countries to: importation of goods; consolidation of luxurious/”mass tourism” destinations; transnational ownership; minimal direct economic benefit to communities in tourist destinations; seasonality; and package tours (TIES, 2006); many of which contribute to guaranteed quality of the tourism business at the expense of local benefits. Overall, it appears that SAPs complicate the goal of making tourism work better for the poor. As observed by Stephen Williams, tourism should no longer be perceived in simplistic terms such as being either a ‘curse or a blessing’, nor as a “path to development or an index to underdevelopment”. In addition, its growth can look attractive because it does not require much investment. However, overreliance on tourism can have its dangers, leaving poor countries and their people vulnerable from the operations of the Multinational Companies (MCNs) (Williams, 2004).

The 1990s arose with an increasing belief that SAPs measures were fairly flawed. The international community and other development practitioners were increasingly learning that “imposed measures,” such as SAPs, complicate rather than facilitate the process of development/poverty alleviation. This thinking allowed for a shifting role of the poor from being

simply *passive recipients* to being *active participants* in their own development. This understanding informed the invention of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). PRSPs refer to policies and programs designed by aid recipient governments, through a participatory process involving both domestic stakeholders and external development partners. The emphasis was on involvement of the local people in the decision-making process. The idea was now that poor people/countries are regarded as participants, partners and owners of the tourism-led development (IMF, 2010). A more specific, ‘grassroots-based’ focus on poverty alleviation emerged towards the end of 1990s with a new concept called Pro-Poor tourism (PPT).

2.3 The Emergence of Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT)

In his “Pro-Poor Tourism: Principles, Methodology and Mainstreaming”, Harold Goodwin (1998) notes that PPT is a “big ambition”, which emerged in 1998 with a new Labour government in the United Kingdom (UK) and which prioritized the goal of poverty elimination. This “ambition” was reflected in the UK Department for International Development (DFID) priorities, which promised to work in line with the Millennium Development Goals, then being formulated. Goodwin (2005) adds that there were two important initiatives that contributed to the framing of the PPT concept. These are: (1) His own discussion paper on “whether or not tourism could assist in the eradication of poverty”, prepared for a workshop in London; and (2) a 1999 DFID-commissioned research paper, on “what the development industry was doing to harness tourism for poverty alleviation”, prepared by a team of three scholars, namely Oliver Bennet from Deloitte & Touche, Dilys Roe from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and Caroline Ashley from the Overseas Development Institute (ODI). The term *Pro Poor Tourism* was coined for the first time in this later report. Goodwin notes that this

was succeeded by a series of six initiatives⁵ (three in the same year and two in early 2000s). Apart from international endorsements, PPT is being developed through research undertakings, a few of which are published in books (Spencely, 2008) or academic journals (Ashley and Haysom, 2006; and Goodwin 2008, 2009), and many of which are unpublished, but available on the PPTP website.

2.3.1 Perspectives on PPT

PPT is defined as “tourism that results in increased net benefits for poor people”. It is an approach to tourism development and management that targets generating benefits greater than costs for the impoverished people in tourist destinations (Bennet et al., 1999: 8). The present study adopts the later definition, i.e. PPT as an attempt to use tourism to generate net benefits for the poor, including economic benefits. It understands “pro-poor” as having an intention and taking initiatives to assist the poor in optimizing the benefits from tourism.

PPT is still a new phenomenon within the academic literature (Scheyvens, 2007; Meyer, 2008; Harrison; 2008; Spencely, 2008). On the one hand, it is viewed as adding to the positive impacts within the contemporary development thinking, i.e. market-led development, within which tourism is regarded as an amalgam of various sectors that can generate a wide range of business and employment opportunities, and as an industry that uses relatively small entry capital, which can accommodate even small enterprises (Spencely, 2008: 12). However, on the other hand, it is viewed as an approach that is heavily shaped by neo-liberal theoretical influences, which should

⁵ These were: a DFID-launched “Tourism and Poverty Elimination: Untapped Potential; endorsement by the international community of the UN’s “Tourism and Sustainable Development”; birth of the Pro- Poor Tourism Partnership (PPTP), from a comparative Study of 7 Cases; PPTP’s devised PPT strategies in 2001; PPT Adoption in the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), “Tourism and Poverty Alleviation” at the World summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (2002); and in the same year, the launching of the UNWTO’s Sustainable Development Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP) (Goodwin, 1998: 1-2; Goodwin, 2005).

be adopted with some scepticism, given its confidence and reliance on the market, when “market failures” are considered (Scheveyns, 2007). While recognizing tourism as inherently a business that is not easy and not very likely to change its structure of operation, PPT proponents accept current tourist practices as realities and attempt to optimize benefits for the poor within the existing system.

The remaining question is, “how can the existing tourism be made more pro-poor without changing its structure and organization?” (Goodwin, 2008: 58). Scheyvens argues that the main priority of tourism, just like any other private-led business, is to maximize profit and not to serve the poor (2009). To note, poor people are confronted by market barriers such as geographical characteristics; poor infrastructure; high leakages; and a poor policy environment (Sharpley and Telfer 2002: 18). However, PPT claims to attempt to facilitate market access for the poor (Goodwin, 2008) by “putting poverty on the tourism agenda and tourism on the poverty agenda” (Ashley et al., 2000). This goal has to be realized by moving beyond the traditional “mass tourism” practices to adopting alternative forms, which focus on small scale, locally owned development, community participation, and cultural and environmental sustainability (Brohman, 1996: 65).

2.3.2 Positioning PPT in the Current Development Paradigm

In connection to the contemporary market-oriented development thinking, PPT adopts a principle of “commercial sustainability” focusing on economic linkages between tourist operations and local populations through market accessibility strategies. Harold Goodwin (2005) notes that PPT is undergoing a paradigm shift, which requires avoiding overdependence on tourism as much as possible. He proposes rethinking the traditional belief of “trickle down” effects in the tourism

revenue, as ideas such as micro-enterprise development are emerging to substitute traditional philanthropic relationships with the adoption of business models.

Philanthropic Versus Business Models

Philanthropy generally refers to generous donations of money, goods or services, usually from the wealthier to the poorer countries/ individuals/ groups. In the development field, the purpose of such donations is generally to help the poor reduce their poverty levels. In the context of this study, tour operators, and to the minor extent the tourists have traditionally been donating to their respective host communities, often for the purpose of delivering social amenities. From the perspective of poor people, the philanthropic model is preferable because it generates large cash value in their communities, and has high potential for meeting priority needs such as education and health services. Commercial-wise, it can be advantageous because it does not interfere with business operations of the tourism industry. Philanthropy can be outsourced and it can build foundations for more substantive partnerships, thus giving tour operators less work after donating the money. However, it uses up cash, which is a scarce resource for most tourism companies; diverges from the original goal of the tourism business (considering that community development is not a core competency of tourism business); has a tendency to offer unsustainable projects; creates dependency; embodies paternalism; and suffers overall from budget constraints (Ashley and Mitchell, 2005).

From the PPT perspective, the business model can be seen as more preferable because it: has a high sustainability potential, hence long-term impact on communities; offers enhanced tourism businesses and complementary products; is cost-saving; enhances corporate governance; offers greater recognition from others; has great impact on social licence; and appeals to markets, government relations and finance. However, it is criticized on the grounds that its impacts take

time to show, and earnings can be unevenly distributed. Nonetheless, from the commercial point of view, the business model is more binding on the company; less flexible and difficult to restructure; more time consuming; and requires more resources (Ashley and Haysom, 2005).

2.3.3 The Enabling Environment for PPT and the International Support

Since its conception, PPT has received considerable worldwide attention in the development field. Interestingly, even actors within the tourism industry use the idea of PPT in their branding activities. PPT has emerged within a more supportive environment than earlier attempts to use tourism for development, largely due to its operation alongside multi-stakeholder engagement (international organizations, donor agencies, NGOs, governments, civil society organizations, and interest groups). Previously, governments were more or less the sole development actors of the time. This change is important because it can offer multiple options for redressing earlier criticisms such as state failure. Furthermore, its emergence coincided with four important and simultaneous events. First, it was conceived of within the same timeframe as “sustainability,” marking a noticeable shift in the language of development; encompassing environmental sensitivity, economic viability and social-cultural consciousness. Second, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) provided an important context because their adoption awakened global attention to the fight against poverty, with the target of halving the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day by 2015 (United Nations, 2010). PPT was therefore considered as a potential contribution to the realization of the MDG goal of alleviating poverty. In Mowforth and Munt’s words, PPT was considered a “unique selling point” for those advocating tourism as a new development tool (Mowforth and Munt 2003, 271). Thirdly, PPT emerged at the same time as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), which emphasize the principle of ownership and participation by aid recipient countries (Hayami, 2003: 41). The

UNWTO adopted the PRSPs principle in its operation of tourism-based development projects. Recipient countries were then required to design papers on micro-economic, structural and social development issues, highlighting external financial needs, and submit them to donor countries and agencies. By mid 2000s, 80% of PRSPs include tourism (Mann, 2005). Last, and perhaps more importantly, PPT has been accompanied by increased activism as reflected within the context of PPT “branding” approaches below.

2.2.4 PPT “Branding” Approaches

i) *Sustainable Tourism*: Refers to tourism that leads 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, and biological diversity and life support systems, while considering both present and future impacts (WTO, 1996). International charters and UN declarations associated with sustainable tourism include: “Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP), the Charter for Sustainable Tourism in 1995, and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementing Sustainable in 2002.

ii) *Eco-tourism*: The need for touristic operations to put excessive attention on the environment so as to maintain the business, while sustaining the benefits to the locals (Holden, 2008).

iii) *Cultural Tourism*: Promoting tourists’ exposure to historical, artistic and general lifestyle of the host communities, while viewing culture as a “common heritage of humanity” that has to be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations. It emphasizes appreciation, rather than assimilation or destruction of destination culture; respect to traditions, values, and way of life of host communities (UNESCO, 2006).

iv) *Community Based Tourism*: A participatory approach to tourism, focusing on local engagement, ownership and socio-political empowerment; and raising awareness about local life styles to visitors (REST 2004).

v) *Responsible Tourism*: A behavioural approach that urges involved stakeholders to act conscientiously, largely in their resource consumptions and distribution, by ensuring conservation of natural and cultural environments; creation of viable business and economic benefits to host communities; and provision of a high quality tourist experience (Spencely, 2008). It incorporates changing business behaviour, implying shifting from just 'doing good' to creating a *win-win* situation in which companies can profit by doing good (Ashley and Haysom, 2005).

vi) *Inclusive Business in Tourism*: Emphasizes the role of private sector, as an effective way of deriving development incentives and the role of the poor as entrepreneurs and value-conscious consumers (Rist, 2008: 24, Van der Duim, 2008: 182; Jenkins et al. 2010: 2).

Although these approaches greatly contribute to the enabling environment for PPT to materialize, they are not (individually) PPT per se. One reason may be that they do not explicitly target the poor and they do not use direct means of poverty reduction (Goodwin, 2006 in Dixey, 2008: 324). Moreover, since they are popularly used for branding purposes, they can be improperly utilized by tour operators as simply labels for attracting customers and influencing their choices, without having real commitments to assist the local poor. It can therefore be argued that these approaches generally target the consumers, and serve the interests of the rich countries, rather than serving the priorities of the poor in host destinations (TIES, 2006). Overall, according to PPT proponents, what distinguishes PPT from these other approaches is its central concern about local operations, which are basically on the destination side of the tourism businesses spectrum, while these

“branding tools” focus more or less on the demand side of the spectrum, i.e. mainly the operations of the tourism industry with respect to their visitors.

2.3.5 PPT Distinguishing Principles, Strategies and Mechanisms

Major PPT proponents such as the UNWTO and PPTP have devised different sets of principles, strategies and mechanisms that underlie PPT proposals and their practicability. In 2004, the UNWTO developed a set of "overarching principles", reflecting the international poverty agenda, the nature and incidence of poverty in respect to tourism, and experience with tourism to the time of writing, in developing countries and LCDs, as detailed in Appendix I. In the following year PPTP devised a set of revised principles, with the objective of establishing "the minimum requirements for tourism to be pro-poor", as described in Appendix II. Concerning the strategies, the PPTP devised three main strategies for harnessing economic benefits (advancement of economic linkages), other livelihood benefits (diversifying and complementing, not replacing traditional livelihoods), and policy reform strategies (Godwin, 2005). These strategies intend to benefit the poor in three main ways: direct effects, through employment; indirect effects, through supply of goods and services; and induced effects such as economic and political empowerment (Mitchell and Ashley, 2007), see Appendix III for details about these strategies. As for mechanisms for realizing the strategies, the UNWTO proposes seven mechanisms, the second of which highlights the “supply of goods and services to tourism enterprises by the poor or by enterprises employing the poor.” According to the UNWTO, it is of the utmost importance that the majority of goods and services in the tourism supply chain come from local sources at all stages. This not only helps to maintain the authenticity of the tourism products but also delivers great pro-poor impact (UNWTO, 2006). A full range of these mechanisms is contained in Appendix IV.

Drawing from an overview of the PPT literature, principles, strategies and mechanisms, current PPT thinking can be summarized into a threefold argument that, (i) tourism by virtue of its profitability and opportunity generating potentiality is an important tool for poverty alleviation; (ii) Business strategies, as opposed to traditional philanthropic relations, should be adopted for poor people to optimize the generated opportunities and (iii) tourism as an amalgam of various sectors and as a potential industry for inter-sectoral linkages generates beneficial market opportunities for producer groups, including horticultural growers. The theoretical underpinning of these propositions is summarized below in an order corresponding to the threefold argument.

i) The core distinguishing feature of PPT is that it emphasizes the poverty alleviation perspective by specifically putting poor people at the centre (Ashley et al. 2000, 50; Roe and Urquhart 2001:5). PPT shapes the roles of tourism in a direction that favours the poor. It performs a distributing function by striking the balance between growth and equity, thus retaining tourism revenues in the local economy (Roe, 2006).

ii) The tourism industry is inherently a private sector, market-driven activity. PPT operates within the principle of “commercial realism and viability” (Ashley et al., 2000: 6; UNWTO, 2006: 3). Since PPT is about doing business differently to benefit poor people, its initiatives should move beyond traditional philanthropic approaches and adopt business strategies (Roe, 2006: 2). The non-philanthropic approaches create opportunities for linking poor producers and other service providers to markets and tourism businesses (Roe 2006).

iii) To advance the local economy, businesses need to develop ways of engaging with poor producers of goods and services, to create linkages rather than leakages with the local economy (PPTP, 2005: 1). This is in accordance with the principle of "retention" which suggests reducing

leakages from the local economy and building up linkages from within through supply chains (UWTO, 2004: 15; 2006:3). Overall, poor producers often lack access to the tourism market, the whole industry and tourists. Therefore, PPT initiatives must increase market access if success is to be achieved (Roe, 2006: 2).

The following section applies these assumptions to tourism-agriculture linkages. Informed by the belief in private sector operation and confidence in the market (Scheyvens, 2007), the above inter-sectorial argument has been implemented by setting up business linkages through various means, most of which are practicing some form of agriculture, including horticulture.

2.4 Linking PPT with Agriculture/ Horticulture

It is surprising that farm-related activities are a prominent source of livelihoods in most poor countries (UNWTO, 2006; Mitchell and Ashley, 2007), and agriculture is possibly the sector within which the potential for linkages is greatest (Jefferson, n.d.), yet there exists a shortage of studies examining the relationship between the two sectors (Torres, 2003:547). This study attempts to contribute to this observed need. More importantly, local agricultural linkages are relevant because approximately 30% of tourist enterprises' expenditure is on food (Torres, 2003:546). Wise spending would facilitate the shift from importing food products to sourcing locally (Torres and Momsen, 2004; Sharpley and Telfer, 2002: 55; Telfer and Wall, 1996). This makes local supply linkages stronger, thus generating more pro-poor impacts (Mitchell and Ashley, 2007). Moreover, it promotes more sustainable farming practices and opens access to other profitable markets, such as export markets (Cox et al. 1995, Momsen 1998, Telfer and Wall, 2000; Saville, 2001; Momsen 1999).

Critical accounts hold that tourism and agriculture are competitors for resources such as land, water and labour, and sometimes using these resources for tourism purposes may deprive local access (Torres, 2003:547). For instance, increased employment in the tourism industry possibly reduces agricultural productivity (Torres and Momsen, 2005). Furthermore, localized systems are often under threat since tour operators have the habit of procuring imported food (Momsen, 1998).

2.4.1 Feasibility of Horticulture in the Tourism Market

Within the context of a growing horticultural relevance in poverty reduction, through agricultural research, business, and health concerns, the tourism market is a relevant option for fruits, vegetables, herbs and spices (Weinberger and Lumpkin, 2005). Local supply linkages support diversification of livelihood sources largely due to demand for varieties and substantial quantities of horticultural produce. This encourages production of both traditional and exotic fruits and vegetables (Saville, 2001). Horticulture matters to the poor because it is perishable (demanded while fresh); the number of consumers has been increasing; it is adaptable to mixed farming methods (AfriVeg, 2007:14); it takes a relatively small share of arable land; is predominantly practiced on a small scale; is labour intensive; and contributes to rural diversification (Weinberger and Lumpkin, 2005:7).

However, the profitability of horticulture is questionable because these crops are more expensive to produce than traditional crops, yields' prices are more variable, and the produce is perishable as it has limited shelf life. Where production is profitable, this may be because of historical, climatic factors that are not present everywhere. Moreover, profitability may not translate into sustainable poverty reduction (Key and Runsten, 1999; Stevens and Kennan, 1999; Minot and Ngigi, 2003:4).

2.4.2 Demand and Supply Issues

Growing demand for horticultural produce in the tourism business can potentially support local producers, most of whom are smallholders. However, there is much that is impeding the success of local sourcing. From the producers' perspective, these include poor access to financial support, the market and information, among many others (Momsen 1998). To address these issues, the following are to be promoted: enabling institutional and marketing environment (access to credit, input supply and capital, access to market information such as price and demand size), improving yield levels, diversification of crops and products, development of hybrid varieties, and stabilization of production through modern technology (Minot and Ngigi, 2003; AfriVeg, 2007).

Demand concerns include insufficient, inconsistent and poor quality supply (inadequate quantities and limited varieties), quality and safety concerns, perishability and proneness to contamination (sanitary concerns) (Momsen, 1998). Reliance on smallscale production is challenged by environmental concerns; food safety; labour conditions; logistics; and quality and standards issues (Dolan and Sorby, 2003; USAID, 2007:26).

One of the proposed options for addressing these challenges is the organization of horticultural growers into co-operatives and producer's associations. Membership in these groups is preferable because it is easier for growers to access markets and other support as groups, rather than individuals (Shepherd, 2007). Current co-operatives, namely marketing co-operatives and new generation co-operatives not only unite producers, but also link them with markets. These have been differentiated from the previously state-led and socialist-oriented cooperatives of the 1960's (Gibbon, 2001) on a number of aspects, such as their ability to control production, the form of business, the membership regulations and the business culture. The new-generation co-operatives are assumed to be very market oriented, i.e. they find a market for their output and

produce for it; and expand production of processed products to correspond with increasing demand (Torgerson, 2001:16). In contrast with the former cooperatives, with open membership policies under which growers could freely join, new-generation cooperatives are only open to those who can afford some form of capitalization investments. Furthermore, they are often organized on a stock basis and characterized by a more “investor” rather than a “cooperative” culture (ibid: 17). Has this shift of cooperatives towards marketing procedures increased their effectiveness, providing smallholder producers the opportunity “to re-negotiate the power relationships along the value chain and reach more favourable terms of trade?” (Markelova et al., 2009:5) What factors are enabling and what ones are constraining with regards to the linking process of cooperatives to tourism industry? Different answers are given throughout the literature, depending also on the theoretical perspective. This suggests the significance of empirical data collection and analysis (Barham and Clarence, 2009).

Dorothea Meyer (2008) suggests a framework for analysing agricultural supply linkages for tourism. She argues that success or failure of such systems is contingent on involved actors and their respective perspectives, particularly on issues surrounding demand, supply, distribution and government dimensions. From the demand side key issues include: characteristics of the tourism industry that influence their procurement, such as type and size of the tourist enterprise, maturity and seasonality of the business, training and nationality of employees, and production capacities of the host destinations. The supply side factors are: production-based characteristics such as physical environment, quality, quantity and price of local production. These may cause a divergence between the tour operators’ demand and the local supply. Distribution related factors involve marketing and intermediary issues such as poor distribution infrastructure, mistrust between producers and middlemen, overreliance on middlemen, and spatially isolated supply

patterns. Regarding the government perspective Meyer points to government policies and institutions that may either support or hinder the linkages. These include access to credit and training and promoting dialogue between the two sectors (Meyer, 2008).

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented a detailed discussion around PPT theory and its linkage to agriculture/horticulture. The broader development paradigm marked the context within which PPT emerged, with reference to Truman's influential inaugural address. This was followed by the history of PPT, along with a series of debates from the socio-cultural, political-economic and environmental perspectives. John Lea's political economy approach raised questions of structural and organizational aspects of the tourism industry, pointing to unequal trade relationships, and structural and systemic drawbacks embedded in tourist destination. Central to this thesis was the analysis of PPT proposal to shift away from philanthropy towards adopting business models. Specific focus was given to the idea of sourcing goods and services delivered by the impoverished people in tourist destinations, including agricultural/horticultural products. Torgerson's (2001) analysis highlights some criteria for organizing producer groups in the modern era, in the light of traditional co-operatives versus "new generation" co-operatives. This theoretical development generates important themes for data interpretation and analysis in upcoming chapters. Meyer's (2008) framework will be adopted in documenting field research findings, with emphasis placed on demand and supply side issues. Overall, this chapter underpins the whole thesis as the upcoming chapters draw heavily from the presented underlying proposals. The next chapter adopts central arguments from this chapter in defining its central objective(s), question(s), general framework, and strategy, specific methods of inquiry and data analysis techniques.

Chapter 3: Research Design

3.1 Objective

Research design deals primarily with aims, uses, purposes, intentions and plans within the practical constraints of location, time, money and availability of staff (Hakim, 1987:1)

The initial step of this study design was to identify core propositions from the PPT theory. The use of theory to design research studies is beneficial because it develops broader contextual understanding and comprehensiveness that allow the use of preliminary concepts from the theory at the outset of the field research undertaking to guide the step by step molding of the study. In addition, it helps the researcher when specifying what is to be explored; selecting a relevant case study; and generalizing the subsequent results (Yin, 2003:3,6). According to John Creswell, the research objective and the main research question are key determinants of the research design (Creswell, 2009). This study asks what it takes to make the key PPT propositions outlined in the previous chapter realizable. The main objective is to explore and examine the opportunities, the on the ground challenges, and sought changes surrounding the process of realizing the shift from philanthropy towards adopting business models. This was pursued by exploring perspectives of various stakeholder groups in and around SENAPA enterprises' horticultural supply system. The design developed from reviewing the relevant literature to selecting the overall framework of inquiry, the strategy of inquiry, the unit of analysis, the sampling techniques and the specific data collection methods.

3.2 Review of Related Literature

This study draws from the overview of PPT theory presented in the previous chapter. It is rooted on the following arguments: (i) local people in tourist-frequented destinations could receive significant overall and sustainable benefits (including economic gains) by adopting business

linkages to tourist operations; (ii) tourism revenues can boost sectors that matter to the poor, such as agriculture, thus suggesting that horticultural supply linkages to tourist hotels, lodges and camps could be ideal initiatives. This thesis understands that inadequate studies concerning PPT have been undertaken and that most of the undertakings have been conducted by proponents, who tend to focus on justifying the theory. This suggests the need for an independent research to challenge the justified potentiality of PPT propositions. This present study therefore attempts to address this observed need by exploring the conditions, if any, under which the above claimed propositions could be realized within the context of SENAPA. The detailed literature review is presented in the previous chapter, (Chapter 2). The main source of PPT literature is *gray* literature (including that from the PPTP, UNWTO) and other relevant scholarly works. Other sources included specific documents on Tanzania, Mara region and SENAPA, with respect to tourism, agriculture/ horticulture and co-operatives. Sources for these documents include Tanzania Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, Tanzania National Park Authority (TANAPA), Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB), Agricultural Council of Tanzania (ACT), Serengeti Development and Research Centre (SEDEREC), Serengeti Farmers' Association (SEFA), Tanzania Horticultural Association (TAHA) and Roundtable Africa and Honey Guide Foundation (RTA and HGF).

3.3 General Framework of Inquiry

After a comprehensive review of the literature, this study employed a number of *qualitative approaches* within the *case study* strategy of inquiry. The qualitative approach of inquiry refers to a highly contextual technique to conducting research in a “real-life setting”, which goes beyond mere snapshot of events, showing how and why things happen (Gray, 2004:320). Its advantages include possession of a quality of “undeniability”, conducted through intense contact

with a field or real-life setting, which provides researchers with a holistic or integrated overview of the study, including perceptions of participants (Gray, 2004, Creswell, 2009). Additionally, it offers researchers a degree of flexibility and ability to structure their questions and other methodological techniques depending on time, resources, and knowledge (Gray, 2004:321). It is especially recommended to study emerging phenomena that have not yet acquired standardized analytical tools (Patton, 2002). Challenges to this approach tend to focus on subjectivity, generalizability and time constraints (Neuman, 2004; Yin, 1994), which this study attempts to mitigate.

3.4 Case Study Strategy of inquiry

A case study is defined as “a comprehensive and an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context.” It is especially useful when boundaries between a phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident (Yin 1994:13). This strategy, among other things, allows researchers to undertake in-depth exploration on a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. It takes into account the available time and allows for collection of detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time (Stake, 1995, in Creswell, 2009: 13). Case studies benefit from prior development of a theory to guide data collection and analysis (Yin 1994). While being cognizant of challenges to the use of case studies, studies that are problematically defined and that are surrounded by complex interactions warrant its use (Yin, 1994: 3). Additionally, “well selected” and conducted studies on contemporary issues over which the researchers have no control can be part of the cumulative body of knowledge in the respective area, and not simply isolated empirical inquiries (Yin, 1994: 3; Yin, 2003:27). Nevertheless, its justification depends on the

researcher's designing ability to balance the objective of the study with the targeted question, audience, and available resources (Creswell, 2009; Eckstein, 1975).

3.4.1 Single, Discipline-Configurative Case Study

The common question is “how can you generalize from a single case?” (Yin 1994:10) It is doubtful whether a single case study can qualify to assess a theory (Gerring, 2007). According to Harry Eckstein (1975), there exist five main types of case studies: (i) *Configurative Idiographic* studies aim to present “depictions of overall configurations” of events, situations, issues, subjects, and provide important descriptions, that may be useful for future theory generating research. (ii) *Discipline-Configurative* uses existing theory to explain or exemplify a case. (iii) *Plausibility probes*, involves “probing the plausibility of candidate theories”. These are preliminary studies to determine whether “potential validity may reasonably be considered great enough to warrant the pains and costs, especially those associated with broad comparative studies.” (iv) *Heuristic*, explorative study, “serving to find out” variables for theory building through a “building block technique.” and (v) *crucial/ critical* case, aims to confirm or disconfirm theories.

This thesis adopts the discipline-configurative typology, based on the argument that, “case interpretations can and should be derived from theories” (Eckstein, 1975:99). This type of research is significant as it “connects a case study into theoretical inquiry, particularly where theories apply or can be envisioned; passively, in the main, as receptacle for putting theories to work; and fortuitously, as a catalytic element in unfolding the theoretical knowledge” (Eckstein, 1975:100). For this thesis, this type is chosen among all other categories because the main research question and the central objective of the study required a study based on existing theory, in this regard, PPT. This is compatible to Eckstein's explanation of the discipline-configurative case, as he argues that, it does not simply “passively” applies the theoretical propositions, but

“impugn the established theories,” with the purpose of, but not limited to, pointing out a “need for new theory in neglected areas” and generating feedback to the theoretical prepositions (Eckstein, 1975:99).

This thesis therefore applies PPT theory to understand different perspectives concerning “Horticultural supply Linkages to SENAPA Tourist Enterprises”, a study undertaken through a three month field research, (February to April, 2001). In the process of undertaking the field work the study came across what Eckstein calls “newly discovery puzzles” far beyond established theoretical propositions, which generate “feedback effects of theorizing”(Eckstein, 1975), marking the reconsideration of the PPT proposal to “shift beyond philanthropic interventions to adopting business strategies”. While recognizing the difficulty of using a single case for generalization purposes, this study offers a significant contribution to the PPT theory as it reveals important factors to be taken into account by PPT practitioners, particularly in the SENAPA area, possibly in other tourist-frequented areas in Tanzania and even elsewhere in the world where similar characteristics exist.

3.5 Unit of Analysis and Sampling

The unit of analysis refers to individuals, groups, organizations, communities that are involved in the research (Gray, 2004: 323). The criteria for selection depend on the research objective, the core question, the scope and the overall research design. This thesis covers a regional scope, i.e. the Mara region, in which SENAPA is located, and the current procurement system through which the supply of horticultural produce to SENAPA tourist enterprises flow. It incorporates perspectives of multiple actors, including tour companies, farmer groups (co-operatives and associations), government, intermediary actors (middlemen) and other related stakeholders.

3.6 Sample Selection Framework

The sample for this study was not pre-planned. It emerged within the course of undertaking the field research. However, the selection was purposive with the sampling framework focusing initially on issues and variables that were core to the research question (Gray, 2004:324), specifically targeting respondents that are most likely to give the richest data (Hurberman, 1994, cited in Gray 2004:324). Though input from people who were perceived to give less rich data, such as retailers and middlemen at market places, provided this study with more diverse views. The “snowballing” sampling technique was useful for making the list of potential interviewees and stakeholders (Desai, 2006). Initially, key stakeholders around SENAPA horticultural supply initiatives within the Mara region were identified. This was followed by developing a subsector map (Appendix V), covering current SENAPA tourist enterprises’ horticultural procurement system.

3.6.1 Subsector Analysis

A subsector is a vertically linked chain of production, marketing and transformation activities that move an agricultural commodity from the field to final distribution to consumers (Holtzman, 2002:9). This method is advantageous, especially in agricultural-based research, because it places heavy emphasis on how a commodity supply chain is organized, which can influence how participants in the process behave, and ultimately how the supply system performs in the aggregate (and also typically stage by stage, or industry by industry) (Holtzman, 2002). Moreover, it enables analysts to trace movement of a product from its production to consumption, and understand the interdependence between and within actors and products (Boomgard et al., 1986:9). The developed subsector map for this study covered the current supply system and identified specific procurements channels. To note, the original plan was to focus the study to

Mara region initiatives. However, the subsector revealed most of the stakeholders are located in Arusha, necessitating the need to expand the scope of the research study. The new scope, though not pre-planned, added a great value on the collected data as it allowed for incorporating the perspectives of tourist operators, experienced horticultural growers and intermediary stakeholders, whom could not otherwise be thought about in the initial plan.

3.7 Data Collection Methods

This section gives a detailed description of different research tools used for gathering the field data. These include: observation, field visits, interviewing, Focal Group Discussions, and desk study.

3.7.1 Observation and Field Visits

Field visits are beneficial as they allow researchers to directly observe the social and environmental situations of the studied subject as well as revealing perspectives that might otherwise not be illuminated (Yin, 2003). Observation is an important information gathering instrument during field work as it allows the researcher to see, listen, and attentively watch local situations, behaviours, and surroundings (Neuman, 2004). However, it may raise ethical issues if it is undertaken covertly, and can contribute to biased behaviours if done overtly (Gray, 2004). To address this issue, the informed consent was presented to participants (who were overtly observed) and the researcher played the naïve role, making the participants behave more or less naturally. Informed by the list of stakeholders and the subsector map, brief site visits were made to various locations in order to acquire some preliminary information about the situation on the ground. These localities included villages, farmer groups, markets and tour companies. Informal conversations and observation of characteristics (of locations and population) facilitated

familiarization and general understanding of key issues in the area. The total number of site visits include: 10 horticultural growing villages (8 in the Mara Region and 2 in Arusha), 3 tourist camps (the Singita Grumeti Reserve's camps), 15 tour company centres (all located in Arusha), 3 horticultural growers' cooperatives (2 in Mara and 1 in Arusha), 5 markets (3 in Mara and 2 in Arusha) and 2 horticultural trading companies and a supporting organization (both in Arusha).

3.7.2 Interviewing

The primary data collection tool used in the field research was interviewing. The main benefits of this method in research studies are its high potentiality to facilitate examination of complexities of new phenomena (Patton, 2002). Other benefits include its ability to elicit rich data, drawing from respondents' views, attitudes and meanings, which underpin their lives and behaviours (Gray 2004:213); address open-ended and complex questions (Gray, 2004:214); and make people put explicitly things that have hitherto been implicit, along with articulating their perceptions, feelings and understandings (Krit, 1999, cited in Gray, 2004:21).

In-depth Interviewing

In-depth interviews are open-ended and flexible, and are often used to elicit a holistic understanding of the interviewee's point of view and/or explore areas for further research (Berry, 1999). This study borrowed Robert Yin's advice that, since interviews are purposeful, they should take a form of "guided conversations", instead of "structured queries" (Yin 2003:80). The interviewing process for this research was challenging. Firstly, time was essential because interviewees had other priorities. Secondly, they had a wealth of knowledge on the issues discussed. As a result, questions had to be specific and pointed in order to elicit information that would contribute specifically to the research objective. This was useful for achieving the end goals. When it was hard to get direct interviews, phone interviews were conducted.

Telephone Interviewing

The utility of this method is that it tends to be conducted faster, with low cost. However, it can be disadvantaged by high rates of refusal (Oppenheim, 1992, in Gray, 2004:232), though the refusals might be reduced by “interviewer invisibility” (Gray, 2004). Notably, this study did not experience any instances of refusal. This method was useful in making prior appointments with respondents and making further communications with them to build the rapport (Gray, 2004:232). It was especially useful for conducting actual interviews with distant or busy respondents, whom it was difficult to reach physically.

Overall, the interviewees were asked to express their perspectives and experiences with horticultural supply linkages to SENAPA tourist enterprises. The questions focused around three aspects (i) the business opportunities opened up by SENAPA tourist operations; (ii) constraints surrounding initiatives to optimize the opportunities; and (iii) sought changes and proposed solutions. The detailed interview framework with guiding questions used in this study is presented in Appendix VI. A total of 84 interviews from both Mara and Arusha regions (including phone interviews) were conducted (summarized in Table 1 below). A detailed list of these interviews is presented in Appendix VII. To note, only participants who gave their consent, as stipulated in the ethics requirement for this study, are mentioned by name.

In addition, the interview data was substantiated by data from other sources as supported in the literature (Dennis, 1996). A number of Focal Group Discussions (FGDs) and a desk study were therefore conducted.

Table 1: Summary of interviews conducted

Stakeholder group	Mara	Arusha
Individual horticultural smallholders	20	5
Production co-operatives and Associations	06	4
Tour Operators	01	15
Intermediary companies	01	1
Supporting NGOs and Research bodies	02	4
Horticultural Trade companies	01	2
Political Representatives	03	
Middlemen	03	10
Agro-dealers/ extension officers		2
Researchers	01	1
Development institutions	02	
Total	40	44

3.7.3 Focal Group Discussions (FGDs)

This methodology can be used as a complementary tool, as it provide a good environment for understanding *collective social action* and accessing group beliefs, behaviours and attitudes that might be overlooked in interviews (Desai and Potter, 2006:154). Focal group discussions require a considerable amount of co-operation and enthusiasm from participants (Gray, 2004:230). This method was useful due its participatory character. However, the main challenges were that it was difficult and time consuming to organize and manage the group discussions. The FGDs were mainly used in producer groups such as Midawe (5 groups making up a total of 30 farmers) and Nduruma (8 groups, for a total of 40 members).⁶ These groups constituted a mixture of men and women, representing their households as respective membership unit for these co-ops suggest.

⁶ To note, Nduruma and Midawe are not part of the Mara region farmers. These were recommended by stakeholders for lesson-drawing purposes.

3.7.4 Desk Study

Along with other data collection methods, interpretation and analysis of the data was informed by a one month desk study, conducted in the Tanzania Horticultural Association (TAHA) offices in Arusha. This exercise helped the researcher to better understand horticultural production and marketing issues. TAHA was chosen for this undertaking because it is the only organization in the whole country that deals with horticulture. Although the literature was not directly related to supply linkages for the tourism market, it provided an important overview of smallholder-based horticultural production and marketing. Moreover, the desk study enriched the research with a thorough understanding of issues facing smallholder farmers, which offered a great contribution to the interpretation of common themes that emerged from the interviews.

3.8 Overall Limitations

Concerning the primary data collection, the major limitation is that the field research was conducted in two regions, approximately 450 km apart, and within each region the targeted respondents were scattered. This posed a serious challenge as it was time consuming and costly to travel across the two regions. Compounding the problem was the fact that respondents' schedules were too diverse to allow for completion of one region at a time. To note, the scheduled time for the research was only three months, which coincided with the rainy season. To mitigate this, phone interviews were used to reach stakeholders who at times were not physically accessible. Since the research was self-sponsored, financial limitations were encountered, namely in transportation and communications; however, these limitations did not affect the overall quality of the research. Additionally, it was hard and time consuming to get the interviewees to understand the informed consent letter, thus very few of them agreed to be declared in the thesis.

Other minor limitations include refusals by some stakeholders who considered the information about where and how they source their food to be both confidential and against their business interests. In addition, the researcher's attachment to a foreign university and the informed consent letter stating that the data would be used for thesis writing added some bias to the responses. The researcher's interaction with various interviewees had to be flexible depending on their status, language, level of education, and background. This limited the framing of interview questions and, in effect, limits the comparison across stakeholder groups. With some respondents, mostly the people with official capacities, the English language was used, while with others such as middlemen and local farmers the Kiswahili language was used. The language switching made it challenging to translate and compare the results because words in different languages suggest different meanings when interpreted. Besides switching between the languages, the competency level of English differed among respondents who responded in English, thus making the interpretation task difficult and time consuming.

Regarding the secondary data collection, main challenges were the availability of the relevant literature and the novelty of the study, largely because both PPT and horticultural marketing are new practices. To note, traditionally, smallholder farming has been generally subsistence-based in Tanzania as a whole, and the relationship between local communities with tour operators has generally been philanthropic-oriented. Despite these challenges, the field research was completed within the planned time and the results were useful in developing this thesis.

3.9 Conclusion

This chapter presented the thesis research design. It outlined the plans and the step-by-step processes that were adopted in the field study and the overall thesis development procedures. The process ranges from general framework of inquiry to specific data collection and analysis

methods. Eckstein's five categories of case studies were reviewed and the Discipline-Configurative typology was adopted. Finally, the overall limitations surrounding the research design were presented. The key findings will be presented later, in Chapter 5. The following chapter presents the general context and the background of the case study region.

Chapter 4: Background of the Case Study Region

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed description of the case study region. It incorporates the geographical, historical, socio-political, and economic contexts within which the fieldwork was conducted (See appendix IX: Case Study Region Contextual Model). The chapter begins by describing the national context, where the geographical location, population and historical, socio-political and economic trends of the study area are presented. Specific emphasis is given to agriculture/ horticulture and tourism sectors. This is followed by a detailed description of the specific case study area. Here Serengeti tourist enterprises and their respective demand for horticulture are presented. Then, a brief description of potential supporting organizations proceeds. Finally, the regional context, covering pertinent horticultural initiatives in Mara, (a region within which SENAPA is located) is presented, followed by a brief conclusion to the chapter.

4.2 National Context

Tanzania is a country in East Africa covering an area of 945,234 sq. km, with a population of about 43,000,000 (World Bank, n.d). The country is divided into 26 administrative regions, under which various district and village governments (local government) fall. Its GDP amounts to approximately \$22.4 billion (2009) and its per capita income is about \$440 (2008). Despite its adoption of a decentralized and participatory market-based economic system, Tanzania remains one of the world's poorest countries, with almost 14 million people living below the national poverty line (Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 2009), and lies at the bottom 10% of the world's poorest countries (UN, 2009).

4.2.1 Agriculture and the Tanzanian Economy

Historically, and up until today, agriculture has been praised as the backbone of the country's economy. It contributes to almost 50% of its GDP, 85 % of export earnings and 80% of employment (Agricultural Council of Tanzania, 2007). The country has high agronomic and irrigation potential as it is endowed with extensive arable land, reputable farming culture and reliable water bodies for irrigation such as Lake Victoria and Lake Tanganyika (the largest fresh water lake and the second deepest fresh water lake in Africa). Despite such favourable qualities, the sector is increasingly performing relatively badly.

To understand the current trends and performance of the sector, the historical context is worth noting. According to the Agricultural Council of Tanzania, agriculture has traditionally relied on smallholdings farmed by peasants and organized through co-operatives and associations. There have been relatively few large commercial enterprises, mainly due to the influence of the country's first president, Julius Nyerere, who considered capitalism as inappropriate for generating economic expansion and growth. Instead, he advocated his own genus of African socialism, called ujamaa (familyhood). Ujamaa advocated public ownership of the means of production, a special status to workers and peasants and increased national production by the development of rural sectors of the economy.

The Ujamaa policy was officially endorsed in 1967 during the Arusha Declaration. As a result of this declaration, most private capital in Tanzania, both indigenous and foreign, was transformed into public ownership to serve the needs of the people collectively. In the end this turned out to be a failure as the efforts to develop the economy of the rural sector were more or less fruitless. At the time the Arusha Declaration was adopted, Tanzania's future prosperity relied upon scattered peasant smallholders who focused mainly on their own subsistence and not in the wider

development of the national economy. These farmers lacked effective agricultural workforce and modern methods of production. President Nyerere responded to this subsistence mode of farming in the country by attempting to house the majority of rural Tanzanians in model villages that would act as collectivist units of production. This attempt was called villagization.

The central idea of the villagization program was to combine the tradition (village life of mutual assistance) with modern production methods (larger collective farms with access to technology). The assumption was that economies of scale could be gained with the whole village joining workforce on common land rather than their own separate plots. These villages were called Ujamaa villages. They were considered important contact points for government officials to teach peasants modern agricultural techniques and supply technology as well as human resource support. This strategy was popular until the late 1970s. Along with the villagization policy, farmers in Ujamaa villages were organized in farmers' co-operatives and associations. In the later years the reputation of the villages and the co-operatives/ associations was increasingly declining, largely due to changes in policies and broad agricultural practices (Agricultural Council of Tanzania, 2007).

4.2.2 Organizing Agricultural/ Horticultural Farming

As indicated in the history, the declining reputation of cooperatives has had greater implications for the current status of agriculture and its future prospects. In his report for the International Labour Office (ILO), Tanzania, "Series on the Status of Co-operatives in Africa: cooperatives in Tanzania Mainland" Dr. Sam Magimbi (2010) notes this trend as one of the key challenges for the agricultural sector in Tanzania. He holds that one of the reasons for the declining experience is the reduced support in terms of credit facilities and other subsidies to farmers, which to a large extent has to do with the adoption of neo-liberal policies in the agricultural sector. Another

reason is the mismanagement and corruption in the co-ops. Magimbi's analysis reflects the historical point of view and adds that state interference into co-ops affairs, which was regarded as a way forward, was solidified by the adoption of the socialism policies in the late 1960s. Socialism, along with other state-led interventions deteriorated, marking the official abolishment of co-operatives in 1976. Functions of co-operative unions were then taken over by parastatal crop authorities, which had to buy directly from the villages. Other services which were rendered by the abolished cooperatives were taken over by state owned companies (Magimbi, 2010: 15). All these changes meant inadequate/ poor support to smallholders in terms of price incentives, input supply and credit. National-wise, this meant decline of foreign exchange due to reduced production. Co-ops were reintroduced in the 1980s, alongside with the adoption of neo-liberal micro-economic policies (SAPs) (Magimbi 2010).

Although this new shift came with policies that consider grassroots development, measures such as removal of agricultural subsidies greatly affect poor farmers' capacities, for instance in terms of access to credit facilities (Rutasitara, 2005:9). Other micro-economic policies such as political decentralization, market liberalization and commercialization of smallholder production (Putterman, 1995), conditions under which agricultural-based economic activities are attempted have transformed farmers' co-operatives into marketing cooperatives, with different features and functions. What does the adoption of these measures mean for poor smallholders and for the Tanzania economy? This thesis reflects on this question in the analysis of impoverished horticultural growers in the SENAPA region.

4.2.3 Trends and Current Status of Horticulture

Horticulture is the fastest growing industry within the agricultural sector and has experienced considerable growth in both production and demand since the 1990s (Tschirley and Mwendo,

2004). Tanzania exported 1,706.48 metric tonnes of fruits and vegetables and export growth increased by 8% per annum (TAHA, 2009a). Horticulture is a labour intensive industry, providing jobs to 30,000-50,000 people yearly. It generates about US \$ 130,000,000 per annum (Nshwitz, 2009:7).

Production and marketing of horticulture is largely challenged by macroeconomic reforms such as the removal of agricultural subsidies, decline in government support for credit facilities, farm input, extension and other supporting services (FAO Tanzania, 2010). Other challenges include poor infrastructure, informal constraints and institutional barriers (Escola, 2006:7). Lynch (1999) adds the dominance of casual contact between buyers and middlemen, which disadvantages the producers, as a main challenge. The dominance of middlemen is noteworthy as they block the farmers from interacting directly with the large-scale buyers. While farmers endure the hard work and cost of production, middlemen dictate price of their produce, which is usually very low from real market prices. Since middlemen emphasize maximization of their own profit, producers remain the most vulnerable group in the supply chain.

To address production based problems, scholars suggest promoting their access to markets, infrastructure, pests and disease control education, access to information and credit facilities (Temu et al., 2005) as well as access to irrigation facilities (Kumar and Nelson, 2007).

4.2.4 Horticulture and the National Policy Environment

In 1997 the national agricultural policy was amended to include a section on horticulture, along with the adoption of more market-oriented management of agricultural production practices. There has been significant attention on horticulture due to recognition of distinctive problems surrounding this sub-sector, for example its sensitivity to production organization and packaging;

marketing and transport systems; and quality control (Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, 2002).

To date, there is no official national strategy focusing exclusively on horticulture. However, there are several promising movements. One is the Horticulture Development Council of Tanzania (HODECT), a public-private partnership body. HODECT recently drafted a horticultural strategy, stating roles of both the government and the private sector in promoting the industry. The strategy suggests that the government play the role of establishing the enabling environment and regulations for the private sector to manage and run horticultural production and businesses (HODECT, n.d). Another is the Tanzania Horticultural association (TAHA), the only body in the country that deals explicitly with horticulture. TAHA is a member-based organization that aims at making horticulture more profitable, sustainable and participatory, so that it contributes more to the development of the country (TAHA, 2009a). The third promising initiative is the current agriculture policy, *Kilimo Kwanza*, “Agriculture First” (2009), launched in early 2009 by the current Tanzanian President. This policy emphasizes the role of agriculture, puts emphasis on horticulture as a poverty reduction strategy and highlights the use of private sector and market-led interventions to its implementation (Tanzania National Business Council, 2009).

4.3 Tourism

Tanzania is the only country in the world that has allocated 25% of its total area for wildlife national parks and protected areas. The country has 14 national parks, 31 game reserves, 50 game controlled areas, one conservation area and two marine parks. (Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, 2009: 3). Popular wildlife destinations include Serengeti National Park,

Ngorongoro Crater, Lake Manyara and Kilimanjaro Mountain in the North and Mikumi, Ruaha and Selous game reserves in the South (see the Tanzanian tourist map, Figure 1).

4.3.1 National Tourism Policy, Trends and the Current Status

Tanzania's tourism policy was endorsed in 1991, and revised in 1999 to reflect the socio-political and economic changes that had occurred in the country as a whole. One of the specific strategies for implementing the revised policy includes community participation and empowerment of the local people in tourist vicinities (Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, 1999).

Recent statistics show that tourism is increasingly growing in Tanzania (with respect to arrivals and receipts). According to the tourism data from the Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources' Statistical Bulletin, in 1995 the annual international arrivals were almost 300,000 people, with receipts of nearly US \$ 300 million. From 1995 to 1999 there was a steady rise, followed by a sudden drop in 2000. Since then the number has again grown annually, except for a slight decline in 2009, due to world-wide recession. In 2008 the number of visitor arrivals exceeded 770,000; while the receipts, in US dollars, were nearly 1.3 billion (Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, 2009:6). Overall, tourism, the highest foreign exchange earner of the country, is an important industry for Tanzania's economy. The Tanzania tourist map gives a detailed picture of the country's tourist destinations, Figure 1.

Figure 1: Tanzania Tourist Map

Source: http://www.skyviewofafrica.com/touristmap_tanzania.htm

4.4 Specific Case Study Context: Serengeti National Park

The largest of the 14 national parks in Tanzania, and one of the world's most famous game sanctuaries, the Serengeti National Park (SENAPA) receives three-quarters of the international tourism arrivals in Tanzania, (Tanzania National Park Authority, 2009). SENAPA was established in 1941, and declared a World Heritage Site in 1981. It is located in the northern part of Tanzania within the Mara region. It is a protected area of nearly 15,000 km², covering a vast area of grasslands and woodlands that host a substantial number of the largest herbivore and

carnivore populations in the world. It is comprised of approximately 40 privately (mostly foreign) owned lodges and camp sites, which employ about 1,700 permanent employees (for a detailed description of SENAPA's capacity see Appendix X).

Recent research shows that in the year 2008, Tanzania welcomed 770,000 international visitors of which 90% visited the country for leisure purposes. International arrivals have risen by 153% compared to the year 2000. About 150,000 of the international visitors visit Serengeti National Park to enjoy the famous wildlife and landscapes and annual migration of the wildebeests. On average these visitors stay in the park for 2 nights where they stay in one of the camps or lodges in or just outside the National Park (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010).

SENAPA is surrounded by Grumeti and Ikorongo game reserves (with about 15 lodges and camp sites), as well as a number of mobile camps that move with animal migration.⁷ Around 2 million people live around the perimeter of the park with a population growth of approximately 3% annually. In general this is a poor, rural population struggling with increasing competition over available resources (Kaltenborn et al., 2008: 100). Yet this population exists within a region endowed with good climatic conditions for agriculture, a considerably large food market, and other significant potential business opportunities.

4.4.1 Horticultural Demand in the SENAPA area

The growth of the tourism business in the Serengeti area has created high demand for fresh fruits, herbs and vegetables. It is estimated that the demand for horticulture, based on enterprises with

⁷ This is a mixture of foreign ownership and wildlife Management Authority (WMA), national ownership.

large capacity⁸ amount to TZSH 834,921,931 in high season months and TZSH 244,885,398 in low season months.⁹ These figures are for some selected varieties with highest demand in volume; highest price per unit; and ability to produce in the designated area (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010:7). In the research preceding their proposal, “Serengeti Fruits and Vegetable Wholesale Company”, Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation selected 18 camps owned by 14 different private companies, with 1036 bed capacity and 830 employees. The findings suggest that the absorption capacity in high season months amounts to TZSH 520,614,906 and in low season months TZSH 143,402,166, with an annual demand of approximately TZSH 666,017,072 (RTA and HGF, 2010). Table 2 represents a sample of products, price per unit, volumes per 100 bed nights and weekly demand in the Central-Northern Cluster.

⁸ The total bed capacity (1596), the occupancy rates in high (average 85%) and low (average 25%) seasons, the number of permanent employees at each accommodation (1730), and the number of products ordered per bed and per employee. For the latter parameter, Nomad Safaris provided a model of the fruits and vegetable purchases per 100 bed nights. These data were extrapolated to the total number of bed nights in the Serengeti area(see Appendix X).

⁹ Tourist peak high season in the Serengeti Ecosystem is in the months of June, July and August and also December up to February can be called high season.

Table 2 SENAPA's Horticultural Demand in a Selected Cluster

Product	Unit	Price per unit average	Volume needed per 100 bed nights	Total volumes needed per week in low	Total volumes needed per week in high	Turnover weekly in low season in Central-Northern Cluster (TZSH)	Turnover weekly in high season in Central-Northern Cluster (TZSH)
Pineapple	Pc	1583	6	109	370	172,235	585,599
Watermelon	Pc	2857	6.5	118	401	336,700	1,144,780
Passion Fruit	Kg	2267	3.5	63	216	143,831	480,027
Sweet Banana	Kg	1333	14	254	863	338,427	1,150,650
Pawpaw	Pc	1200	9.5	172	586	206,682	702,719
Broccoli	Kg	2467	2.5	45	154	111,802	380,126
Butternut	Kg	2500	5	91	308	226,625	770,525
Zucchini	Kg	1800	9.5	172	586	310,023	1,054,078
Cauliflower	Kg	1775	3.5	63	216	112,633	382,951
Green pepper	Kg	1667	3	54	185	90,650	308,210
Leeks	Kg	1620	3	54	185	88,112	299,580
Red onion	Kg	1300	6	109	370	141,414	480,808
Tomato	Kg	1250	15	272	925	339,938	1,155,788
Carrot	Kg	1233	12	218	740	268,324	912,302
Sweet potato	Kg	1120	10	181	616	203,056	690,390
Irish potato	Kg	1133	26	471	1603	534,231	1,816,384
Aubergine	Kg	1171	5	91	308	106,190	361,046
Green lettuce	Pc	600	32	580	1973	348,096	1,183,526
Rocket	Bunch	600	14	254	863	152,292	517,793
Coriander	Bunch	370	12	218	740	80,497	273,690
Basil	Bunch	325	16	290	986	94,276	320,538
Dill	Bunch	333	5	91	308	30,217	102,737
Parsley	Bunch	433	10	181	616	78,563	267,115
						4,514,812	15,350,362

Source: Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010: 8

4.4.2 The Current Procurement System

In-depth interviews conducted with eight larger companies¹⁰ operating in the Serengeti area showed that the largest share of fresh fruits, vegetables and herbs are bought on the Kilombero and Arusha central market through middlemen. These traders take the fresh products to the companies' headquarters in Arusha where the invoice is delivered and where the products are checked. Afterwards, a truck (hired or owned) or airplane transports the goods (together with other supplies like dry goods, liquor, water, meat and dairy, gas) to the respective lodges in the Serengeti. Usually, these companies work with multiple middlemen for different varieties of produce with whom they make a contract and a fixed price arrangement. Transportation from Arusha to Serengeti can take up to two days. The journey is hot, bumpy and the risk of accidents and failure is high. This causes part of the supplies to be damaged. It is estimated that by the time the goods arrive at their destination, 1-5% is wasted. Companies therefore take wastage into account when they place orders. Although the bulk of produce is sourced from Arusha market, efforts towards establishing local supply relations are underway. Two companies (Moivaro and Serena) buy the largest part of their supplies from traders in Mugumu town, about 50 km from the Fort Ikoma entrance gate to Serengeti. Moivaro goes to the market using its own truck, Serena uses a delivery service, while Asilia buys most of its products (except for exclusive products like broccoli, raspberries and lemons) from the Machochwe farmers' project.

¹⁰ Larger companies with their operations in Serengeti: Thomson Safaris (3 camps), Moivaro Lodges and Tented Camps (1 camp), Serena Hotels (3 lodges and camps), Asilia (3 camps), Singita Grumeti Reserves (3 lodges), Sopa/Elewana Lodges (2 lodges), Tanganyika Wilderness Camps (3 camps) and Nomad Tanzania Ltd (3 camps) (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010).

On two Asilia camps the products are delivered and one camp collects the products directly from these markets. Singita Grumeti Reserves buys fruits and vegetables to be used in their staff canteens from the GHOMACOS farmers. Guest supplies are sourced from different locations.

Tanganyika Wilderness Camps has its own farm near the Ngorongoro Conservation Area entrance gate which supplies a variety of products for several of their camps. Sopa/Elewana is also ordering a part of their demand from local farmer groups in Tarangire and Bunda, however they are not able to meet demand (only 30% can be obtained). Nomad Safaris in the past tried to buy from local farmers and invested in water pumps and seed supply, however the farmers did not succeed in meeting the demands (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010:9).

4.5 Local Sourcing: Potential Supporting Organizations

The case study region is home to a number of organizations, mostly NGOs, which have been involved in supporting local horticultural production and marketing. These actors play different roles including organizing farmers into groups, co-coordinating supporting efforts, informing and connecting them with markets. These include the following:

TAHA (Tanzania Horticultural Association) is an umbrella organization that was registered in 2004 and became operational in 2005. It represents horticultural growers, processors, traders and service providers. It is a platform where issues regarding horticulture industry are addressed, and that promotes the development of horticultural industry in Tanzania. TAHA works with the government, international agencies and other NGOs to strengthen horticultural value chains and promote linkages, networking, marketing, and service provision for the horticultural subsector. Mara region belongs to their area of operation.

RTA (Round Table Africa) is a project executed in partnership with Maastricht School of Management (MsM) based in the Netherlands and the Eastern and Southern African Management Institute (ESAMI), based in Arusha. Its objective is to stimulate expertise development in the area of sustainable business in Southern and Eastern Africa and achieve a structural collaboration between international businesses, local companies and policy-makers by launching joint projects, either by focusing on investment opportunities or on policy development.

HGF (Honey Guide Foundation) is a Tanzanian (Arusha-based) NGO, founded in 2007 that aims to bridge the gap between the tourism industry and local communities by creating new business enterprise markets and other community development activities. HGF established the Machochwe farmers' group in partnership with 5 local groups in the Northern part of SENAPA that was further linked to 3 tourist camps. It has also achieved tourist based community linkages in Zanzibar and Ngorongoro districts. Its main interventions have been on responsible tourism, specifically on the conservation aspect, and on branding and certification.

HGF and RTA are the main initiators of the Business Partnership project for establishing a horticultural wholesale company in the SENAPA area. At the moment, these partners are working towards introducing a Tanzanian certification scheme that evaluates the performance of hotels and lodges in terms of responsible practices.

Grumeti Fund is dedicated to community-based work, anti-poaching and development. In March 2010, they established the GHOMACOS farmers association that supplies fresh fruits and vegetables to Singita Grumeti staff canteens. This institution has a Community Outreach Program (COP) that manages its relationship with neighbouring communities.

FAO (Tanzania Food and Agriculture Organization) has been supporting the government of Tanzania in promoting small-scale irrigation for horticultural growers in four regions (Mara, Mwanza, Shinyanga and Kagera) of the Lake Zone since 2005. One of the projects, the *Small-scale Horticultural Growers*, targets a total of 384 groups about 4,000 farmers. The project concentrates on improving production techniques (irrigation technology and management practices) to encourage more production of horticultural crops.

TSAEE (Tanzanian Society of Agricultural Education and Extension) is a non-profit organization dedicated to increasing agricultural production and income in the Lake Zone. TSAEE assists farmers groups by providing services such as group formation, training in crop and livestock husbandry, poultry farming, post-harvest technologies, marketing, and entrepreneurship.

UARI (Ukiriguru Agricultural Research Institute) is the oldest research station and one of the main agricultural research centres in Tanzania. It is the centre for the Lake Zone which consists of Mwanza, Mara, Shinyanga, and Kagera Regions. Following the growing attention given to horticulture development, the institute has done numerous studies of different aspects of agriculture including production and marketing for tourism market.

IBDI (Inter Business Direction Inc) is a consulting company based in Musoma. It has been closely involved in research and advocacy on relationships between tourism and surrounding communities. Some of the IBDI staff has been involved in research and formation of supply linkages to SENAPA tourist enterprises. For instance, the general manager of IBDI was hired by Grumeti Fund to coordinate the set-up of GHOMACOS.

MSHP (Mara Smallholder Horticultural Project), in existence since 2002, has been assisting some small-scale farmers to acquire support from various institutions in the region and hence improve their skills and knowledge in horticultural production and other related issues. Involved farmer have improved crop management practices, use of farm inputs, and post-harvest handling of produce, and maintained quality standards of produce. The MSHP has linked the farmers to the high value markets of the Serengeti National Park tourist hotels, where they achieve reasonable prices and regular demand for their produce throughout the year.

The following three organizations were involved in MSHP

ACTMD (Anglican Church of Tanzania Mara Diocese) connects local smallholder farmer groups with donors and other development agencies through projects. ACTMD was both funding and extension service manager during establishment and operation of MSHP. Currently, it supports farmers' group formation and market linkages in Mara region.

DALDOs (District Agricultural and Livestock Development Offices) is a department that operates under District Local Government Authority and constitutes one of the departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives. This office has extension workers in most of the wards in Mara region and had a representative who collaborated with the MSHP coordinator.

MFEC and BRAC Farmer Extension Centers are training centres located in Mara region, Tarime and Musoma districts respectively. The two institutions offer training on horticultural agronomic practices such as Good Agricultural Practice (GAP), post-harvest handling techniques, entrepreneurial skills and the like.

4.6 The Regional Context: Mara Region

The Mara Region lies in the Northwest of Tanzania, with Lake Victoria at its western edge, the Kenyan border at the northern boundary, and Serengeti National Park around the southern and eastern sides. It is one of the smallest regions in the country, endowed with the largest water surface area after Mwanza and Kagera, thus possessing high potential for irrigation agriculture (Mara Regional Administration, 2005). The region is divided into five administrative districts: Bunda (to the south west), Serengeti (to the south east), Tarime (to the North) as well as Musoma Urban (the municipal) and Musoma Rural. Musoma serves as the region's capital.

Tourism is one of the major economic activities in the region. Others include mining and agriculture. In addition, the region has one of the densest concentrations of cattle in East Africa, yet it is characterized by one of the worst food poverty rates: nearly half of the households live below the basic needs poverty line of Mara (Regional Administration, 2005:12)

Approximately 90% of the residents of Mara depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Agriculture contributes about 60% of the regional GDP. One of the region's current priorities is to diversify the economy by cultivating high-price non-traditional crops such as horticulture, sugarcane and cereals (ibid, 13).

4.6.1 Potential Horticultural Supply Initiatives in Mara

This study came across seven potential horticultural initiatives targeting the SENAPA market, spread out over the 4 districts. These networks have a high potential for internalizing local supply system, however, they experience some important constraints, as detailed later in chapter 5. Below are detailed descriptions of these initiatives.

Serengeti Horticultural Wholesale Company

Since the beginning of 2010, the Honey Guide Foundation and Round Table Africa have been working on a proposal to establish a horticultural business centre in the Serengeti area that would supply fresh fruits, vegetables and herbs to SENAPA enterprises by sourcing locally. The project is called, “Serengeti Fruits Herbs and Vegetables Wholesale Company: Sourcing from Smallholder Farmers in Serengeti”. The research focus of the initiators has been on the feasibility of the business from the demand side level. The plan is to establish a region-wide horticultural sourcing and distribution centre. This project was intended to start operating by April, 2011; however it has been delayed due to various constraints. It is now almost at take-off stage and TAHA will be one of its implementers. This project plan uses the following strategies: i) management support throughout the first year of operation i.e. credit, extension, research and monitoring by public-private collaboration; ii) privatized technical assistance to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in the supply linkages and iii) local organizations for delivery. This initiative is an example of PPT projects that put much emphasis on the capacity of the market rather than on the supply side situations and other potential challenges.

Grumeti Horticultural and Marketing Co-operative Society (GHOMACOS)

GHOMACOS is located in Nata village, adjacent to the Singita Grumeti Reserves (SGR) in the Western Serengeti area. It was founded in 2009 by Grumeti Fund, managed by the Grumeti Community Outreach Programme (COP) and The Inter Business Direction Inc (IBDI). The primary goal was to organize and formalize farmers’ groups in eight local villages to supply fresh fruit, vegetables and herbs to SGR. Today, the co-op has 60 members, led by a chair, vice-chair and a secretary. The secretary, who is the only paid personnel, manages all the financial transactions of the co-operative. While not yet linked to actual tourist hotels and lodges,

GHOMACOS supplies to SGR staff canteen, albeit with considerable difficulties with respect to production, distribution, marketing and co-op management affairs. This co-operative is an example of an infant level initiative with limited support from the onset, marking its failure to adequately benefit market opportunities that SENAPA tourism generates.

Balimi Farmers Network

The network has 100 members distributed in three villages called Tamau, Guta and Nyatwali in Bunda district. It was initiated in 2003 as part of the Mara Small Holder Project (MHSP), a research project that focused on the type of assistance that farmers' groups require to develop sustainable and profitable linkages to neighbouring tourist destinations. Ideas for the network establishment were drawn from a consortium of stakeholders including donors, development agencies, civil society organizations, extension service as well as some government and private actors. The network received intensive support during the first year of its operation under management of the Anglican Church Mara Diocese and Mara District Council Extension Services. The network has a bulking committee that receives orders from hotels, collects the produce from farmers and arranges transport to hotels. In effect, this committee distributes the money back to farmers. Balimi appears as an exemplary initiative, largely due to efforts put into it at its founding stage, especially the collaborative effort by initiating stakeholders. During the first year of operation this group received constant training and close supervision as well as financial support. It would be interesting to pursue an in-depth assessment of its current status and achievements.

Gorong'a Farmers Network

The network was established in 2003 in Kitawasi and Masanga villages of Tarime district. This was also part of the MSHP initiative; however it has yet to be linked to SENAPA enterprises,

largely due to its distant geographical location from the park. It started with 16 groups and increased to 46 farmer groups (630 farmers) by the year 2007. This group sells its produce at local markets; specifically, the Tarime Central Market and at the Tanzania-Kenya border. From the inception time to 2007, production and marketing skills are recorded to be improving (Mafuru et al. 2007). The improvement trend is a good sign for the desired localized supply system.

The Machochwe Group

This is a partnership between Honey Guide Foundation (HGF) and 5 local farmers groups in the Machochwe area (North of Serengeti National Park). Following the establishment of this group, HGF linked the initiative with three tourist camps (Olakira Migrating camp, Sayari Camp and Dunia Camp) which are part of the Serengeti Asilia Tourist Company in the SENAPA vicinity. Further assessment on the development and current status would be recommended to determine its success/failure factors, especially from the perspective of its members.

Serengeti Farmers' Association (SEFA)

Serengeti Farmers' Association (SEFA) is a not-for-profit civil society organization in Mugumu town, Serengeti district, founded in September 1995 and registered as an NGO since 2002. This NGO encourages and participates in development of the agricultural sector and natural resource management for improving community livelihoods. Currently, the association has sixty (60) farmers groups; each group is composed of ten (10) members. The produce is used for subsistence or sold in local markets. The location and capacity of this group adds to the strength of the localized supply system.

The Small-scale Horticultural Growers Project

This was established in the year 2005 by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Tanzania. The project is part of FAO's support for the Tanzanian government in promoting small-scale irrigation for horticultural growers in the Lake Zone (Mara, Mwanza, Shinyanga and Kagera regions). The project targeted a total of 384 farmer groups (about 4,000 farmers) which would bring about 500 acres under small-scale irrigation in twenty-eight districts. It concentrated on improved production techniques (irrigation technology and management practices) that would encourage more production of horticultural crops. Reviewing the current status of this project would add to the evidence for the plausibility of the localized system.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter presented historical, geographical, social-cultural, political and economic aspects, as they concern tourism and agricultural/horticultural supply linkages in the SENAPA region. The provided information shows that SENAPA is a relevant setting for exploring agricultural-based PPT proposals, given its touristic and agronomic characteristics as well its big horticultural market. The emerging development of projects and farming groups discussed in this chapter means that a localized supply system would not start from scratch. Successful initiatives such as the Mara Small Holders Project can be considered when trying to address weaknesses in other farming groups. The Balimi network's internal operations also seem useful to review and perhaps replicate, due its acquired sustained support. The supporting NGOs add hopes to the promotion of a localized supply system. Collaboration, partnerships and discussions amongst these actors could lead to a significant joint effort in support for a localized supply system for SENAPA. While the pertinent initiatives and their respective supporting actors demonstrate significant opportunities, marking the optimism for poverty alleviation through business links in

SENAPA, the current procurement system, however, suggests a big threat to its establishment and survival. The following chapter will advance this argument by presenting the analysis of the key findings from the fieldwork.

Chapter 5: Case Study Findings and Analysis

5.1 Introduction to Findings

This chapter presents and reviews the practical issues and perspectives surrounding the pro-poor tourism (PPT) perspective for shifting away from philanthropic relationships towards embracing business interventions. It assesses findings from the case study of horticultural supply linkages between and within the Serengeti National Park (SENAPA) tourist enterprises' hotels, lodges, camps and employee canteens. The argument will be advanced that despite the belief and efforts by stakeholders, especially development practitioners, the actual transition and the realization of pro-poor agricultural-based linkages for tourism is more difficult than the theory suggests. This is so because the transition away from philanthropy towards market-oriented strategies is a long-term process that may fail to be attained easily and quickly, especially given the attitudes, circumstances and processes embedded in relationships between the poor in tourist destinations and their respective tourist enterprises.

The findings from this study show that although SENAPA and its surrounding tourist enterprises enjoy the reputation of being large and profitable businesses in Tanzania, the people who live in their vicinity gain limited benefits in terms of business opportunities. This experience conflicts with the strategies and mechanisms advocated by PPT that touch on local supply of goods and services. The location of these enterprises within Mara, the region endowed with abundant resources, would mean that effective local business linkages, including horticultural ones, could potentially be very successful. Yet the current trend of horticultural supply initiatives suggests more instances of failure than of success. This is so despite the fact that the geographic characteristics of the region, such as plentiful water sources and favourable climatic conditions for horticultural production, lay a solid foundation for successful linkages. Mara region's

population is in a good position and should logically be able to access the SENAPA tourism market based on PPT, as opportunities to supply fresh fruits and vegetables are right in their vicinity. While reference to these potential opportunities remains an essential tool for PPT theory and practice, the real pro-poor impact requires a serious work of converting the available resources into tangible effects. As it shall be discussed later in this chapter, the supply and demand constraints surrounding the local system are key considerations when attempting to implement the proposal in question. The ideal turning point, to ensure benefits are realized, could be capacity building in the direction of social enterprise development within the Mara region, which would pave the way for the local poor to optimize the respective opportunities. Efforts towards developing adequate production capacities and marketing skills in the local setting are imperative in this process.

Just as in the literature, ‘philanthropy’ was fairly criticized in this research from at least three main perspectives. These include perspectives of the tour operators, business practitioners and development practitioners. Main arguments were that philanthropy generates unsustainable projects, and it lacks the accountability value, largely marked by incidences of misuse of the donated money, such as with the Grumeti Community Outreach Program (COP). In a conference at Nata Secondary School in early 2011, COP representatives presented their evaluation of the Singita Grumeti Reserves’ (SGR) contribution to local community development. The evaluation noted that of 36 boreholes that were recently constructed, sponsored by Grumeti Fund, only 12 were still working.

*These technicians just call us one time and say, three boreholes are not working. We give them the money. Next few days, here they are again, two are broken, we give them the money again. In the end, almost all of them are not working. We suspect these technicians have made the fixing of the boreholes a whole business now. Who knows whether or not they are telling the truth?*¹¹

¹¹ COP Conference Presentation, 2011

Mismanagement of both money and facilities funded by donated money has been a critical issue that Grumeti Fund management is struggling with. However, the contribution of the funding toward health, education and security affairs of its vicinity was highly acknowledged. Specific appreciations were directed to the Grumeti Fund's sponsorship program, building of the Nata Secondary School (where the conference was held), constructing a police station and many other social amenities.

From the COP perspective, and as far as the general experiences with philanthropic interventions are concerned, it appears to be ideal to shift towards more business-oriented interventions. However, this shift should not be completely directed to substituting 'philanthropy'. Support of pressing needs such as those concerning health, education and water services, which require immediate assistance, would still need to be addressed via some form of donation or supplement.

While researched horticultural supply initiatives in the Mara region were striving to transform themselves into business partners, dependency on donor agencies and NGOs in setting up and running the linkages, especially in the transition period, remain high. A consortium of actors should come together in organizing and managing these initiatives, which require serious commitment and support, especially at early stages of operation. The Mara Smallholders Project (MSHP) confirms this statement as it is referred to by stakeholders as an ideal initiative (Interview with Round Table Africa Researcher, March 2011). The MSHP was initiated in 2007, funded by DFID and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and organized by the Institute for International Development (Institut für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, IIZ) in collaboration with local institutions including government, NGOs, private sector and other

stakeholders. This collaboration also resulted in the establishment of Balimi Farmers Network, referred to as one of the most successful initiatives in the region (Mafuru et al., 2007). Other initiatives such as Grumeti Horticultural Marketing Co-operative Society (GHOMACOS) remain weak, largely because they lacked enough support from the onset. This dependency on external support undermines the idea of “putting poverty at the centre of tourism and tourism at the heart of poverty” (Ashley et al., 2000). Realistically analysed, the poverty agenda is instead put at the heart of donor agencies and development practitioners such as NGOs, who are the main concerned actors and who are in a position to raise ideas about assisting the poor. The perspectives of the tourism industry presented below advance the argument that poverty alleviation, though desirable, appears to contradict core business goals of the tourism industry and tends to compromise PPT principles, such as commercial viability.

This observed gap can be addressed by organizing farmers’ co-operatives, “new generation co-operatives” (Shepherd, 2007), which ostensibly possess business characteristics compatible with the requirements of the tourism industry. Influencing the formation of and sustaining of these co-ops, however, seems to require at least a portion of the well-off members of the community to participate. Their help is required in order to afford production, distribution and marketing processes, which are inherently costly. This situation dictates that social enterprise, rather than poverty level, be an ideal membership criterion for these co-ops. For example, GHOMACOS’ Secretary noted the co-op had members who never had anything to supply, which divides the co-op into “active and passive members”:

In fact, we have a total of 60 members, from eight villages, but two villages thus far have never produced anything. So I would say only half of my farmers are active. Some cannot simply

*afford to buy seeds and maintain their farms. Would you call those members? I mean, that is why our business is just a failure. If we had active people here, we would have been so far by now.*¹²

Based on PPT's targeted beneficiaries, the criterion for participating in these initiatives widens the emerging gap amongst involved perspectives. Some analysts favour the idea of focusing the recruitment on 'ideal members', those with some form of pre-existing possessions.

*I think what has to be done is to develop a role model kind of mechanism. I guess a few farmers who already have some promising production potentials have to be selected, for example based on their land size or/and the interest to participate in the business. Success of these few people will set an example to others. This can be better and even more sensible than targeting the poor, who may lack the interest or who may misuse the benefits. I mean, even if it was possible to accommodate everyone, regardless of the criteria, most of the poor and unskilled would not rechannel the money back to the business, and this way, I don't know if the business will ever grow.*¹³

Within the business logic, it can be argued that being poor is in itself a big hindrance to the success of these initiatives. As recent research suggests, vulnerable smallholder farmers are those who lack skills and abilities to produce on a commercial basis, especially the ones who do not own land that can serve as collateral or who are not a registered business entity. "These are the criteria which most smallholder farmers do not fulfil" (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010:14).

Concerns about criteria for participation, while in conflict with PPT's targeted beneficiaries, who should be the poor people, confirm its criticism of perpetuating inequalities. This may ultimately squeeze out the poor from entering the businesses, thus keeping them completely out of the beneficiary group. In addition, the tourist enterprises have a tendency to depend on middlemen and avoid dealing directly with poor farmers, as detailed in a later section.

¹² Interview with GHOMACOS Secretary, February, 2011

¹³ Interview with TAHA Program Manager, April, 2011

Overall, questions of financial support, infrastructure, marketing skills, involved actors' interests and focus, and time and other resources, make the proposal to adopt business models contingent on many serious factors, which have to be taken into account when attempting to put PPT into practice. Given the novelty of the business idea, and considering the amount of resources needed to support its realization, and the time it will take for it to bear fruits, some form of well-managed donations would still be recommended. The business model viewpoint discussed previously (Ashely, 2005, see chapter 2) confirms that a business model is resource-intense, highly time consuming and interferes with operations of tourist companies.

5.2 Summary of Key findings

This section details findings on the horticulture procurement system for SENAPA tourist enterprises and the underlying perspectives.

5.2.1 SENAPA's Central Procurement System

The case study findings showed that tourist enterprises in and around SENAPA procure the bulk of their fresh fruits and vegetables nationally, from Arusha, notably from Kilombero and Arusha central markets. To note, Arusha is one of the central tourist cities in Tanzania and most of the wildlife tourism headquarters, including SENAPA enterprises, are located within this hub. SENAPA enterprises then organize their orders through central procurement managers, who further delegate to intermediaries and these middlemen largely source from the abovementioned markets or from farm gates. While some intermediaries possess own transport and are trusted enough to deliver the produce directly to the enterprises in Mara, most orders are delegated to multiple middlemen who further deliver the produce to the headquarters to be checked, sorted and bulked before being transported by operators' trucks. The latter method is preferable because

it allows for enforcing accountability measures to the middlemen. Furthermore, for tour operators with own transport, especially for those with some other enterprises besides SENAPA, they prefer this system as it allows for centralized procurement. In some few cases tour operators transport the produce on planes, along with other dry goods and liquor, for example the And Beyond Tourist Company. In emergency situations, such as replacing damaged produce or managing a sudden increase of clients, negligible amounts of produce are sourced “locally”, i.e. within the Mara region. In rare cases the produce is sourced through tour operators’ own farms within Mara region. However, the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) discourages this as it restricts the ownership of tourist enterprises to tourist operations. Sourcing from organized local growers is just emerging, however it is surrounded by many constraints. What does such a procurement system mean for PPT theorists? In addition, what does it mean for stakeholders such as tour operators, horticultural producers (farmers’ co-operatives and associations) in the Mara region, development practitioners such as NGOs, and political representatives and other relevant stakeholders in and around SENAPA? The field research undertaken received different responses, contingent on stakeholder groups and their embedded interests.

5.2.2 Perspectives on SENAPA Horticultural Procurement System

From the PPT perspective, if one considers the characteristic of replacing food importation from abroad, SENAPA enterprises qualify as local sourcing entities given their major procurement within the country. However, local development practitioners, political representatives and business operators expand the definition of food importation to include sourcing from outside the tourist destination region, such as sourcing from Arusha. Among these stakeholder groups, the first two perceive the current procurement system as a big threat to the impoverished Mara

smallholders in particular and to the local economy in general. Business operators perceive it as a threat to their livelihoods. In the end, while Serengeti enterprises are still considered as “local buyers” from the broader PPT perspective, Mara horticultural producers and traders reject this perception. They remain concerned about being detached from accessing and benefiting from their proximity to both the larger market and the SENAPA. These voices, alongside those of development practitioners, call for the establishment of a localized supply system. This alternative proposal, while compatible with the poverty alleviation agenda, remains a weak one since the tour operators, the key decision-makers in the market model, continue to favour the existing system. Overall, findings from the case study demonstrate the following perspectives: development practitioners and political representatives, business operators, producers, key informants, and tour operators. Detailed analyses of these perspectives are presented below.

5.2.2.1 Development Practitioners and Political Representatives Perspective

Interviewed development actors such as NGOs, individuals and political representatives such as Village Chairs, Ward Councillors and parliamentary members, were more concerned with resources within the region and opportunities that tourism businesses generate for the poor, and for the local economy. Pointing to various potential success factors, these actors argue for a replacement of the current procurement system as they see Mara as a region endowed with many unrealized potentials, which if well realized, could highly contribute to successful business operations and perhaps poverty alleviation in the region.¹⁴ An interview with the MP for Serengeti suggested that,

¹⁴ (Mafuru et al, (2007); Interview with SEDEREC Coordinator, Interview with MP for Serengeti, Interview with SEFA Secretary; Interview with IBDI researcher; Interview with TAHA secretariat (Februay-April, 2011); Business Partnership Plan, (2010).

Purchases be focused to the local products rather than importing from outside the District. Also, the supply to the hotels and other offices in the national park should be done by the local people in the District¹⁵

5.2.2.2 Business Operators Perspective

Business practitioners, such as the initiators of the current TAHA business partnership plan, emphasize the demand capacity. Their analysis focuses on potential profits that “a sophisticated and efficient distribution body” (Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010), such as their proposed wholesale company, would make. While expressing a common interest in promoting the replacement of the current procurement system with a localized system, it is doubtful whether these stakeholders could be dependable when pursuing the poverty alleviation agenda. It can be argued that this group of stakeholders are more likely to focus on satisfying the demand side requirements rather than on assisting the poor. This may be so because their key strength is based on their ability to convince the tour operators to shift to sourcing locally. In addition, for the wholesale company proposal to materialize, they would need to at least demonstrate a proven ability to compete with the multiple middlemen-driven systems as well as the capacity to guarantee the tour operators all their requirements. Considering the current status of the supply system, it is hard to imagine how the proposed company may effectively play this role without compromising the poverty alleviation agenda.

5.2.2.3 Producers Perspective

While not fully understanding the opportunities and potentials viewed from the development and business perspectives and to a larger extent the essence of the shift towards marketing models,

¹⁵ Interview with the MP for Serengeti, February, 2011

producer groups are concerned with more pressing issues that directly inhibit their productive capacities and create entry barriers to the market. This is not surprising given their historical background concerning their relationship with tourist centres and considering their level of education and lack of adequate marketing information about the tourism market. Informal interviews with individual farmers in the Mara region revealed that most smallholder farmers think they produce higher quantities of produce than can be bought by tourist enterprises. However, some farmers mentioned that the market for their produce is lacking and they do not know what to do with the remaining products, especially when it comes to exotic products.

5.2.2.4 Key Informant Perspective

Informal interviews with competent officials in the area, as well as in-depth interviews with development workers and other related stakeholders, underscored the limited capacity embedded in the current local supply system. Obstacles surrounding local production capacity and market access were highlighted as key factors for the existing weak linkages to the tourism industry. Production and marketing barriers include socio-political and cultural considerations, cash constraints, knowledge and skills gaps, information and communication barriers, seasonality, infrastructure problems, and stringent requirements from buyers. The three quotes below reflect these emerging issues.

The general failures can be viewed in three parts. Firstly, the local villagers do not have the knowledge of farming and skills of marketing their products. Secondly, most of the producers still depend on the nature.....emhhh... rain-led production, which is unpredictable. No irrigation facilities in place to keep the production going especially in dry seasons. I would say that the seasonality problem divides the supply system in two parts, the time of abundance, which I may call a season of overproduction and the time of scarcity, which means very little or no production at all. Thirdly, capital of running the business is still a problem to most farmers. No cash of buying seeds, chemicals and other materials for farming.¹⁶

¹⁶ Interview with IBDI researcher, March, 2011.

Another interviewee added,

Concerning fail factors, so far no business has actually taken up the challenge, only subsidised projects which might not be sustainable. Moreover, requirements from tourism industry in terms of quality and quantity are very strict; so far these requirements cannot be met. Hence coordination among several parties to invest in guaranteeing sustainable supply is crucial¹⁷.

The MP for Serengeti noted,

Constraints include weak harmonious environment between owners of hotels and the community and the local leadership as there is no formal meetings to discuss common things together. Still the community and local leaders don't realize mutual benefit from the national park authorities nor hotels in the national park. Hence there must be a room to iron out problems regularly rather than ad hoc meetings. There should also be a special unit to oversee routine activities to make sure there is benefit between the two parties. In addition, hotel owners, the community, local leaders and District authorities should have a forum of routinely meetings to discuss the concerned matters jointly.¹⁸

Socio- Political and Cultural Considerations

Drawing from a historical context, market-oriented supply systems, which take the form of contract farming, are a new practice for most traditional subsistence farmers in the Serengeti area. A transition towards market-oriented models requires time for adaptation as the process generates considerable socio-cultural changes and political concerns. Marking the changes is the organization of producer groups in farmers' co-operatives, a process that has partly been affected by the history of the declining reputation of cooperatives in the country as a whole.¹⁹ Undoubtedly, this process requires mindset changes, among other related things. The historical

¹⁷ Interview with the Round Table Africa Researcher, March, 2011.

¹⁸ Interview with MP for Serengeti, February, 2011.

¹⁹ The adoption of market economy in Tanzania has meant decline of agricultural co-operatives in the country as a whole due to the neo-liberal policies that are incompatible with the government commitment to provide financial and technical support to the agricultural co-ops (Tanzania Co-operatives Federation, 2006, <http://www.hakikazi.org/papers/Cooperatives.pdf>).

aspect, for example, has a pervasive effect on current supply linkages as it makes some farmers hesitant to participate in the co-ops.

Some local people would deliberately not engage in any of these suggested businesses as they consider the charitable donations as their “rights”. To some, even if they embraced the shift, they would demand full co-operation from tour operators, again justified as a right. This is a very challenging perspective when the “self-help” marketing philosophy is taken into consideration. A collision of perspectives emerges here, as the business perspective seems to accommodate motivated and interested people. Even those who are trying to internalize this new model have shown failure to stand on their own and define their business goals. Although there are some subsidized projects, they do not seem to be sustainable because farmers tend to expect to be assisted indefinitely, rather than reinvesting in their projects. This perpetuates dependency, with a high chance of losing their financial support.²⁰

The historical relationship between communities and wildlife areas is worth noting. Generally, these communities are being deprived of free access to resources in the parks, most of which are off limits to these same communities. There are many restrictions, especially on hunting and collecting firewood and building materials. Consequently, there is an antagonistic relationship between wildlife management and local communities. The problem of wild animals leaving the parks and destroying local peoples’ farms was mentioned by the Serengeti Development Research and Environmental Conservation (SEDEREC) coordinator as being a

serious divisive factor between local communities and the tourism industry...coupled with insufficient compensation to farmers and legal penalties for farmers who kill animals that are

²⁰ Interview with Round Table Africa Researcher, March, 2011; Informal interviews with development Serengeti workers, February, 2011.

*eating their crops, it is indeed a salient issue when analysing the relationship between the tourism industry and local communities.*²¹

Generally, it has been proven hard to transform local people from their traditional lifestyles to new ways of generating income, such as through commercial agriculture. The process of adopting business models generates opposing perspectives between those who consider access to the resources that they are currently deprived of as a right issue and those who accept the transformation to business models. Overall, socio-cultural issues may contribute to tension among tour operators, the community and the local leadership, factors which impair the development, and even the establishment, of the business model. Meetings to discuss these concerns might be helpful.

Cash constraints

Overall, producer groups, individual farmers and development practitioners that were interviewed concurred that one of the leading issues that inhibits production and marketing of horticultural products in the Mara region is the income status of farmers. Most small-scale farmers lack sufficient money to support the production system. A successful production and marketing system is in reality a resource intensive process. Buying farming tools, seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, establishing irrigation facilities, on-farm handling and harvesting, post-harvest handling and transport costs mark the financial gap between the impoverished smallholder farmers and the big demand for the produce.

*The poor GHOMACOS farmers simply do not have the money to run their farms. Capital for running the business is still a problem to most villagers. No cash for buying seeds, chemicals and other materials for farming.*²²

²¹ Interview with SEDEREC coordinator, April, 2011.

The GHOMACOS Secretary, for example, holds that his farmers are particularly constrained by lack of capital to run their farms as well as to transport the produce to the market. Due to financial problems, they use motorcycles, bicycles or mini-public buses as a means of transport, which contributes to high risk of damage to the produce, potentially disqualifying them from the tourist market.²³

A point echoed throughout the interviews was that horticultural production, especially on a commercial basis, is more expensive than growing other crops, hence producers have to be financially empowered. To meet quality requirements, farmers need to buy proper seeds and pesticides, and to get these products they need access to technical support. While harvesting, horticulture needs a lot of labour, and since late harvesting destroys the quality, producers have to ensure timely harvesting. In addition, post-harvest handling costs must be taken into account. Nevertheless, specific packaging materials for different varieties are required as well as an appropriate mode of transport to get the produce to destined markets. Considering that most farmers cannot afford these expenses, cash constraints remain a large impediment to horticultural growers targeting the tourism market.

Knowledge and skills gaps

Most of the poor local farmers have little knowledge about business-based farming in general and production of exotic crops for the tourism market in particular. This is unsurprising given their background in subsistence farming, which simply requires traditional skills. To note, most horticultural crops that would enhance their linkages to tourist markets are new to them and

²² Interview the IBDI Researcher, February, 2011.

²³ Interview with GHOMACOS Secretary, March 2011.

require new technologies and skills in order for them to meet required qualities and quantities. In addition, most farmers are unfamiliar with the demanded crops, with some farmers not even knowing the names of some crops they are producing. Some GHOMACOS farmers, for example, mentioned that they are “just trying some of these new crops on their farms.”²⁴ This suggests the lack of adequate training, especially at the onset of group formation and at initial stages of operation, which in effect contributes to poor farming, pest management, harvesting and post-harvest handling practices. Interviews also revealed problems beyond individual level such as poor management and leadership at group levels, including poor record keeping mechanisms, mistrust and disunity among farmers of the same groups. The problem of poor entrepreneurial skills was also highlighted throughout the research.²⁵ In addition to market access related barriers such as lack of support concerning marketing of their produce, smallholders in the Mara region need frequent training, technical assistance and access to extension services.²⁶

Information and Communication Barriers

Existing local initiatives are not well informed about market trends and requirements, for instance the types, quantities and qualities required by their clients at given times. Assessments of groups such as GHOMACOS and Machochwe that are already supplying to tourist enterprises suggest the problem of producing too much of a given crop in one season and too little in another. There is also the problem of producing substandard qualities. These problems are intensified by the fact that horticultural products are perishable, and need to be consumed fresh, while farmer groups do not have proper storage facilities such as cold rooms.

²⁴ Interview with an anonymous farmer from GHOMACOS.

²⁵ Interview with IBDI Researcher, February, 2011.

²⁶ Interview with Midawe and Nduruma Leaderships, April, 2011.

Seasonality

Both tourism and horticultural production are highly dependent on the season. While the latter is much driven by availability of water, and most farmers depend on seasonal rainfall, the former depends on tourism's high peak and low seasons respectively. Local production is low during dry season, which is from June to September while high-peak tourism season is the months of June, July and August as well as December to February. This results in a mismatch between the two seasons, which needs planning and management skills to be able to match local production calendars with the tourism seasons and resources to build mechanisms for reducing their dependency on rain-fed production.

Poor infrastructure

Poor infrastructure is especially a problem for individual farmers or groups that are distanced from the tourist centres. This resembles Doroth Meyer's analysis, in what she calls, a "physical environment" problem (Meyer, 2008). Generally, the roads in Mara region are bad, especially during rainy season. It was pointed out that some roads are totally inaccessible during rainy seasons. To farmers, specific problems range from poor transport modes such as the use of bicycles and motorcycles as well as public mini buses (*daladala*). These lengthen the transportation time, and increase the damage risk and transportation cost. Other infrastructural problems include poor storage, packaging and irrigation facilities. It appears difficult to address the road transport problem, as improved roads may adversely affect wildlife conservation and ultimately reduce the number of tourists.

Stringent Requirements from Tour Operators

Interviewed farmer groups find the requirements from tourist enterprises difficult to fulfill. They claim part of the problem to be that buyers do not clearly define their quality concerns. During the interviews a farmer from Mara lamented,

*when we mentioned this problem to them, the chefs responded by displaying pictures on the walls that show good looking tomatoes, green papers etc. But how can we compare our products with these pictures? Yes they say the middlemen ensure they bring them products that resemble the pictures. But they forget that these are just other buyers who go to the market and choose the first class of produce that does not necessarily come from one farm. We produce under very hard conditions, and it is hard to determine the outcome.*²⁷

Notwithstanding the clarity about the requirements concern, the key informants accepted the reality that requirements such as consistent supply and timely delivery, while logically desirable, mark the market entry barriers for local smallholders. It is not hard to understand this given other factors beyond their control such as inadequate financial support, group management problems and other marketing issues described earlier. While some farmers accused tour operators of failing to specify (in a way that is comprehensible to them) the required qualities, some pointed out that these requirements of quality and quantity are very strict, to the extent that they often cannot be met. It appears that, even if farmers get a clear picture of what exactly is required, they would still be in trouble as their poverty situation continues to limit their production and marketing capacities. Unless there is coordination among several parties to provide investment or collaborative partnerships to raise their social capital, resolving the requirement related concerns would not necessarily address their vulnerable position in the supply system.

²⁷ Informal interview with SEFA farmer, February, 2011

5.2.2.5 Tour Operators Perspectives

The tourist operators, while making commercially viable decisions about their purchases, were much concerned about the limitations of the local supply system. They focused their analysis on quality, quantity, availability, consistency and reliability of the supply system. Their major problems with the local supply system were centred on the inability of the system to guarantee them all their requirements. Echoed throughout the interviews with tour operators were four impediments for local procurement. These are price instability, poor quality of produce, unreliability of suppliers and inconsistency of supply. This is not surprising given the production and marketing level problems documented above.

Obstacles to sourcing locally

Local supply is generally characterized by low quality of produce and marketing skills marked by similar products, with varying freshness, colour, shape, size, taste and ripeness. Tour operators insisted that since tourism is a very sensitive and competitive business, they could not afford to damage their image abroad or to lose customers for the sake of accommodating local farmers' interests, who cannot meet their quality criteria.²⁸

Furthermore, it was noted that local supply is overall inadequate to fulfill the demands of the tourist market. It was added that, "some varieties simply do not grow in the region."²⁹ The inconsistent supply is also a problem of seasonal production as well as absence of big market centres that could collect all varieties, especially of exotic horticultural products in the Mara region. Due to limited varieties in Mara markets, tour operators find it economically and

²⁸ Interview with Soda Manager, March, 2011.

²⁹ Interview with Central Manager, Serena, March, 2011

logistically unviable to buy small quantities locally and complete their orders with bulks from Arusha or elsewhere.

Perhaps not surprisingly, other responses pointed to poor marketing environment, especially on time management and trustworthiness. An explanation for this may be the poor entrepreneurial skills discussed previously. Some tour operators based their scepticism of local sourcing on their past experience. An interview with the Sopa Lodge Central Manager noted problems of timely delivery and weak coordination between market actors as part of his discouraging experience to shift back to sourcing locally. Additionally, tour operators prefer credit arrangements to cash- on -delivery methods, given the nature of their business. However, this option is not affordable by small-scale farmers, as

*their business cannot survive if not on cash –on- delivery method of payments, obviously due to their income levels. But our business is not compatible to such arrangements.*³⁰

Overall, demand side respondents made reference to supply side constraints outlined above as key conditions to their reluctance to turn to local purchases. Perhaps if they are guaranteed real changes, they can shift towards localized systems. How long this will take and what incentives would be put behind the change are open to further research and discussions.

Factors for the Current Procurement System

Significance of the two big markets in Arusha, i.e. Kilombero and Arusha central markets, was widely pronounced throughout the formal interviews and informal conversations with a wide range of stakeholder groups. Characteristically, these markets are not only urban markets that source from Arusha region and neighbouring places, but are big collection centres to which products come from various parts of the country. The strategic position of Arusha city and its

³⁰ Interview with Hotel and Lodges Procurement Officer, April, 2011

long history of tourism business attract traders from different places to bring large varieties of fresh fruits and vegetables, including exotic products. Additionally, this possibility is due to existence of competent horticultural growers in areas neighbouring Arusha, for instance the Kilimanjaro region. Farmers in these regions are more experienced in production and marketing to local, tourist and export companies. Their competency is due to substantial training from various sources including government and private sectors. For tour operators, this is a big opportunity because it gives them access to quantities and varieties of produce that they want. Furthermore, in these two markets there are established suppliers/middlemen who can afford credit arrangements. These are either rich traders or people who have established bonds with traders/ farmers from whom credit-based sustainable supply system is guaranteed.

Given tour operators' experience with the two markets, they have managed to track prices of commodities in different seasons. This gives them power to negotiate with their suppliers and get good prices. Some tour operators are reluctant to shift to Mara suppliers, as they would miss the flexibility that dealing with different suppliers in these markets affords. This raises some doubts as to whether tour operators are really willing to shift locally, even with the ensured requirements. It is arguable that their inclination to the status quo is part of their self-serving interest as it enables a "centralized purchasing system" to function.³¹ This seems logical given that some tour operators own enterprises in different locations and prefer to purchase supplies for all of them at the same location, to make their purchase more economical and logistically viable.

³¹ Interview with Retired Asilia financial Administrator, April, 2011

5.2.3 The Feasibility of Shifting to Local Sourcing

Findings from the case study suggested many reasons for supporting a local procurement system. Firstly, it seems to be a beneficial idea, largely due to high demand from SENAPA tourist enterprises, coupled with relatively higher prices offered by the tourism industry.³² During an interview with the Round Table Africa, Ms. Arda Riedjk stated,

*I will give you at least five or so success factors. One, the agronomic potential is there. Two, willingness and demand from tourism industry is there. Three, gains in terms of less wastage, less transport costs are clear. Four, various initiatives have seen this as an opportunity. And five, positive branding for the tourism industry that contributes to local economic development by purchasing from local farmers. I think based on these reasons, businesswise the idea is very feasible.*³³

Other rationales behind local sourcing include economic and logistic viability, quality and safety control, and responsiveness to corporate social responsibility.

Economic and Logistic Viability

It can be argued that a localized supply system would create a win-win situation among tour companies, local farmers and even tourists. It would mean cheaper transport costs and lower purchasing price compared to what the companies currently spend in Arusha, while being more economically viable as it reduces damage costs. It is worth noting that currently the tour operators take into account anticipated damage when placing their orders given the transporting situation and weather, which make their produce more risky. On the farmers' side, it would be more profitable than selling to local markets because tourist enterprises pay higher and constant prices; hence establishing market assurance. More importantly, local farmers can learn and build their expertise on horticultural production and marketing, not necessarily to supply only to tourist

³² Honey Guide Foundation and Round Table Africa, 2010:8.

³³ Interview with the RTA Researcher, March, 2011.

enterprises, but also to other emerging markets in the region, such as the mining industry. Tourists, on the other hand, would benefit from consuming healthy meals, given the freshness and overall quality of local produce, as well as fulfilling the ethics of buying local and supporting the impoverished farmers, which appeals to most tourists.

Logistically, this would shorten the ordering system, as there would be fewer supply actors through whom the order has to go. In the current procurement system, for example, orders are determined by lodges, camps, hotels and employee canteen management and then are passed to Arusha central management to further be distributed to various middlemen. The middlemen, in turn, re-channel the produce to the consumption sites or back to the headquarters. This would be different in localized systems, as tourist enterprises would communicate directly with farmer groups' representatives and get the produce delivered from shorter distances and within a shorter period of time.

Quality and Safety Control

Experiences of sourcing locally, although there are not many in the SENAPA area now, confirm that by doing so it is more feasible to control the quality of produce. This is because products can be properly traced, as there would be a direct relationship between farmers and tour operators. In the current procurement arrangements, it is almost impossible to track where the produce comes from. Informal interviews with traders at Kilombero and Arusha Central markets noted that fruits and vegetables at these markets come from all over Tanzania. Noteworthy is the fact that food quality, especially of perishable horticultural produce, deteriorates with long transportation distances and/or longer storage time. It is important to note that the journey from Arusha is long and the roads are bumpy, and with the hot weather, orders are always excessive to what is needed, taking into account anticipated damages. Establishing relationships with local people

would make it easier to control the whole production system and avoid unnecessary damage costs, while enjoying fresh produce. Horticultural export companies, such as the Home Veg Tanzania Limited,³⁴ attest to the viability of this option. With the growing global attention to food traceability,³⁵ it would be important for tour operators to gradually shift towards local sources as tourists are likely to begin to be more mindful and stringent about the sources of the food they eat while on vacation.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Currently, there is growing debate among tourists and other development agents concerning social and environmental responsibility of tourism practices. Sourcing horticultural products from local communities is widely desired as a feasible CSR practice. Some interviewees considered it as a “positive branding” for the tourism industry.³⁶ In an interview with one tour operator, he noted:

*As part of our CSR, buying our products from local markets would be ideal. The only thing is that we need to be guaranteed of reliable qualities and quantities at all time. Mind you tourism is a sensitive and competitive industry, as we think of CSR, consistency of the supply and suppliers' commitment to abide by our contracts remains very important to us.*³⁷

This viewpoint parallels the concern in PPT, noted previously in chapter 2, in branding approaches. While this thinking is important for a localized system, especially in realizing the

³⁴ Home Veg is the first Tanzanian owned fresh vegetables export company based in Arusha. It exports baby products such as baby corn and French beans, mostly to European markets. This company is entirely dependent on small scale growers. These growers are organised into cooperatives/associations, on a contractual basis, whereby all farming operations are centralized in a unique Quality Management System (QMS) to ensure food quality and safety (Interview with Home Veg Staff, April, 2011).

³⁵ This refers to the growing concern by consumers about where the food they eat comes from.

³⁶ Interview with RTA Researcher, March, 2011

³⁷ Interview with Sopa Lodge Manager, March, 2011

poverty alleviation agenda, it appears to be a conditional action, rather than a priority for tour operators.

5.2.4 Critical Success Factors

High Agronomic Potential

The Mara region occupies a considerable space of arable land and favourable climate for agriculture, including horticulture. Various crops, particularly vegetables such as spinach, cabbages, tomatoes, and onions, as well as garden fruits such as watermelons, can grow very well in the region.³⁸ Geographically, Mara is the region with one of the largest water surface area in Tanzania, after Mwanza and Kagera, giving it a high potential for irrigation agriculture. There are also areas with constant water flow along the Mara River.

Traditionally, subsistence agriculture is one of the main economic activities in the region as about 80% of the Mara region population are farmers.³⁹ Given that PPT suggests *diversification* of traditional livelihoods means rather than their *total replacement*, establishing agricultural supply linkages to SENAPA enterprises seems a feasible idea. Production of fresh fruits and vegetables has mainly been practiced in household gardens for subsistence purposes. However, recently with growing agri-business awareness, smallholder farmers are increasingly realizing the potential income-generating opportunities that can be extended from horticultural marketing. During an interview with the Member of Parliament (MP) of the Serengeti Constituency, Dr. Stephen Kebwe, referring to the proximity of Mara to Lake Victoria and presence of other water bodies within the region, he noted,

³⁸ Interview with SEFA Executive Secretary, February, 2011.

³⁹ Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, “Sourcing Fresh Fruits and Vegetables from Smallholder Farmers in Serengeti: The Business Partnership Plan”, 2010: 12

*Naturally, Mara is endowed with abundant resources for agricultural productivity. Its high irrigation potential lies within the region and in its boundaries.*⁴⁰

Recently it was estimated that approximately 65 hectares of land are already being used for horticulture; producing 620 metric tons annually,⁴¹ and that between 800 and 1,500 farmers grow high value fruits and vegetables in the Serengeti district alone.⁴² Most commonly grown horticultural crops are tomatoes, cabbages, pawpaw, pineapples, watermelons, onions, spinach, carrots, green peppers, mangoes, legumes and bananas. Some tourist enterprises in the area acknowledge “the best pineapples, watermelons and pawpaw are grown in the region.”⁴³

Pertinent Existing Linkages

Collaborative efforts by development agencies, tour operators, NGOs and other related stakeholders have contributed to several initiatives that explicitly target connecting smallholders to the tourism market. One prosperous example is the Balimi network described previously. Other groups such as GHOMACOS could be improved by strengthening their supply system. Providing farmers with production and entrepreneurial skills and facilities, as well as leadership and management training for the co-op leaders, would make a difference. Similarly, groups such as SEFA (600 farmers, 60 groups) and Gorong’a that are not yet linked to SENAPA, have a great potential to develop strong horticultural supply linkages. Both groups need support in the form of technical assistance to build the enabling environment for developing such profitable linkages.

Additionally, there are a few examples of localized procurement systems in place. Serena lodge, located adjacent to the Western Corridor of SENAPA and Grumeti River, buys the largest part of

⁴⁰ Interview with MP for Serengeti, February, 2011.

⁴¹ Babu et al., 2000, Quoted in Mafuru et al. 2007: 12.

⁴² Interview with SEFA Executive Secretary, February, 2011.

⁴³ Interview with Hotels and Lodges Co. procurement officer, March, 2011

their fresh fruits and vegetables from Mugumu and Namadi markets located in Serengeti and Bunda Districts respectively, while they source their supplementary orders from neighbouring places such as Mwanza.⁴⁴ Moivaro camp sources from Mugumu using its own truck, and Asilia buys most of its fresh fruits and vegetables from the Machochwe initiative via either direct delivery through farmers' arrangement or collection by the camp's trucks.⁴⁵

Recent research by Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation notes a considerable government support for the local system. The Serengeti District, for example, employs a form of adult education known as *Farmer Field School approach*. In this model, farmers learn from field observations and experimentation with continual supervision and assistance from extension officers. These officers are distributed in each ward whereby they visit and advise smallholder farmers on planning, spacing, disease control and other production-related issues. Currently 420 farmer groups spread across 70 villages are joining farmer field schools. These farmer groups are currently not linked to tourist markets.⁴⁶ Such forms of initiatives could be useful components for strengthening the proposed region-wide localized supply system.

High Demand from the Enterprises

There are approximately 150,000 international arrivals to the Serengeti National Park annually. These visitors are hosted in about 40 privately owned camps and lodges throughout SENAPA. These enterprises employ about 1,700 permanent employees. The number of employees is noteworthy because they can afford somewhat higher prices than the local market and their quality requirements are less stringent than those for tourist lodges, hotels and camps. In addition,

⁴⁴ Interview with the Central Manager, Serena Lodges, March, 2011

⁴⁵ Interview with the Human Resource Manager, Asilia Co. April, 2011

⁴⁶ HGF and RTA Business Plan Report, 2010: 14

recent research shows that SENAPA enterprises' monthly spending on horticultural products has been increasing.⁴⁷

Interviews with procurement officials in three tourist companies indicated that their demand for fresh fruits and vegetables is increasing because of the growing tourism business. However, they noted that the demand is seasonal.⁴⁸ Figures for Serena tourist company monthly demand in its three lodges (Kirawira, Mbuzi Mawe and Serena), which vary seasonally, are TZSH 24,000,000 to 55,000,000,⁴⁹ while Hotels and Lodges Co. (Seronera and Lobo wildlife lodges) spends approximately from TZSH 8,000,0 to 20,000,000.⁵⁰ The And Beyond Tourist Company, despite having their own farm around the Kliens camp, spends TZSH 4,000,000 to 8, 000,000 monthly.⁵¹ These figures indicate a large market for local famers in the Mara region. Properly optimized, local supply linkages could be strengthened, ideally leading to increased opportunities for the poor to benefit.

5.3 Discussion

This section provides a detailed discussion of the case study findings. The poverty alleviation perspective is discussed in the light of other involved perspectives. In addition, the feasibility of the horticultural industry in the tourism market will be analysed with respect to supply and demand challenges. This analysis will incorporate issues surrounding the organization and operation of the supply linkages.

⁴⁷ Ibid: 8

⁴⁸ The high season is in the months of June- August and December to February.

⁴⁹ Interview with Serena Central Manager, March 2011

⁵⁰ Interview with Hotels and Lodges Co. Manager, March 2011

⁵¹ Interview with Procurement Manager, And Beyond Co., March 2011

5.3.1 The Poverty Alleviation Perspective

These findings exhibit a real gap between the perspectives involved, largely due to the asymmetrical power relation between and amongst stakeholder groups, mainly with respect to financial status. This is unsurprising given the inherent principles of a market-led economy. Forces of demand and supply, which are obviously based on what involved actors from the supply side have to offer and what those from the demand side require, have meant that a real business model is one that is governed by the criteria and interests of different players in the market. When analysed in terms of the validity of their arguments, each stakeholder group has some logic, albeit embedded in its core interest. Even though both development practitioners and business operators support the idea of sourcing locally, it can still be argued that business operations, including even the Business Partnership Plan that TAHA is about to implement, may compromise the poverty alleviation goal, as well as the patriotic motivation to buy local, given the impracticability of the local system at the moment. In reality, given the tourism market requirements, if the TAHA project had been initiated at the anticipated time, that is January 2011, it is still doubtful that the proposed wholesale company could have avoided having to source from distant markets. It seems impractical for this wholesale company to effectively guarantee tour operators all their requirements, while it is not yet known who would at the same time guarantee the local farmers all the finance, information, knowledge and other supports that they need to make the desired change a reality.

It is interesting that local farmers do not fully understand how big the market is. They think they have a problem of “overproduction”. This makes sense to them as they see produce remaining over most of the time. Either they are unable to sell this food because local people find exotic food unacceptable or do not know how to prepare it; or, if they can sell it to the local people,

they are not paid a good enough price to cover their cost. Would the transfer of knowledge about market parameters that is possessed by business and development practitioners make any difference to their optimization of the opportunities? Would their full understanding of the requirements of the tourism market make the change a reality? Perhaps the third important question is this: is their poverty level an asset for promoting their active participation in the market or is it a liability making them vulnerable in the market for horticultural produce in the Serengeti area? All these questions are relevant for PPT discussions in general and for the PPT proposal to shift away from philanthropic interventions towards adopting business strategies in particular.

If this discussion was based on who are the losers and winners in the SENAPA horticultural supply system, among the involved perspectives, one could argue that tour operators are the most powerful actors as they are the top decision makers concerning price, quality and even where they want to source their produce. Interestingly, while they may be pursuing their profit maximization goal, they can still claim to be in accord with the PPT principles such as those of local sourcing and commercial viability. This is so given that they are buying within the country and they are making sure they are incurring minimal losses. While the development practitioners and business operators may remain overwhelmed by the vastness of the market and the embedded opportunities, which indeed have potential for poverty alleviation, it is tour operators who gauge the direction for their realization. It should be noted that both business operators and development practitioners look at the potentiality for a successful local supply system. However, if the business operators win the game, the line between their pursuits of profit maximization and that of the tour operators may remain blurred, leaving development practitioners alone in the pursuit of the poverty alleviation agenda. The real change therefore, from the poverty alleviation

perspective, may depend on how powerful the voice of the development practitioners is and how great are the resources they have to back up their will. A lesson about PPT is that generating net benefits for the poor through a win-win process is a trickier thing in practice than it sounds. Although the potential may exist, the process may take longer and may require far more resources than it may be assumed.

5.3.2 Feasibility of Horticulture in the Tourism Market:

From Theory to Practice

Review of the literature (section 2.4.1) raises critical questions, responded to by both optimistic and pessimistic accounts, concerning the feasibility of horticulture in the tourism market in general. However, the case study findings warn us not to be too optimistic, but to consider factors that may challenge the theoretical assumptions. Various perspectives address previously asked questions differently, such as that of Barham, *what factors are enabling and what ones are constraining with regards to the linking of co-operatives to tourism industry?* (2009). To decide which of them to adopt, however, depends on the analysis of empirical data from the particular situation where PPT theory is to be applicable.

Meyer's analysis (2008) distinguishes four factors that may affect an attempt to link local food to the tourism market. These are the production side issues, demand side issues, intermediary issues (distribution) and the role of the government. Of these, the present study mainly focused on the first two and some attention was given to the other two. This emphasis accords with the shift from philanthropy to business models, as proposed by recent PPT theory, which places forces of demand and supply at its heart. Interestingly, Meyer's prediction of the supply-demand issues, along with others' critical views on the feasibility of horticulture in the tourism market

discussed earlier, were mostly confirmed (Key and Runsten, 1999; Stevens and Kennan, 1999; Minot and Ngigi, 2003).

A few demand-supply issues anticipated in the literature were not found in this research. One is the sanitary concern about possible food contamination (Momsen, 1998). This is perhaps because this research did not move beyond procurement to food preparation and serving consumers. Another that is untouched is that of labour conditions (Dolan et al., 1999), which may be because in the literature it was raised as a critique of small-scale production in favour of large-scale farming to avoid overdependence on human labour. But the context within which this study was undertaken was one in which large-scale farming appeared impractical. Furthermore, the quality and safety issues (Momsen, 1998) were not given enough attention. The quality issue, though claimed by tour operators to be the main concern, was only emphasized as a condition to suppliers, and mainly at the procurement level. This is when the size, shape, colour and overall appearance of the produce matter. Considering the journey from Arusha to SENAPA, specifically road and climatic conditions, it is obvious that these qualities cannot be maintained until delivery time. Given that food quality includes nutritional value and taste, both of which deteriorate with the respective long journey, it is clear that the current procurement system compromises the quality criteria that it claims to steadfastly embrace. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, food safety is compromised in the current system since it is almost impossible to track the source of these products. As mentioned earlier, Kilombero and Arusha central markets source from all over the country and even from neighbouring countries. And for certain, the middlemen who are the integral part of the current system may not necessarily, or it is not in their interest to, know how and where the food was produced. It can therefore be argued that

sourcing within the Mara region can allow for safer, nutritionally more valuable and tastier food than the current system.

5.3.3 Supply Constraints versus Demand Requirements

One of the big challenges that these findings demonstrate is the gap that exists between production and marketing status in the Mara region and the requirements of the tourism industry. The former is largely due to low income of farmers and weak support. The latter may be because tourists supposedly leave their countries in pursuit of experiencing “different” cultures, including food, and appreciating them. Yet, they want to eat food of the same or even better quality than what they usually do at home. It would have made a big difference if the need for exotic food products was combined with the need for local cuisines because farmers could still use their traditional technologies to produce for the tourism market. It is interesting to learn that GHOMACOS, for example, can meet the standards for the employees’ canteens in Singita Grumeti Reserves, but not for tourist hotels, lodges and camps within the same enterprise. While one of the PPT principles is to “maintain” and “improve” traditional means of livelihoods and “not replace” them (Goodwin, 2008), realities on the ground show that for supply linkages initiatives to be successful their production has to shift away from traditional products to exotic ones. This is confirmed by the analysis of the Balimi success factors, which emphasize the group’s increased competency in growing exotic products (Mafuru et al., 2007). The mention of “growing crops that they do not even know the names of” by some of the interviewees reflects a contradiction to Goodwin’s idea. Growing these new crops, with minimal/lack of supervision and support, while marking a shift towards the business model, is in itself an impediment for the shift to offer any meaningful changes. Considering how costly the real process might be, it is unsurprising to see signs of failure from the supply side. Given their knowledge level and

inadequate support, it is obvious that the poor are not ideal candidates for the underlying business model.

It appears as though there is a structural argument for the current dominant supply system. Would addressing the supply side issues really change the structural arrangement of these enterprises? As the findings reveal, most of SENAPA enterprises' headquarters, if not all of them, are located in Arusha, and one company may have a tourist enterprise in more than one location in the country. Given such a structure, it is arguable that a centralized procurement system may preserve the status quo since buying in small quantities in the locality of each enterprise may affect their economies of scale. Whether or not improving the status of production in Mara (no matter how much it costs and how long it takes) would offer incentives to change the current system is open to debate. Irrespective of where this debate leads us, the supply side issues and the role of involved actors remain salient. How should the supply linkages in the Mara region be organized and the actors interact in ways that yield meaningful benefits for the poor smallholders?

5.3.4 Organizing and Operating the Supply Linkages: Stakeholders' Roles

While the literature proposes the farmers' cooperatives, (marketing co-operatives/new generation co-operatives) as ideal organizational units (Sherpherd, 2007; Gibbon; 2001; and Torgeson; 2001), the present study came across various arrangements, some of which contradict this proposal. On the one hand, there were co-operatives, but which were dysfunctional, while on the other hand there were arrangements which did not involve co-operatives, but were favoured by the tour operators. The dominant use of middlemen, and few incidences of tour operators' own farms near their enterprises are indicative of such arrangements. While the idea is that these new types of co-ops are not just producer groups but that they also organize producers and "find their

own markets”, the SENAPA tourism market, at least for now, cannot easily be penetrated unless some big changes take place with regard to organizing the production and the linking process. Arguably, the change has to begin with organizing the farmers. To manage the internal operations, one has to recall Torgeson’s earlier suggestion that the new-generation co-operatives are characterized by “investor” rather than “cooperative” culture (Torgeson, 2011). With his idea in mind, it is not hard to understand why dysfunctional co-ops existed in SENAPA, especially when the membership criteria are considered.

TAHA’s upcoming initiative is intended to play a regional intermediary role between the SENAPA enterprises and producer groups within the whole of the Mara region. It is doubtful whether all the producer groups would agree with this plan as it can be thought that adding the wholesale company would lengthen the supply chain, hence possibly reducing benefits to these groups. Would tour operators support the company? Or would they prefer direct linkages with producers’ co-operatives? It is interesting how the role of middlemen is vital to tour operators considering the dominant model of organizing the supply has been through informal communications. The interviews made it clear that tour operators are in favour of a “sourcing via middlemen” channel, and not from producer groups even within Arusha. This reality adds some doubts to the shift from the current procurement system to sourcing locally in the Mara region, through direct arrangements with farmers. However, because of the apparent mistrust and lack of confidence in smallholder farmer groups that tour operators possess, the wholesale proposed business company, Nata Community Business Centre, may be accepted by tour operators as it can guarantee reliable and consistent contractual arrangements, including credit arrangements.

A two-fold doubt is raised here. One part of it concerns whether or not the middlemen would want to sell to the company if they can get a way of selling directly to the tourism market; while

the other is whether the tour operators would buy from this big wholesale company, if there is a way of continuing their practice of ordering informally through middlemen. Here a conflict of interest is emerging among the three actors; tour operators, middlemen and the proposed wholesale company. Perhaps outside intervention such as by the government would be helpful; but unfortunately, the underlying PPT proposal that this thesis adopts suggests a minimalist role for the state, and is in favour of relying on the private sector for solutions. While development practitioners such as NGOs may have a role to play, their influence remains weak when they are only offering verbal support to a capitalist-based model. How can the poverty alleviation perspective survive in a commercially sustainable way that would be compatible with the other key perspectives involved? To address this question, in-depth research that brings all the involved perspectives into a discussion would be useful.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has identified and discussed the main perspectives surrounding the idea and practice of linking local horticulture to the tourism market in light of PPT theory. In particular, it has discussed the gap between the philanthropic relationships and the business models in the SENAPA context. The findings underscore that supply side problems such as those surrounding production and marketing levels overshadow the perceived opportunities, and that demand side requirements such as those related to quantity and quality largely depend on addressing the supply side problems. In depth interpretation of the results suggests a real complexity to these findings, as revealed in the discussion of the perspectives involved and the role of respective actors. What does this disparity in perspectives mean for PPT theory? In this thesis, it briefly means that PPT has to look through a combination of different lenses, rather than just one, if its implementation is to have meaningful impact.

Chapter 6: Implications, Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter summarises the contribution of this thesis to PPT theory and practice. It offers insights for reconsidering the PPT proposal to shift away from philanthropy and embrace a business model. It also incorporates recommendations for PPT theory and for further research and ends with the statement of overall conclusions.

6.1 Implications of the study for PPT Theory

The findings imply that PPT could work under certain conditions, at least in the SENAPA horticultural supply system, and perhaps elsewhere where similar conditions exist. Concerning the shift from philanthropy towards business models, financial capacity emerged as an integral aspect that would ensure business initiatives are successfully established. Arguably, philanthropy is still needed to provide the financial investment and the technical resources required to set up an enabling environment for the business model to work. Philanthropic projects such as educational programs, infrastructural provision, input supply, technical and management support are important, especially at initial stages of operation. To note, proper planning and management, as well as serious accountability measures have to be in place for such interventions to materialize. This would address problems such as matching the production calendar with tourism seasonality, handling transactions within farmers' groups, and ensuring timely delivery.

It is possible that funding of business initiatives could come from outside sources, or even within the tourism industry itself in the form of investment. This would, however, target investors who must be prepared to gain very little benefits from their involvement. This is because the businesses that provide financial support are less likely to profit significantly at initial stages of operation, for instance during the first year, considering inevitable expenses that the setting up

process incurs. Seeking “ethical investors” would be ideal given the weak economic status of the local farmers, to whom only minimum or no interest charges would be feasible. Ideal investors would therefore be those with the compassion to support the poverty alleviation agenda. Drawing from lessons that this study generates, particularly on the abuse of philanthropic money, this strategy would require some committed and competent people to monitor both the short- and long-term use of funds. NGOs would be ideal stakeholders for setting up the investment plan and managing its operation. Overall implications of this thesis for PPT theory are summarized below.

1. The proposal to embrace business models could potentially materialize, however some critical issues have to be taken into consideration. While potential business opportunities may exist, the goal of poverty alleviation may not consequently be reflected. One reason is that the implementation process is far more intense than the theory suggests. The wide gap between theory and practice can be attributed to the wide variety of perspectives, foci and interests of all of the involved actors. Given this complex reality, preparedness and commitment to serve the poverty alleviation agenda must be pursued as a conscious and well informed shared goal. This requires massive collaboration – both logistical and ideological – amongst involved stakeholders.

2. The actual shift from philanthropy to business model implies that the pros and cons of both models be considered, albeit not with the goal of taking sides. The ultimate goal is not to incline to either pro-charity or pro-business because these approaches complement each other. While it remains logical to criticize philanthropic interventions, based on incidences of mismanagement and abuse, serious issues embedded in poor communities such as those concerning health, education and water warrant immediate attention, which in turn necessitate charitable donations. Well-managed and purposed aid is also imperative when addressing finance related supply side issues, for instance poor infrastructure, lack of capital and other related needs.

3. To fully appreciate the shift, issues at the transition level and at the initial stages of operation have to be emphasized. The two periods are very important to consider as they reveal the immensity of the task to actualize business models. What does it take to transform the impoverished people into business partners? What incentives should be used to encourage involved stakeholders such as tour operators to co-operate in poverty reduction efforts? What should be done to harmonize and facilitate the transition process? More importantly, what does it take to establish a meaningful business base that would sustainably and effectively contribute to poverty reduction? To address these questions, it is imperative to adopt interventions that would strike the balance between both the philanthropic and business models. In addition, it is important to put more efforts at initial stages as a strong foundation means promising initiatives for both short-term and long-term solutions. This is so because poverty alleviation is a complex process that takes time, resources and involves many changes before significant, real impacts can be observed.

4. Most importantly for the examination of agricultural/horticultural based linkages, it should be noted that combining the local sourcing idea with targeting the poorest of the poor is practically a far more difficult task than can be assumed. This is because the poor lack most of the business capacities and requirements, thus their participation into business is conditionally impaired when modern agricultural practices are considered. In addition, some people may simply not have the interest to participate. The entry point into the business model should therefore not solely target the poor but invite better off classes in those localities. This is important as it allows for proper utilization of available resources, whilst at the same time generating multiplier effects. This would also inspire people who are reluctant to participate to get involved into these businesses as they witness the profit-generating capacity of business ventures. Furthermore, this would

facilitate various learning processes among the local population, as farming and other business skills such as entrepreneurship can be practically transformed through combined efforts within the local community.

5. Although both the demand and supply sides pose some challenges to the theory, this thesis shows that supply-related challenges are more significant than demand-related challenges. The financial capacity of producer groups highlights this theme. This implies that financial and logistical support of producer groups is imperative in creating the business environment and attracting the participation of the poor.

6. While the financial support remains integral to the process, this should not be pursued in isolation. Combining the financial investment with other skills such as education (both farming and business-related), information sharing, and social enterprise are very important in facilitating the transition process, especially that of diversifying traditional livelihoods to meet the demands of the tourism market.

6.2 Implications for PPT Practice

This thesis demonstrates that the claim that PPT exclusively targets the poor people neighbouring tourist-frequented areas is a difficult one to reconcile in practice. As the findings suggest, it seems more practical for the producer groups to lay down some base criteria for membership so as not to compromise the success of their business. However, this should be done with caution as the idea may allow for perpetuation of inequalities within these communities. The process may start by empowering poor people, especially those with some pre-existing possessions and who show interest to participate. This could be an ideal strategy as it facilitates the transition process. This would mean that the poor who are “actively” participating would

enjoy the direct involvement in the business, while others in the area can benefit from generated opportunities such as employment in the tourism industry and within the supply chain. Once the localized supply system is established, a sizeable proportion of the local poor could gain employment opportunities in areas such transportation, labour provision in farming, harvesting and post-harvest handling jobs, such as sorting and bulking. This strategy appears to be a better way of realizing meaningful pro-poor impacts due to its high potential to deliver multiplier effects.

While modifying business operations, socio-cultural implications must also be considered. As discussed earlier, some poor people are simply unlikely to engage in the proposed businesses. Those who consider donations as “compensations and rights” could complicate the transformation by attacking any idea that is not based on donations. This means that there should be measures in place to ensure fair compensation to the local people in instances that they deserve to. In addition, local populations must be helped to understand why the idea of adopting business interventions is necessary and how it can be beneficial to them. Community empowerment through awareness raising and information sharing must be incorporated in the process to ensure that participants make informed decisions about their involvement.

Another important consideration is the required resources. It is clear that the shift necessitates both financial and human resources, implying that committed and competent individuals be sought to represent effectively the poverty alleviation agenda. How and where these people should come from, either within or outside the region, is one of the important questions that must be addressed. People from within the region may be ideal for this role because they understand the history of the locality and are already involved with tourism processes. However, they may not have sufficient competencies. People from other areas, such as Arusha, might be considered

for their competency; however, the objection may be that they do not belong to the area. Thus, they might not be very keen to assist local people. Moreover, they might work effectively but spend the money outside the region, limiting the multiplier effect. From the business perspective, the argument may be that, wherever the organizers come from, competency and commitment to do the job are major priorities, as these characteristics are consistent with business requirements.

In addition, potential changes to stakeholders' roles need to be considered. The findings have shown that middlemen are an integral part of the tour operators' procurement system. Currently, middlemen play the accountability role in the supply process, ensuring quality, quantity, consistency and reliability. These are some of the important qualifications that smallholders are missing. Perhaps producer groups have to learn these skills from the middlemen. However, even after they have acquired such skills, it seems difficult to convince tour operators that they can guarantee the required standards. Tour operators are reluctant to source directly from the producer groups as their current procurement system suggests. This reality makes it fairly problematic to imagine the shift to sourcing directly from the farmers, without the involvement of other actors. Perhaps an active role played by supporting actors such as development agencies can alter the current attitude. These actors would ideally help the farmers by building their entrepreneurial capacity and by connecting them to the tourism industry. This could build trust within tourism enterprises since the assurance would be coming from outside the farmers' groups. This intervention is especially necessary at the initial stages of operations. Skills such as leadership may be important in the process of transforming the farmers since they are only expected to receive the support temporarily.

The strength of the current procurement system is so significant that the possibility of shifting to sourcing from Mara is threatened. What incentives could be used to make the shift more

realizable? Perhaps tourists themselves can play this role. Once they begin to be mindful of the sources of the food that they eat on vacation, tour operators could be forced to shift to buying from local sources. Tourists' concerns about food safety, nutritional values and taste might push the local sourcing agenda. As the findings suggest, it is clear SENAPA enterprises that source from Arusha and Kilombero markets cannot trace their food sources. This is a serious issue as far as food safety is concerned. In the current system, it is unthinkable that middlemen would be held responsible. This is so given that very few middlemen buy from farm gates and that the products are mixed up at the bulking stage, meaning that tracing the source is practically impossible.

The overall implication of the findings is that while efforts to address the supply side problems are underway, tour operators have to begin thinking of shifting to buying locally. This is an important shift because it generates mutual benefits for involved stakeholder groups. While this strategy allows for poverty reduction, it also ensures tourists would benefit from eating healthy, tasty and safe food. Tour operators themselves would benefit through reduced costs of transportation and other logistics, while gaining a more positive reputation from the tourists as they can advertise practicing fair trade.

The question that remains unaddressed is that of *how* to organize the supply system. Sourcing directly from producer groups would mean eliminating the middlemen. Should the elimination process include even big intermediary actors such as TAHA's proposed wholesale company? Should the response be no, the implication would be replacing multiple middlemen with a giant one, an idea that might appeal to tour operators; given the potential ability the company would have to guarantee their requirements. However, farmer groups might reject this idea on the grounds that the farmers should search for their own markets and sell directly to their clients.

While the need to address both the supply side and demand side problems remains salient, the issue of organizing the actual linkages, i.e. the distribution system, warrants further discussion and research. Perhaps diversifying the capacity of existing producer groups, for instance by creating region-wide farmers' networks, could be an ideal alternative. This requires massive co-operation and information sharing among all involved stakeholders. The process might start with combining efforts at district level to regional level. This idea, though hard to accomplish, seems one of the options that would overcome the dependency on middlemen.

6.3 Recommendations

6.3.1 Avenues for Further Research

As highlighted in the research design, the fieldwork was conducted within a resource scarce environment, coupled with time limitation. Given the time and resources, an in-depth study addressing similar questions can be useful in broadening the understanding of these issues and building a stronger worldview about the emerging issues. Within the SENAPA region, future studies should focus more on the actual capacity of the local supply system. Critical analysis of the supply side characteristics such as soil conditions and feasibility of an irrigation system is imperative for building the evidence to back up the shift to local sourcing. In addition, review of initiatives that are already linked to SENAPA, such as Balimi and Machochwe networks, would be recommended. Conducting studies with the same objective in the whole country would also be ideal. This could start with other big wildlife tourist destinations such as Mikumi, Ngorongoro and Manyara. A countrywide comparative study would present meaningful evidence that would allow taking sides between optimistic and pessimistic accounts of PPT theory. In the suggested future studies, a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research techniques would be useful, as it

would allow for assessing numerical parameters such as cost-benefit analysis of the business interventions.

Other related research in the future might focus on food supply in general, not just on horticulture. Studying the supply patterns of other products such as dry goods and liquor, as well as staple food such as banana, rice and potatoes would be useful in building the broader picture. For specific studies, it would be interesting to assess pastoralist-based linkages since Mara region is reputable for high concentration of cattle in Tanzania as a whole. Given that Mara farmers are already familiar with cattle, it would be especially interesting to hear tour operators' perspectives about milk and beef sourcing. Responses to the suggested sourcing patterns, compared with findings of this thesis, can help us understand more about the real factors surrounding local supply of goods and services to their respective tourist destinations.

6.3.2 Suggestions for the Way Forward

The supply side constraints and responses from tour operators call for a consortium of actors who would address the emerging problems. The findings demonstrate the need for education and technical assistance to farmers; for financial support; for communication and information sharing; for changing mindsets; as well as for more research on the area. Noteworthy is the consensus from the interviewees that these proposals should not be implemented in isolation from one another. Thus, seeking collaborations and partnerships is crucially important.

Education and Technical Assistance

Building social enterprise should be an integral part of the process. Education and training to farmers would allow for proper management of both on-farm and group level operations. Clearly, the introduction of new crops and contract-based production and marketing systems requires

adoption of new skills and technologies. To note, education to smallholder farmers should be highly informal. It should be given through farm visits or other practical learning mechanisms rather than class-based settings, given that most participants are adults, who have many family priorities. Overall, educational support and technical assistance in the form of the following will be useful: leadership and entrepreneurial skills, exchanging visits, field follow-up, input supply instruction, Good Agricultural Practice (GAP), post-harvest handling, financial management and mindset changing.

Financial and Infrastructural Support

In addition to education, financial support is very important since most smallholder farmers are hindered by lack of capital. One of the suggestions is to search for interested donors or other funding agencies such as micro-finance institutions to invest in assets such as cold rooms, irrigation schemes and trucks. Improving existing roads to facilitate transportation is needed. However, this should be strategically adopted to avoid distracting nature and disturbing wild animals.

Collaboration amongst Stakeholders

The need for collaborations and partnerships is clear from the findings of this research. To note, initiating collaboration between individual farmers or among farmer groups may be a difficult task. Diversities such as those of place, position, motivation, concerns, beliefs and priorities have to be assessed. The grassroots characteristics such as geography and perceptions from the actors are very important factors to take into account. Since physical characteristics such as distance from the park or from water sources influence the capacity of the localized supply system, the goal should be to identify such characteristics and try to assist the groups in accordance with their status. In the process of building collaborations, establishing harmonious relationships and

trust building amongst stakeholders should be an integral part of the process. This would require continual dialogue and information sharing mechanisms to strengthen the relationships.

6.4 Concluding remarks

Adopting business-based interventions is a widely recognized response to poverty alleviation in general and for tourism-based poverty reduction strategies in particular. This thesis shows that this shift means different things to different stakeholder groups. While the logic of the proposal remains intact, the immensity of the implementation task problematizes its feasibility. While the theory raises optimism, on-the-ground issues generate pessimistic accounts that may lead to consideration for abandoning the theory. This thesis weighed both accounts and concludes that the theory should be modified to include the lessons from the case study findings. While recognizing the immensity of the task inherent in the transition process, this thesis concludes that overall, given the time and resources, it is possible for local-based horticultural supply linkages to succeed in the SENAPA area as long as competent and committed stakeholders help see the transition through.

Bibliography

- Adams, W.M., & Infield, M. (2003). Who is on the gorilla's payroll? Claims on tourist revenue from a Ugandan national park. *World Development*, 31 (1), 177-190.
- Adhikari, D. (2011). Can Nepal Sell Itself as a Gay-Wedding Destination? *Time World*, Retrieved August 1, 2011, from <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2083711,00.html>
- AfriVeg. (2007). Overview of the vegetable sector in Tanzania (Report 1). Arusha, Tanzania.
- Agricultural Council of Tanzania. (2007). *History of agriculture*. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.actanzania.org/index.php?Itemid=19&id=17&option=com_content&task=view
- Akama, J. S. (1996). Western environmental values and nature-based tourism in Kenya. *Tourism Management*, 17 (8), 567-574
- Ankunda, J. (2011). *World Bank in campaign to save Serengeti migration*. Retrieved May 10, 2011, from <http://www.africatoursandsafaris.com/blog/2011/03/04/world-bank-in-campaign-to-save-serengeti-migration/>
- Ashely, C., Charlotte, B., & Goodwin, H. (2000). *Pro-poor tourism: Putting poverty at the heart of tourism agenda*. Natural resources perspectives, 51 London: ODI. Retrieved February 10, 2011, from <http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/51.pdf>
- Ashley, C & Dilys, R. (2002). Making tourism work for the poor. Strategies and challenges in Southern Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 19 (1), 61-82.
- Ashley, C., Meyer, D., Roe, D., & Goodwin, H. (2004). *Pro-poor tourism in PRSPs*. Retrieved November 2010, 12, from www.propoortourism.org.uk/info_sheets/9%20info%20sheet.pdf
- Ashley, C., & Haysom G., (2005). From philanthropy to different ways of doing business: Strategies and challenges in integrating pro-poor approaches into tourism business. *Development Southern Africa*, 23 (2), 265-280.
- Ashley, C. (2006). *How can governments boost the local economic impacts of tourism? Options and tools*. The Hague, Overseas Development Institute and SNV. Retrieved October 21, 2010, from <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/40.pdf>.
- Ashley, C., Brine, P., Lehr, A. & Wilde H., (2007). *The role of the tourism sector in expanding economic opportunity*, Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative Report No. 23, Cambridge: Harvard University.

Ashley, C., & Goodwin, H. (2007). *Pro-poor tourism: What's gone right and what's gone wrong?* Opinion 80. Retrieved December 10, 2010, from http://www.odi.org.uk/publications/opinions/80_propoortourismJune07.pdf.

Ashley, C. & Mitchell, J. (2005). *Can tourism accelerate pro-poor growth in Africa?* (ODI Report, November 2005). London: UK

Ashley, C., & Mitchell, J. (2010). *How can tourism lead to poverty reduction?* Retrieved May 15, 2010, from <http://www.odi.org.uk/events/audio-video.asp?id=2115&title=can-tourism-lead-poverty-reduction>

Ayitey, G. B. N. (2003). Why structural adjustment failed in Africa. In Baffoe-Bonnie, J & Khayum, M. (eds) *Contemporary Economic Issues in Developing Countries*. Westport: Praeger

Babu, A., Meerendonk, H., Maganga, C. (2007). *Linking Mara Fruits and Vegetable Growers to Serengeti National Park Tourist Hotels Market* (Conference proceedings 353-357). Retrieved February 12, 2011 from: <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/52145/2/Babu.pdf>

Barham, J., Clarence, C. (2009). Collective action initiatives to improve marketing performance: Lessons from farmer groups in Tanzania. *Food Policy*. 34 (2), 53-59.

Bebbington, A. (1997). Social capital and rural intensification: Local organizations and Islands of sustainability in the Rural Andes. *The Geographical Journal*, 163 (2), 189-197.

Beeton, S. (2006). *Community development through tourism*. Collingwood: Landlinks Press.

Bélisle, F. J. (1983). Tourism and food production in the Caribbean. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10, 497–513.

Bélisle, F. J. (1984). Tourism and food imports: the case of Jamaica. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 32, 819–42.

Bennett, O., Dilys, R., & Ashley, C. (1999). *Sustainable tourism and poverty elimination* (Report) DFID, UK: Deloitte and Touche, IIED and ODI. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/dfid_report.pdf

Berry, R. S. (1999). *Collecting data by in-depth interviewing* (Conference Paper). British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Sussex at Brighton, September 1999.

Boomgard, J. J. Davies, P. S. & Haggblade, S. & Mead, D. C. (1986). *Subsector analysis: Its nature, conduct and potential contribution to small enterprise development* (Working Paper 26), MSU International Development Papers, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan States University, USA.

- Britton, S. (1982.) The political economy of tourism in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9 (3) 331-358.
- Brohman, J. (1996). New directions in tourism for third world development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (1), 48-70.
- Brown, F., Derek, H. (2008). Tourism and development in the global south: the issues. *Third World Quarterly*, 29 (5) 839-849.
- Bryden, J. M. (1973). *Tourism and development: A case study of the Commonwealth Caribbean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, R.W. (1980).The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*, 1 (24), 51-2.
- Charnley, S. (2005). From nature tourism to ecotourism? The case of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania. *Human Organization*, 64 (1), 75-85.
- Chok, S., Jim M., & Carol, W. (2007). Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of 'pro-poor tourism' and implications for sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (3) 144-165.
- CIA. (2009). World Factbook, Tanzania. Retrieved October 12, 2010, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tz.html>
- Collier, P. (2007). *The Bottom Billion: Why the poorest are failing and what can be done about it*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Community Outreach Programme. (2011). *Tourism and community development*. (Workshop) Nata Secondary School, Serengeti: Tanzania.
- Cooksey, B. (2010). *Can aid agencies really help combat corruption? An overview of donor policies and practices in East Africa* (Conference paper). Lisbon: III ANCORAGE-NET Biannual Meeting Protecting Aid Funds in Unstable Governance Environments: Towards an Integrated Strategy, presented, 18–19 May.
- Cox, L. J., Fox, M., & Bowen, R. L. (1995). Does tourism destroy agriculture? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22 (1), 210-213.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.). SAGE publications, Inc.
- Curry, S. (1990). Tourism development in Tanzania. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 17 (1), 133-149

De Kadt, E. (1979). *Tourism: passport to development: Perspectives on the social and cultural effects of tourism in developing countries*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Deloitte & Touche, International Institute for Environment and Development, & the Overseas Development Institute. (1999). *Sustainable tourism and poverty elimination study*: A report to the Department for International Development. Retrieved November 2, 2010, from http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/dfid_report.pdf.

Dennis, R. (1996). Elite interviewing: Approaches and pitfalls. *Politics*, 16 (3) 199-203.

Desai, V., & Potter, R. (2006). *Doing development research*. London: Sage publications inc.

Dieke, P. U. C. (Ed.). (2000). *The political economy of tourism development in Africa*. Elmsford: Cognizant

Dixey, L. (2008). The Unsustainability of community tourism donor projects: lessons from Zambia . In Spenceley, A., *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development* (323-341). London: Earthscan.

Dolan, C. S., and Sorby, K. (2003), *Gender and employment in high-value agriculture industries*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Easterly, W. (2006). *The white man's burden: Why the west's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*, New York: Penguin Press.

Economic and Social Research Foundation. (2003). *Understanding economic and political reforms in Tanzania*. Retrieved December 31, 2010, from http://depot.gdnet.org/cms/grp/general/Tanzania_proposal.pdf

Economy Watch. (2010). *Tanzania economic statistics*. Retrieved, July 3, 2011 from <http://www.economywatch.com/economic-statistic/tanzania/population/>

ECPAT. (n.d). *Child sex tourism: Sun, sand and sexual exploitation*. Retrieved, July 14, 2011, from <http://www.jubileeeaction.co.uk/reports/GA%20THAILAND%20briefing.pdf>

Eckstein, H. (1975). Case Study and theory in political science. In Greenstein, F. & Polsby, N. (eds), *Handbook of Political Science*. (7:79-137), Carlifonia: Addison-Wensley Publishing Company.

Escola, E. (2006). *Agricultural marketing and supply chain management in Tanzania: a case study*. Working paper, series no. 6, ESRF study on globalization and East African economies.

Evans, P. (1996). Government action, social capital and development: Reviewing the evidence on synergy. *World Development*, 24 (6), 1119-1132

FAO. (2010). *Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) on horticultural production for extension staff in Tanzania*. Retrieved January 30, 2011, from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1645e/i1645e00.pdf>

Foreign and Commonwealth Office. (2009). *Country Profile on Tanzania*. Retrieved January 12, 2011, from <http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/travel-advice-by-country/country-profile/sub-saharan-africa/tanzania?profile=geography>

Gabre-Madhin, E. Z., and Haggblade, S. (2003). Successes in African agriculture. In WEnt, IFPRI, NEPAD, CTA conference. Pretoria, South Africa.

Gerosa, V. (2003). *Pro poor growth strategies in Africa*. Retrieved March 15, 2011, from http://www.uneca.org/docs/Meetings_Events/ESPD/PoorGROWTH/Tourism%20&%20Poverty%20DEFINITIVE%20VERSION.pdf

Gerosa, V. (2003). *Pro Poor Growth Strategies in Africa*. Retrieved March 15, 2010, from www.uneca.org/.../Meetings.../poorgrowth/Annotated%20AgendaASEARevised%20for%20pdf%20final.pdf

Gerring J. (2007). Is there a (viable) crucial-case method? *Comparative Political Studies*. 40(3) 231-253

Gibbon, P. (2003). Value-chain governance, public regulation and entry barriers in the global fresh fruit and vegetable chain into the EU, *Development Policy Review*, 21(5-6), 615-625

Gibbon, P. (2001). Cooperative cotton marketing, liberalization and “civil society” in Tanzania. *Journal of Agrarian Change*. 1 (3), 389-439

Goodman, R. (2002). Pastoral livelihoods in Tanzania: Can the Maasai benefit from Conservation?. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 5 (3), 280-286

Goodwin, H. (1998). Sustainable tourism and poverty elimination, (Discussion Paper), the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions and the Department for International Development. London: UK Retrieved, June 20, 2011, from <http://www.haroldgoodwin.info/resources/dfidpaper.pdf>

Goodwin, H. (2008). Tourism, local economic development, and poverty reduction. *Applied Research in Economic Development*, 5 (3), 55-64.

Goodwin, H. (2008). Pro-poor Tourism: a response. *Third World Quarterly*, 29(5), 869-871

Goodwin, H. (2000). Pro-poor tourism: Opportunities for sustainable local development. *Development and Cooperation*. Retrieved October 10, 2010, from <http://www.inwent.org/E+Z/1997-2002/de500-3.htm>

Goodwin, H. (2008). Pro-poor tourism: a response. *Third World Quarterly*, 29(5), 869-871.

Goodwin, H. (2009), Reflections on 10 years of Pro Poor Tourism, *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 1 (1), 90-94.

Goodwin, H. (2005). *Pro-poor tourism principles, methodologies and mainstreaming*. International conference, university technology Malaysia 4-6 May

Goodwin, H. (2008). Tourism, local economic development, and poverty reduction. *Applied Research in Economic Development*, 5 (3), 55-64.

Gray, D. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Green, R. H., D. G. Rwegasira, & Van Arkadie, B. (1980). *Economic Shocks and National Policy Making: Tanzania in the 1970s*, Institute of Social Studies, Research Report No. 8, The Hague

GTZ. (2010). *Tourism in detail*. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from <http://www.gtz.de/en/themen/uebergreifende-themen/11013.htm>

Guerrier, Y. (n.d). In-depth interviewing techniques. (webcast) Retrieved November 10, 2010, from <http://www.blc.lsbu.ac.uk/aa/aa/Multimedia/In-Depth%20Interviewing%20Techniques/player.html>

Gulati, A., Minot, N., Delgado, C. & Bora, S. (2007), *Growth in high value agriculture in Asia and the emergence of vertical links with farmers*, In Swinnen J. F. M. (ed), *Global supply chains, standards and the poor: How the globalization of food systems and standards affects rural development and poverty*, CAB International, Oxford, UK

Hakim, C. (1987). *Research design: Strategies and choices in the design of social research*. London: Allen and Unwin Publishers Ltd.

Hall, Michael C. 2007. Pro-poor tourism: Do tourism exchanges benefit primarily the countries of the South? *Current Issues in Tourism*. 10 (2&3), 111-118.

Harrison, D. (2008). Pro-poor tourism: a critique. *Third World Quarterly*, 29 (5), 851-868.

Harrison, D. (1997). *Tourism and the less developed countries*. England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Harrison, D., & Schipani, S. (2007). Lao tourism and poverty alleviation: Community-based tourism and the private sector. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 10(2&3): 194-230

Hawkins, D. & Mann, S. (2007). The World Bank's role in tourism development . *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34 (2), 348-363.

Hayam, Y. (2003). From the Washington consensus to the post -Washington consensus: Retrospect and prospect. *Asian Development Bank Review*. 20 (2), 40-65.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008). Justice tourism and alternative globalisation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 16 (3), 345-364

Holden, A. (2005). *Tourism studies and the social sciences*. London, UK: Routledge.

Holden, A. (2008). *Environment and tourism*, London, UK: Routledge

Holtzman, J. S. (2002). *Using subsector analysis to assess the impact of policy reform on commodity subsectors*. Abt. Association Inc., Report for Ministry of Agriculture, Egypt.

Horticulture Development Council of Tanzania. (n.d). *National Horticulture Strategy(Draft)*, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

IMF. (2010). *Factsheet PRSP*. Retrieved May 30, 2010, from <http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/prsp.htm>

Inter Business Direction Inc. (2010). Mapping tourism dollar: The case study of western Serengeti. (Survey Report), Mara, Tanzania.

Jefferson, O. (n.d). *Some economic aspects of tourism in Caribbean tourism: The economic impact of Tourism*. Christ Church: Caribbean Tourism Research Center.

Jenkins, S. (2010). Forecasting international tourism in Malaysia. *South Asian Journal of tourism and Heriatage*, 3 (2), 50-60

Kahyarara, G., & Mchallo, I. (2008). *The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of Tourism Development in the Northern tourist circuit of Tanzania*. International Association for Impact Assessment, Centre for Environmental Economics and Development Research. Retrieved January, 31, 2011, from <http://www3.webng.com/jerbarker/home/cia/toolkit/downloads/grants/IATanzania.pdf>.

Kaltenborn, B. P., Nyahongo, J. W., Kidegesho, J. R. & Haaland, H. (2008). Serengeti national park and its neighbours – Do they interact? *Journal for Nature Conservation*. 16, 96-108

Kay, C. & Urioste, M. (2005), *Bolivia's unfinished Agrarian reform: Rural poverty and development policies*, ISS/UNDP land. Poverty and public action policy paper no. 3, Institute of Social Studies (ISS), The Hague, The Netherlands

Key, N., & Runsten, D. (1999), Contract farming, smallholders, and rural development in Latin America: The Organization of Agroprocessing Firms and the Scale of Outgrower Production, *World Development*, 27 (2), 381-401.

Khan, M. (1997). Tourism development and dependency theory: Mass tourism vs. ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (4), 988-991.

Kumar, N. & Nelson, R. (2007). *Agriculture sector management*. (Report no. 40109), Sector, Global and Thematic Evaluation Division, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank.

Kweka, J., Morrissey, O., & Blake, A. (2003). The economic potential of tourism in Tanzania. *Journal of International Development*. 15 (1), 335–351

Lea J., (1988). *Conceptualizing Tourism Place in Development*. New York: Routledge.

Locke, R. M. (2003). *Note on corporate citizenship in a global economy*. Sloan School of Management and Department of Political Science, MIT. Retrieved on July, 23, 2010, from <http://mitsloan.mit.edu/50th/pdf/corpcitizenship.pdf>

Luvanga, N. and Shitundu, J. (2003). *The role of tourism in poverty alleviation in Tanzania*. (Report No. 03.4), REPOA, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Lynch, K. (1999). Commercial horticulture in rural Tanzania - an analysis of key influences. *Geoforum*, 30 (2), 171-183

Mafuru, J. M., Babu, A., & Matutu, T. F. (2007). *The impact of market links on horticultural production in the Mara Region, Tanzania: Recovering markets innovative practice series*, London, UK: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Magimbi, S. (2010). *Cooperatives in Tanzania Mainland: Review and growth*. (Working paper no 14). International Labour Organization (ILO), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Mamadi, M. (2004). *A critical analysis of the effects of tourism on cultural representation: A case study from Leboeng*. Dissertation, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Manheim, J.B., Rich, R.C., Willnat, L. & Brians, C.L. (2008). *Empirical political analysis: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*. Toronto: Pearson Longman.

Mann, S. (2005). *Development through Tourism. The World Bank's role 1966 - 2005*. Washington: Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency.

Mara Regional Administration (2005, 22 December). Regional investment profile for Mara Region. Retrieved January 11, 2011, from <http://www.tanzaniagateway.org/docs/Mararegionalinvestmentprofile.pdf>

Markelova, H., Meinzen-Dick R., Hellin J., & Dohrn S. (2009). Collective action for small holder market access. *Food Policy*, 34 (1), 1-7.

Meyer, D. (2008). Pro-Poor Tourism: From leakages to linkages. A conceptual framework for creating linkages between the accommodation sector and 'poor' neighbouring communities. *Current issues in tourism*, 10 (6), 558-583.

Meyer, D. (2009). Pro-poor Tourism: Is there actually much rhetoric? And, if so, whose?, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 34 (2), 197-199.

Milne, S., & Ateljevic, I. (2001). Tourism, economic development and the global–local nexus: Theory embracing complexity. *Tourism Geographies*. 3 (4), 369–393

Ministry of Agriculture and food Security, Tanzania. (2002). *Basic Data Agriculture sector*. Dar es salaam: Tanzania.

Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, Tanzania. (1999). *National tourism policy*, Retrieved February 12, 2011, from <http://www.tanzania.go.tz/pdf/Tourismpolicy.pdf>

Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources, Tanzania. (2009). *The tourism Statistical Bulletin*, Dar es salaam, Tanzania.

Minot, N & Ngigi, M. (2003). *Are horticultural exports a replicable success story? Evidence from Kenya and Cote d'Ivoire*. (Conference paper no 7). INWENT, IFRI, NEPAD & CTA.

Mitchell, J. and Ashley, C. (2007), *Can tourism offer pro poor pathways to prosperity?*, (Briefing Paper No. 22). Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London, UK.

Mitchell J. and Faal J. (2007), Holiday package tourism and the poor in the Gambia, *Development Southern Africa*, 24 (3), 445-464.

Mitchell, J. & Ashley, C. (2009), *Value chain analysis and poverty reduction at scale*, (Briefing Paper No. 49), Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London, UK.

Mitchell, J., and Ashley, C. (2010). *Tourism and poverty reduction - pathways to prosperity*. London: Earthscan.

Mitchell, J., and Muckosy, P. (2008). *A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America*. Retrieved May 31, 2011, from www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1012.pdf

Momsen, J. H. (1998), Caribbean tourism and agriculture: New linkages in the global era? in Klak T. (ed.), *Globalization and neoliberalism: The Caribbean context*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield

Momsen, J. H. (1999). A sustainable tourism project in Mexico. In Hammati, M. (ed.), *Gender and tourism: Women employment and participation in tourism*. London: UNED-UK, 142-48.

Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2003). *Tourism and sustainability: Development and new tourism in the Third World* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2009). *Tourism and sustainability - development, globalisation and new tourism in the Third World*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead Aid; Why aid is not working and how there is another way for Africa*. London: Penguin.
- Muganda, M., Mondher S. & Karen A. S. (2010). Tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation: A community perspective from Tanzania. *Development Southern Africa*, 27 (5), 629-646
- Neuman, L. W. (2004). *Basics of social research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Nishwitz, J. (2009). *Sustainable horticultural crop production in Tanzania*. Dept. of Horticultural Science, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, USA
- OECD. (2010a). *Glossary of statistical terms*. Retrieved March 11, 2011, from [ww.oecd.org: http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/search.asp](http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/search.asp)
- OECD. (2010b). *Creditor reporting system*. Retrieved March 12, 2010, from [www.oecd.stats.org: http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=CRSNEW](http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=CRSNEW)
- Okech, R. N (2010). Tourism development in Africa: Focus on poverty alleviation: *The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research*, 1(1), Retrieved May 24, 2011, from <http://www.icptr.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Tourism-Development-in-Africa.pdf>
- Okello M. M. & Yerian S. (2009). *Tourist satisfaction in relation to attractions and implications for conservation in the protected areas of the Northern Circuit, Tanzania*, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17 (5), 605–625
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (third edition). USA: SAGE Publishers Inc.
- Pattullo, P. (1996). *Last Resorts: The cost of tourism in the Caribbean*, London: Latin America Bureau and Kingston: Ian Randle
- Pingali, P.L. (1997). From subsistence to commercial production systems: The transformation of Asian agriculture: *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 79, (628–34)
- Pingali P., Khwaja Y., & Meijer M. (2005). *Commercializing Small Farms: Reducing transaction costs*, (ESA Working Paper no. 0508), Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
- Porter, M. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York: Free Press

Posthumus, H. (2007). Can value- chain development create rural employment and alleviate poverty? *Enterprise Development and Microfinance*, 18 (3), 67-89

PPTP. (2004a). *Defining pro-poor tourism*. (PPT info_sheet, no 1) Retrieved November 24, 2010, from <http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/info.sheets/1%20infosheet.pdf>

PPTP. (2004b). *Tourism and poverty reduction-making the links*. (Pro-poor tourism info-sheet, no 3) Retrieved June 30, 2010, from http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/info_sheets/3%20infosheet.

PPTP & Overseas Development Institute (n.d). *Review of the Impacts of Previous Pro-Poor Tourism Research* (Working Paper No. 9). Retrieved December 13, 2010, from http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/9_impacts.pdf.

PPTP. (2001). *Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making tourism work for the poor*. A review of experience. Retrieved May, 10, 2011, from [www.propoortourism.org.uk: http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/ppt_pubs_outputs.html](http://www.propoortourism.org.uk:www.propoortourism.org.uk/ppt_pubs_outputs.html)

PPTP. (2005). *Annual register pro poor tourism partnership*. London: PPTP

Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital", *Journal of Democracy*, 6 (1).

Ravallion, M. (2004). *Pro-poor Growth: A Primer. Policy Research*. (Working Paper Series 3242). Washington: The World Bank.

Regional reporter. (2007, April 4). Horticultural activities impress EU Head, *The Guardian*

Rist, G. (2008) *The history of development: From Western origins to global faith*, (3rd edition) London: Zed Books

Roe, D, & Urquhart, P. (2001). *Pro-poor tourism: Harnessing the world's largest industry for the world's poor*. (Opinion Paper for World Summit on Sustainable Development) London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

REST. (2004). *Community -based tourism: Principles and meaning*. Retrieved June 01, 2011, from www.mekongtourism.org/site/uploads/media/cbt_manual_1_.pdf

Roe, D., Harris, C & de Andrade, J. (2003). *Addressing poverty issues in tourism standards: A review of experience*. (PPT Working Paper No. 14). Retrieved October 30, 2010, from http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/14_Standards.pdf.

Roe, D., Ashley, C., Page, S. & Meyer, D. (2004). *Tourism and the poor: Analysing and interpreting tourism statistics from a poverty perspective*. (PPT Working Paper No. 16).

Retrieved January 10, 2011 from http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/16_stats.pdf.

Roe, D. (2006). How pro-poor is tourism? New practices can reduce poverty. *Insights Communicating development research* 62 (June), 1-6. University of Sussex, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Retrieved September 30, 2010, from <http://www.id21.org/insights/insights62/index.html>.

Rogerson, C.M. (2006). Pro-poor local economic development in South Africa: The role of pro-poor tourism. *Local Environment*, 11 (1), 53-64.

Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, (2010). *Sourcing fresh fruits and vegetables from smallholder farmers in Serengeti: (The Business Partnership Plan, Draft 02)*, Arusha, Tanzania.

Rutasitara, L. (2005). *Economic policy and rural poverty in Tanzania: a survey of three regions*. REPOA publication inc: Dar es salaam, Tanzania

Sandbrook, C. G. (2008). Putting leakage in its place: The significance of retained tourism revenue in the local context in rural Uganda”, *Journal of International Development*, Published online: DOI: 10.1002/jid.1507

Saville, N.M. (2001). Practical strategies for propoor tourism: case study of pro-poor tourism and SNV in Humla district. (Working Paper no. 3 on pro poor tourism), West Nepal: CRT, IIED, and ODI, UK.

Sawkar, K., Noronha, L., Mascarenhas, A., Chauhan, O. S., & Saeed, S. (1998). *Tourism and the environment: Case studies on Goa, India and the Maldives*. Washington, DC The Economic Development Institute of World Bank.

Scheyvens, R. (2001). *Poverty tourism development bulletin*. 55 (July), 18-21.

Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism poverty nexus”, in Hall, M.C. (ed.), *Pro-poor tourism: Who benefits?: Perspectives on tourism and poverty reduction*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications

Scheyvens, R., & Momsen, J. H. (2008). Tourism and poverty reduction: Issues for small Island States. *Tourism Geographies*, 10 (1), 22-41.

Schilcher, D. (2007). Growth versus equity: The continuum of pro-poor tourism and neoliberal governance. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2), 166-193

Serengeti Development Research and Environmental Conservation Centre. (2009). *Serengeti tourism enterprises mapping and benefit sharing survey*. SEDEREC: Mara, Tanzania.

Shah, K. and Gupta, V. (2000). *Tourism, the poor and other Stakeholders: Experience in Asia*. London: Overseas Development Institute, UK.

Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. (2002). *Tourism and development: concepts and issues* . Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Sharpley, R. (2007). Tourism in Gambia – ten years on. In Tribe, J. & Airey, D.W. (eds.). *Developments in tourism research*. Oxford: Elsevier Science

Shepherd, A.W. (2007). *Approaches to linking producers to markets: A review of experiences to Date: Agricultural management, marketing and finance*. (Occasional Paper 13). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

SNV Lake Zone. (2009). *How can tourism benefit the poor*. (Survey Report). Mwanza: Tanzania.

SNV. (2009). *Rural development fail to profit lucrative wildlife tourism*. Retrieved October 30, 2010, from http://www.tnrf.org/files/E-INFO-SNV_Serengeti_briefing_2009.pdf

Sokoni, C.H. (2008). Commercialisation of smallholder production in Tanzania: implications for sustainable resources management. *Geographical Journal*, 174 (2), 149-175

Salazar, N. B. (2009). A troubled past, a challenging present and a promising future: Tanzania's tourism development in perspective. *Tourism Review International*, 12 (3-4), 259-273.

Spenceley, A. (2008). *Responsible Tourism: Critical issues for Conservation and Development*. London, UK: Earthscan

ST-EP Foundation . (n.d.). *ST-EP Programme*. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from www.unwto.org/step/pub/en/pub.php

Stevens, C. & Kennan, J. (1999). *Will Africa's participation in horticultural chains survive liberalization?*(IDS Working paper no 106). Sussex, UK: Institute of Development studies.

Tanzania Development Research Group.(2008). *Tanzanian cashew situation analysis*. Dar es Salaam: Mimeo.

Tanzania Horticulture Association. (2009a). *Narrative Report Year 2008-09*. Arusha: Tanzania.

Tanzania Horticulture Association. (2009b). *Report on the impact of withdrawing tax exemptions on the deemed capital goods for the horticultural industry*. Arusha: Tanzania.

Tanzania Horticulture Association (2009c). *How the world economic crisis has impacted on the horticultural Industry in Tanzania*. Arusha: Tanzania

Tanzania Horticultural Association. (2011). *Linking local horticulture to the Serengeti tourism market: Opportunities, constraints and proposals analysis*. (Field Report). Arusha: Tanzania.

Tanzania National Business Council. (2009). *Kilimo Kwanza* (Paper Final Report). Dar es Salaam: Tanzania.

Tanzania National Parks Authority. (2009). *Visitor statistics* (Annual report), TANAPA, Arusha, Tanzania.

Telfer, D., & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and development in the developing world*, New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Telfer, D.J. & Wall, G. (1996). Linkages between tourism and food production. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 23 (3), 635-53.

Telfer D.J. and Wall G. (2000), "Strengthening backward economic linkages: local food purchasing by three Indonesian hotels", *Tourism Geographies*. 2(4), 421-47

Telfer, D. and Sharpley, R. (2008) *Tourism and development in the developing world*, London: Routledge

Temu, A.E., Minjas, A. N & Paul, J. L (1991). *Horticulture in the farming systems Of Mgeta villages*. Acta Hort. (ISHS) 270:83-90). Morogoro: Tanzania. Retrieved July 10, 2011, from http://www.actahort.org/books/270/270_9.htm

TIES. (2006). *Global ecotourism fact sheet* . Retrieved June 8, 2011 from www.ecotourism.org/.../TIES%20GLOBAL%20ECOTOURISM%20FACT%20SHEET.PDF

Torgerson, R. (2001). A critical look at new-generation cooperatives. *Rural Cooperatives* 68(2), 15-19.

Torres, R. (2003). Linkages between tourism and agriculture in Mexico. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30 (3), 546-566

Torres, R. (2002). Cancun's tourism development from a Fordist spectrum of analysis. *Tourist Studies*, 2 (1), 87-116

Torres, R. & Momsen, J.H. (2004). Challenges and potentials for linking tourism and agriculture to achieve pro-poor tourism objectives. *Progress in Development Studies*, 4 (4), 294-318

Torres R. & Momsen J.H. (2005). Planned tourism development in Quintana Roo, Mexico: Engine for Regional development or prescription for inequitable growth. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8 (4), 259–285.

Truman, H. (1949). *Truman's inaugural address, Jan 20, 1949*. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inaugural/20jan1949html.

Tschrley, D & Mwendo, K. M. (2004). *Horticulture research and input sector reputation in Kenya and Tanzania*. (working paper). Tegemeo Institute of Agricultural policy and development. Edgerton University: Nairobi, Kenya.

Uddhammar, E. (2006). Development, conservation and tourism: conflict or symbiosis?. *Review of International Political Economy*, 13 (4), 656-678

UN (2009). *Rethinking Poverty*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York: United Nations

UNCTAD. (2001). *Tourism and development in the Least Developed Countries*. (Third UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries). Las Palmas: Canary Islands

UNDP. (2010). *Basics Facts about the MDG*. Retrieved June 1, 2011, from [www.undp.org: http://www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml](http://www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml)

UNEP. (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*. Retrieved June 1, 2011, from [www.unep.org: http://www.unep.org/Documents/Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=78&ArticleID=1163](http://www.unep.org/Documents/Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=78&ArticleID=1163)

UNEP. (2006). *Wildlife watching and tourism: A study on the benefits and risks of a fast growing tourism activity and impacts on species*. (Survey report) UNEP.

UNESCAP. (2003). *Poverty alleviation through sustainable tourism development*. (Research report) New York: United Nations. Retrieved May 23, 2011, from http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TPTS_pubs/Pub_2265/pub_2265_fulltext.pdf

UNESCO. (2006). *Tourism, culture and sustainable development*. Paris: Societe Edition Provence, Nîmes.

United Nations (2010) *United Nations Millennium Development Goals*. Retrieved June 30, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml>

United Nations Millennium Project. (2006). *About MDGs: What they are*. UN Development Group. Retrieved, June 25 2011, from : <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/goals/index.htm>.

UNICEF (n.d). *Sexual exploitation*. Retrieved, June 1, 2011 from http://www.unicef.org/protection/index_exploitation.html.

UNWTO. (n.d.). ST-EP PROGRAMME. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from [www.unwto.org: http://www.unwto.org/step/pub/en/pub.php](http://www.unwto.org/step/pub/en/pub.php)

UNWTO. (2002). *Tourism and poverty alleviation* . Madrid: UNWTO.

UNWTO. (2004). *Sustainable development of tourism*. (Mission Statement). Retrieved June 18, 2011, from [www.unwto.org: http://www.unwto.org/sdt/mission/en/mission.php](http://www.unwto.org/sdt/mission/en/mission.php)

UNWTO. (2006). *Poverty alleviation through tourism: A compilation of good practices*. Madrid: World Tourism Organisation.

UNWTO. (2008). *Annual Report of the World Tourism Organization on Development Assistance Activities*. Madrid: UNWTO

USAID. (2007). *A rapid assessment of the horticulture vegetable sector in Indonesia*. (Research Report) Indonesia: Developemnt alternative, inc

Van der Duim, R. (2008). Exploring pro-poor tourism research: The state of the art, In: de Haan, H. & Van der Duim, R., *Landscape, Leisure and Tourism* (179-196), Delft

Weinberger, K. & Lumpkin, T.A. (2005). *Horticulture for poverty alleviaition: the unfunded revolution*. (AVRDC working paper. Series no. 15). Taiwan: the world Vegetable Centre.

Weibing, Z., & Brent, R. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3), 119-143.

Wilde, H. (2007). *The Role of the tourism sector in expanding economic opportunity*, corporate social responsibility initiative (Report No. 23) Cambridge: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Williams, S. (2004). *Tourism, development and sustainability: Critical concepts in social scienaces*. London, UK: Routledge.

Wolter, D. (2008). Tanzania: *The Challenge of Moving from Subsistence to Profitable business for development*. OECD/DAC Development Centre. Retrieved July 2, 2011, from www.oecd.org/dev/publications/businessfordevelopment

World Bank. (2000). *World development report 2000/2001: Attacking poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (2001). *Credit Immobilier et Hotelier Project*. Retrieved May 27, 2011, from <http://web.worldbank.org/external/projects/main?pagePK=64283627&piPK=73230&theSitePK=40941&menuPK=228424&Projectid=P005373>

World Bank. (n.d). *Work for a world free of poverty in Tanzania*. Retrieved March 10, 2011, from <http://data.worldbank.org/country/tanzania>

World Bank Group/NIGA. (2005). *Attracting investment in tourism*. Washington, USA: The World Bank Group/MIGA

WTO. (1996). *Sustainable tourism – Turning the tide*. Retrieved July 3, 2011, from <http://www.earthsummit2002.org/es/issues/tourism/tourism.pdf>

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (2nd ed Vol. 5) Applied social science research methods series. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (3rd ed, Volume 5 of Applied social science research methods series). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Yunis, E. (2004) Sustainable tourism and poverty alleviation. (Presentation for World Bank-ABCDE Conference, May 10) Europe: Brussels Retrieved May 20, 2011, from :[http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/eurvp/web.nsf/Pages/Paper+by+Yunis/\\$File/EUGENIO+YUNIS.PDF](http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/eurvp/web.nsf/Pages/Paper+by+Yunis/$File/EUGENIO+YUNIS.PDF)

Appendices

Appendix I: PPTP Revised PPT Principles

1. PPT is not based on a specific product or type such as ecotourism or community-based tourism. PPT can be applied at different levels such as at the enterprise, destination or country level, and to any kind of tourism, as long as it facilitates the changing of the distribution of benefits from tourism in favour of the poor.
2. PPT is about doing business differently to benefit poor people. It recognizes that tourism is inherently a private sector, market driven activity. Therefore, PPT initiatives should adopt business practices rather than focusing on traditional philanthropic interventions. Although philanthropy is desirable, developing businesses linkages reduces leakages with local economies. To maximize local economies, poor producers would need to supply goods and services to their respective tourist.
3. An initiative can only be described as pro-poor if it delivers net benefits to the poor and the beneficiaries can be identified in advance. Although there may be some additional, initially unidentified, livelihood benefits, it is only the pre-identification of the beneficiaries that can offer an initiative a “pro-poor” status.
4. The targeted beneficiaries of PPT are people who are economically poor, lacking opportunities and services like health and education although not necessarily the poorest of the poor. They are usually the poor and marginalized people.
5. Tourism generates both substantial benefits and costs to the poor. Benefits such as employment, market opportunities and improved access to infrastructure and services, and costs such as reduced access to natural resources and increased exposure to risk should be taken into account in PPT analysis.
6. Empowerment of the poor to manage and control tourist activities in their respective destinations is required because tourism is most likely to benefit the poor when they are actively engaged in the multi-stakeholder processes that attempt to govern it in destinations.
7. PPT recognizes the cultural richness and natural heritage embedded in lives of the poor people. This should be perceived as a tourism asset, and lay the grounds from which the poor should benefit from tourism business, rather than being used to secure access to mainstream companies, with unequal returns to the poor.
8. For PPT to offer effective contribution, it has to be incorporated into government plans and policies. This will help making tourist enterprises consider the impact of their business operations to the poor.
9. Entry barriers are critical to enhancing local supply linkages. Poor producers are often inhibited by the access to the market, the established industry and to tourists. Pro-poor initiatives should increase the ability of the poor people to access the market. Initiatives that do not address how to market products of the poor and how to integrate them into the value chain are considered ultimate failure.
10. It is the principles of Pro-Poor Tourism that are important, not the term.

Sources: (Roe 2006, 2)

Appendix II: The UNWTO Principles

1. *Mainstreaming*: Sustainable development (social, cultural, environmental, and economical) of all segments of tourism should be included in general poverty elimination programs, such as government policies.
2. *Partnerships*: partnerships between government, non-governmental, private sector and international bodies, with a common aim of poverty alleviation through tourism should sought
3. *Integration*: integrated approach with other sectors rather than depending solely on tourism should be adopted.
4. *Equitable distribution*: A more equitable distribution of tourism revenue and services is more important than economic growth.
5. *Decentralization*: more grassroots based initiatives along with supportive national/central government policies are imperative to facilitate establishment of local linkages.
7. *Retention*: Reduce leakages from the local economy and build linkages within it, focusing on the supply chain.
8. *Economic viability*: Sound financial discipline should be incorporated in PPT practices.
9. *Empowerment*: strategies for empowering and enabling the poor to access information, influence and take decisions should be designed.
10. *Human rights*: All forms of discrimination and exploitation against people working (or seeking to work) in the tourism industry should be abandoned.

Source: (Yunis 2004, 3-4)

Appendix III: PPTP Strategies for realizing the PPT Approach

Economic- Based Strategies

1. Expanding business opportunities for the poor: small enterprises, particularly in the informal sector, often provide the greatest opportunities for the poor.
2. Expanding employment opportunities for the poor: unskilled jobs may be limited and low-paid by international standards, but they are much sought after by the poor.
3. Enhancing collective benefits: collective community income from tourism can be a new source of income, and can spread benefits well beyond the direct earners.

Livelihood -Based Strategies

1. Capacity building, training and empowerment: the poor often lack the skills and knowledge to take advantage of opportunities in tourism.
2. Mitigating the environmental impact of tourism on the poor: tourism can lead to displacement of the poor from their land and/or degradation of the natural resources on which the poor depend.
3. Addressing social and cultural impact of tourism: tourists' behaviour, such as phonography and western habits, is often regarded as cultural intrusion. Sex tourism exploits women. Tourism can affect many other social issues, such as health care.

Policy Reform Strategies

1. Building a more supportive policy and planning framework: many governments see tourism as a means to generate foreign exchange rather than to address poverty. The policy framework can inhibit progress in PPT, therefore, reform is needed.
2. Promoting participation: the poor are often excluded from decision-making processes and institutions, making it very unlikely that their priorities will be reflected in decisions.
3. Bringing the private sector into pro-poor partnerships: locally-driven tourism enterprises may require input to develop skills, marketing links, and commercial expertise .

Source: (PPTP, 2001: 12)

Appendix IV: UNWTO Mechanisms for implementing the Strategies

1. Employment of the poor in tourism enterprises: Tourism enterprises require staff that is able to provide a certain service standard. Therefore adequate training of the local population is tremendously required in order to enlarge the number of people benefitting.

2. Supply of goods and services to tourism enterprises by the poor or by enterprises employing the poor in order to foster pro poor impacts it is of utmost importance that the majority of goods and services in the tourism supply chain come from local sources at all stages. This maximizes the benefits for the poor and helps to maintain the authenticity of the tourism products.

3. Direct sales of goods and services to visitors by the poor (informal economy): One of the major income sources of the poor is the direct selling of goods and services such as handicrafts, fruits, or guided tours. Linking the tourists to the local services by providing information on its availability can be rewarding for both sides. The poor generate direct income and the tourists are able to get in touch with the local culture.

4. Establishment and running of tourism enterprises by the poor - e.g. micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs), or community based enterprises (formal economy)

This includes the establishment of locally owned (either community-based or individually owned) tourism enterprises such as accommodation establishments, catering, transport, retail outlets, guiding and entertainment. The special benefit of this mechanism is that it places power and control in the hands of the locals.

5. Tax or levy on tourism income or profits with proceeds benefiting the poor

By using taxes or levies that come from tourism activities for poverty reduction parts of the poorer population, that are not involved in tourism, will be able to benefit as well. Though, transparency is heavily required in order to prevent wrong taxation.

6. Voluntary giving/support by tourism enterprises and tourists: Investment in infrastructure stimulated by tourism also benefiting the poor in the locality, directly or through support to other sectors

7. Investment in infrastructure projects that are related to tourism development such as roads, water and energy supply, sanitation and communications, can have a beneficial impact on the poor.

Source: (UNWTO, 2006)

Appendix V: The Subsector Map

Appendix VI: Specific Interview Framework and Questions

Given the varying range of actors interviewed and sought perspectives, interview questions varied in accordance with stakeholder groups and the key information sought. Instead of asking interviewees very particular questions, relevant topics were brought up in order to provoke answers on the state of horticultural supply system in SENAPA. This allowed the participants to raise issues that they think are most important to them. Presented below is a general framework of questions applied to the main stakeholder groups. Other stakeholder groups were asked about their perspectives on the activities, practices and issues surrounding both sides of the procurement system, with respect to opportunities, constraints, sought changes and proposals. To note, these questions were kept flexible to allow for a natural flow of interview.

Supply Related Questions

Objective: To get the perspectives of the producer groups and individuals concerning horticultural supply system to SENAPA

1. What does SENAPA tourism business mean for you as a group/ an individual?
2. Are you aware of any donations or assistances that SENAPA enterprises deliver to your community? What do you think about them? What are the general impacts to you as an individual and to the Mara community at large?
3. Are there any business opportunities that SENAPA tourist enterprises open to you/ your group? What are those?
4. What would be your preference if you were to choose between the donations and business opportunities?
5. What do you think about the current horticultural (fruits, vegetables and herbs) supply system for the SENAPA tourist market?
6. Specific question for producer groups: When was your group established? And how was it formed/ who were the founders? Was there any membership criteria? How many were you at the beginning and how many are you now? What is your leadership structure? What do you grow? How did you learn to grow? Where do you get your inputs from? What are your production trends? Who are your key buyers? How is your overall business going? What are your key concerns, strengths and weaknesses?
7. Based on your experience, what are the key challenges surrounding horticultural supply linkages to SENAPA? Can you think of any solutions?

8. What changes (if any) need to take place to have an ideal horticultural supply system for the SENAPA tourism market?
9. Overall, what do you think about a proposal for a localized procurement system? If one has to set up such a system, what factors should be taken into consideration?
10. Are there any other person/ source of information you would recommend for this research?
11. Is there anything else you would like to tell me?

Distribution-related Questions

These questions target the actors involved in the distribution system. The goal is to examine issues concerning the movement of the produce from the post harvesting stage to delivery as stipulated in the channels across the subsector map.

1. Where do SENAPA enterprises source their horticultural produce (fresh fruits, vegetables and herbs) for SENAPA sourced?
2. Who are the involved actors?
3. What are the means of transport used?
4. What are the key challenges surrounding the produce from post-harvest stage to delivery? Any sought changes/ solutions
5. What would the shift to the localized system mean for the current distribution system and to the involved actors?
6. Are there any other person/ source of information you would recommend for this research?
7. Is there anything else you would like to tell me?

Demand-Related Questions

The aim is to gather the demand side perspective, especially from the tour companies.

1. What is the capacity of your company? How many lodges, camps, and hotels do you own in the SENAPA area?
2. How does your company relate with the neighbouring communities? Do you offer any donations? What do you think about them?

3. Are you aware of any horticultural production co-operatives/ sources in your neighbouring communities?
4. How and where does your company source its fresh fruits, vegetables and herbs? What is the demand trend for horticultural produce? What influence your current procurement system?
5. Do you have any experience of sourcing from proximal areas around SENAPA? How was the experience? What is your general perspective about sourcing from within the Mara region? Any challenges?
6. If you were to shift to a localized procurement system, what changes (if any) would you propose?
7. Are there any other person/ source of information you would recommend for this research?
8. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Key Informants:

These questions target perspectives of stakeholders in their official capacities including development practitioners, business operators and political representatives

1. What do you think about the relationship between SENAPA enterprises and their neighbouring local communities? What is your perspective concerning philanthropic versus business-oriented interventions?
2. What do you think about horticultural supply and procurement system (fresh fruits, vegetables and herbs) for SENAPA?
3. What are your key roles in and concerns about the system? Do you see any challenges? Where do they lie? Any sought changes? Who is/ should be responsible?
4. What do you specifically think about establishing a strong localized procurement system (sourcing within the Mara region) whom will it benefit? And what are the surrounding potential challenges?
5. Are there any other person/ source of information you would recommend for this research?
6. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix VII: List of Interviewees and Respondents

Stakeholder group	Mara	Arusha	Status Description
Individual horticultural smallholders	20	5	All Anonymous
Production co-operatives and Associations' Leadership	06	4	Chair and Secretary, GHOMACOS; Chair and Secretary, SEFA; Coordinator and Partner, SEDEREC. And Chair, Secretary, financial Administrator, Midawe; Horticultural groups' coordinator, Nduruma
Tour Operators (companies)	01	15	Procurement Manager, Serena. And Manager, Sopa; Regional Fleet and Procurement Manager, And Beyond; HR, Asilia; Central Store Manager, Serena; Manager, Thomson Safaris; Head of Purchase, Tanganyika Wilderness; Procurement Manager, Hotels and Lodges;; Procurement Coordinator, Sopa; Operations Consultant, Nomad; Operations Manager, Moivaro; Field Operations Manager, Asilia; General Manager, Hotels and Lodges; Manager, Singita Grumeti Reserves; Community Outreach Coordinator, TANAPA; Information Officer, Tanzania Tourist Board
Intermediary companies	01	1	Coordinator, Horecca Co. and Initiator, Serengeti Fruits, Herbs and Vegetables Wholesale Company
Supporting NGOs and Research bodies	02	4	Coordinator, SEDEREC; Researcher, IBDI. And Program Assistant, Marketing Officer, TAHA, Director, Honey Guide Foundation; Director, round Table Africa.
Government officials	03		MP, Serengeti; Ward Councillor, Nata; and Village Chair, Nata
Middlemen	04	10	2 Mugumu Marekt Traders, 2 Serena. And 3Sopa, 2, Hotels and Lodges; 3 And Beyond; and 2 Asilia
Agro-dealers/ extension officers		2	1 Nduruma and 1 HomeVeg. Tz Ltd.
Researches	01	3	Project Coordinator, MSHP; 1 Round Table Africa, 2 TAHA.
Development workers	02		Project Manager, SEFA and Coordinator, SEDEREC
Total	40	44	

Appendix VIII: Arusha-Based Production and Market Actors

Kilombero and Arusha Central Markets

These are the big wholesale and retail food markets in Arusha city. They source horticultural products from both within the region and outside places within Tanzania and neighbouring countries. Fruits such as oranges, apples and pineapples come from as far as Tanga region. Most potatoes come from West Kilimanjaro while some other produce such as herbs come from as far as Zanzibar. Sourcing within Arusha is dominated by middlemen and rich traders who often source from farm gates (Observation and Informal Interviews with traders in both markets, February-April, 2011).

Midawe Mshikamano Cooperative Society

This cooperative, located in Arumeru district, was established in the year 2005 by local farmers in Arusha. At inception, the co-op had 62 members while it currently has 88 members. Midawe was organized out of groups of farmers who came together in order to learn from neighbouring producer groups called Gomba and Wimbo Farmers Association. In 2008 it began to supply and eventually became one of the main suppliers for the HomeVeg Tanzania Limited Horticultural Export Company. Success factors for Midawe include the initial field learning from Gomba and Wimbo, access to water and irrigation schemes, funding from the African Development Fund (ADF), technical and extension service from HomeVeg, and marketing and auditing assistance from TAHA. To date Midawe possesses its office building, collection centre, truck and motorcycle (Source: Interviews, FGDs with Midawe members and Leadership, April, 2011).

Nduruma Farmer Groups

Nduruma has a long history of horticultural production due to their early experience with foreigners residing in that locality. The area is one of the chief tomato growing areas in Arusha and in Tanzania as a whole. Success factors include suitability of soil and climate; adequate training; substantial government-based extension service in the early stages; and informal communication (via mobile phones) with buyers in Arusha, Dar es Salaam, Tanga, Mombasa and other places. Overall, the significance of Nduruma experience in the current study is the example it set of 'advanced farmers' who have managed to overcome production barriers but still experience many challenges where marketing is concerned. It was noted that most farmers sell from the farm gate via middlemen/traders, hence reap limited benefits from their production capacity because of middlemen dominance. Key lesson learnt is that addressing production barriers should not be done in isolation from providing farmers with market connection (FGDs, Nduruma famrrers, April, 2011).

Appendix IX: Contextual Model for the Case Study Region

Appendix X: SENAPA Tourist Enterprises

Owner	Name	Location	Beds	Employees
Sopa Lodge	Serengeti Sopa	Seronera	156	150
Serena	Serengeti Serena	Seronera	132	122
Serena	Kiraira Luxury Tented Camps	West	50	81
Serena	Mbuzi Mawe	Central-North	32	41
Asilia	Olakira camp	Migrating	12	23
Asilia	Sayari camp	North	16	65
Asilia	Dunia Camp	Central	14	23
Thomas Safaris	Thomson Nyumba 1	North	36	10
Thomas Safaris	Thomson Nyumba 1	Ikoma	36	10
Thomas Safaris	Thomson Nyumba 1	South	36	10
& Beyond	Serengeti Mobile Camps	Migrating	8	4
& Beyond	Klein's Camp	North	12	6
& Beyond	Grumeti River Camp	West	20	10
Elewana	Migration Camp	North	40	40
Mbalageti	Mbalageti Tented Camp	West	50	25
Kijereshi	Kijereshi Tented camp	West	46	23
Kusini	Kusini Camp	South	24	12
Tanganyika wilderniss camps	Mobile Camps	Migrating	54	27
Tanganyika wilderniss camps	Simiyu Camp	Migrating	20	9
Tanganyika wilderniss camps	Serengeti Kati Tented Camp	Seronera	36	15
Nomad	Nomad Serengeti Safari Camp I	Migrating	12	6
Nomad	Nomad Serengeti Safari Camp II	Migrating	12	6
Nomad	Loliondo camp	Migrating	12	6
Grumeti Reserves	Sasakwa Lodge	Grument	34	600
Grumeti Reserves	Sabora Tented Camp	Grument	18	na
Grumeti Reserves	Faru Faru Lodge	Grument	22	na
Ikoma Safari Camp	Inkoma Safari Camp	Ikoma	18	6
Moivaro	Inkoma Safari Camp	Ikoma	70	42
Wild Frontiers	Serengeti Wilderniss Camp	Migrating	20	10
Kempinski	Bilila Lodge	Central North	152	150
-	Lobo Wildlife Lodge	North	150	75
-	Seronera Wildlife Lodge	Seronera	150	75
-	Mapito Tented Camp	Ikoma	20	10
	Robanda Safari Camp	Robanda	32	16
	Serengeti Stop Over Point	Direction Musoma	20	10
Orion Hotels Ltd	Serengeti Bush Tops	North	24	12
			1596	1730

Source: Round Table Africa and Honey Guide Foundation, 2010