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Abstract

Community-Based Ecotourism (CBET) in developing countries has become a popular solution to environmental, social, and economic issues. This study seeks to address how CBET models from the Global South could be implemented in the U.S. ecotourism context, using social entrepreneurship models. Research was completed through a variety of sources including academic journals and government databases, exploring the importance of ecotourism, and a comparison of ecotourism in the Global South to ecotourism in the Global North. The method for analysis was conducted through qualitative interviews with social entrepreneurs working in ecotourism in Uganda, Indonesia, Nepal, India, Costa Rica, Chile, and Brazil. Results from the analysis reveal the complexity in analyzing cross-cultural contexts for implementing CBET models in the U.S. From these results, the challenges and opportunities for implementation are discussed alongside a case study in Bar Harbor, Maine, an island community surrounded by Acadia National Park. This study concludes with suggestions for applicability, including social entrepreneurship organizations’ election of fellows, civil society involvement by the U.S. National Parks System, and social reinvestment methodologies for host communities located in U.S. ecotourism areas.

Keywords: community-based ecotourism; ecotourism; social enterprise; social entrepreneurship; social entrepreneur; sustainable development; sustainable tourism
Introduction

Traditional views and methodologies of international sustainable development have long been a one-directional transaction of the Global North providing aid and theoretical frameworks to the Global South. Critics argue that this form of development is akin to neo-imperialism and the imposition of Western ideology on non-Western cultures (Easterly, 2006; Grosfoguel, 2000). This eliminates the possibilities, as outlined by Post-Development theorists, that perhaps the definition of development is not necessarily defined by the Global North’s approach (Willis, 2012; Escobar, 1995). Although there have been efforts by large international development organizations -- such as CARE, UNICEF, World Food Programme -- to develop bottom-up approaches to implementing projects, one can see how the overarching goals of such organizations echo faintly the sentiments of Robert Kipling’s 1899 White Man’s Burden:

Take up the White Man's burden--
Send forth the best ye breed--
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need; […]
Fill full the mouth of Famine
And bid the sickness cease

The question of morality and lack of achievement among large international development organizations to address the complicated issues of poverty, environmental degradation, and conflict has led to the creation and expansion of the Social Entrepreneurship (SE) field. Social entrepreneurs can best be described as “highly adaptive, innovative leaders who see new ways to solve old problems and who find points of leverage to create large-scale systemic [social] change” (Crutchfield & Grant, 2008, p.4). Over the past few decades, SE has gained considerable attention within sustainable development, business administration, and economics studies, to such an
extent that “no Davos World Economic Forum gathering would be complete without a coterie of social entrepreneurs” (Crutchfield & Grant, 2008, p.4). Ashoka, the world’s first and largest SE organization is comprised of more than 3,000 social entrepreneur fellows across 70 countries – demonstrating that SE is a global phenomenon, not limited to Global North ideologies. SE methodology provides a solution to what Easterly refers to as the Planner (large development organizations) versus the Searcher (social entrepreneur) divide, wherein “a Planner believes outsiders know enough to impose solutions. A Searcher believes only insiders have enough knowledge to find solutions, and that most solutions must be homegrown” (Easterly, 2006, p. 5-6).

For the purposes of this paper, the focus was on ecotourism within social entrepreneurship models. A comparative analysis of the Global South and the Global North presented the argument that developed countries with failing ecotourism models should embrace methodologies created by developing countries’ social entrepreneurs. Research was completed through a Literature Review exploring the importance of ecotourism, ecotourism in the Global South, and ecotourism in the Global North, specifically the U.S. The Method for analysis was interviews with Ashoka fellows working in ecotourism and interviews with U.S. specialists in ecotourism and social entrepreneurship. Results from the analysis were presented through a data collection summary and discussion, followed by a conclusion reflecting on the study’s contribution to the Sustainable Development field.
Literature Review

The Importance of Ecotourism for Sustainable Development

The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) defines ecotourism as, “All nature-based forms of tourism in which the main motivation of the tourists is the observation and appreciation of nature as well as the traditional cultures prevailing in natural areas” (Ecotourism and Protected Areas, 2002). The UN General Assembly declared 2017 to be the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development, in order to show support to the newly adopted Sustainable Development Goals (SDG’s). The global tourism industry applies to SDG’s 8, 12, and 14: Decent work and economic growth; Responsible consumption and production; and Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources (The United Nations Declares, 2016). Community-based ecotourism (CBET) in particular presents “the prospect of linking conservation and local livelihoods, preserving biodiversity, […] simultaneously reducing rural poverty, and […] achieving both objectives on a sustainable [and] self-financing basis,” thereby encompassing the three main elements of sustainable development: “economic efficiency, social equity and ecological sustainability” (Kiss, 2004, p. 232; Fiorello, 2012, p. 6).

Environment

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) identifies six key possible contributions from the nature-based tourism industry to environmental conservation: financial contributions for conservation organizations, improved environmental management and planning of ecotourism areas, environmental awareness raising of local populations, protection and preservation of biological diversity, alternative employment
to destructive practices, and regulatory measures for conservation (Tourism and Environmental Conservation, n.d.).

National parks across the world are created as publicly implemented ecotourism, for the dual benefit of land protection and recreation. The latest publication of the UN List of Protected Areas, revealed that, as of 2003, there were 3,881 national parks sites globally, covering more than 4.4 million square kilometers of the Earth’s surface. This means that national parks account for 23.6% of the total Protected Areas in the world (Charpe et. al, 2003).

Economy

The tourism industry is enormous, accounting for 9.8% of global GDP, and employing 1 out of 11 people worldwide (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2016). The UN identifies this industry as “one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the world,” larger than oil exports, food products, and automobiles (Why Tourism, 2015). Within the broader realm of tourism exists the ecotourism sector, considered to be the fastest growing market in the tourism industry, at a 5% annual growth rate, which constitutes 6% of global GDP, and 11.4% of all consumers spending (Neto, 2003; Defining Ecotourism, n.d.). Ecotourism is particularly economically impactful on local communities compared to standard mass tourism: a UN-supported study by the Collaborative Partnership on Forests demonstrated that ecotourism returned up to 95% of revenues to local economies, versus just 20% for regular tourism models (The Case for Responsible Travel, 2013). It is important to note that economic benefits of ecotourism vary widely, especially in relation to “the nature and degree of community involvement, and whether earnings become private income or are channeled into community projects or other benefit-spreading
mechanisms” (Kiss, 2004, p. 234). That is to say, local employment alone is not a sufficient measurement for economic empowerment of a host community.

**Human Health**

In recent decades, cognitive psychologists have become interested in proving through scientific evidence what nature enthusiasts like John Muir and Ralph Waldo Emerson have claimed – that exposure to nature has innate mental and physical health benefits. Among findings, there is evidence that people who spend more time outdoors or who simply live near green spaces have lower likelihood of fifteen different diseases, including obesity, depression, and high blood pressure. Scenic window views alone quicken recovery in hospitals, improve academic performance in schools, and decrease violent behavior in prisons and neighborhoods. The scientific evidence is so compelling that some countries have implemented public health policies that include government-sponsored nature programs to mitigate suicide rates of citizens and post-traumatic stress of civil servants (Williams, 2016). For people who live in urban areas with no access to natural settings, ecotourism provides an outlet for environmental exposure. This is particularly important in a society like the U.S. where there has been a sharp decline in daily hours spent outdoors, especially among youth, as 70% of U.S. mothers spent time outside everyday, compared to 31% of their children (Williams, 2016).

**Ecotourism in the Global South**

**Industry Trends**

Across the majority of developing countries with ecotourism industries, Protected Area visitation is on the rise, and in many countries this is increasing by over 4% per year. This is doubly beneficial, as being non-consumptive of natural resources while at
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the same time earning financial gains (Balmford et al, 2009). Community-based ecotourism (CBET) is an especially popular model in the Global South for biodiversity conservation, with this model being represented in “USAID’s 105 projects, totaling US$2 billion […] and 32 of the 55 World Bank-financed projects that supported Protected Areas in Africa between 1988 and 2003” (Kiss, 2004, p. 232). In sub-Saharan Africa, ecotourism is currently earning as much revenue as the total of the farming, forestry, and fisheries industries (Balmford et al, 2009). In countries like Costa Rica, Ecuador, Malaysia, and South Africa, private investment for private nature reserves help to protect biological diversity, but do little for the economy of local communities (Neto, 2003). Ecotourism in the Global South has been used as a vehicle for influencing national policy as well. In Ecuador, citizens advocated for a tourism model to save a biodiversity hot spot from oil exploitation. In Mozambique, the government is setting aside vast land pieces as part of a national tourism development strategy (Kiss, 2004).

There are many models in the Global South for effective ecotourism: economy-focused, community-focused, and environmental-focused. What is perhaps most compelling as far as industry trends, is the comparative success of the Global South relative to the Global North, where poorer countries have growing visitation numbers to Protected Areas, with data showing a negative correlation to per capita GDP (Balmford et al, 2009).

**Filling the Gaps through Social Innovation**

There is considerable debate if ecotourism in the Global South truly benefits local communities or the environment in significant ways, and in fact some critics have argued that ecotourism may even be detrimental to biodiversity and local cultures (West &
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Carrier, 2004; Cater, 2006; Kiss, 2004). While this debate is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to note that there exist a variety of ecotourism models, some more beneficial than others. For the purposes of this study, the focus was on community-based ecotourism (CBET), which has reflective characteristics of social entrepreneurship (SE) models. Kiss (2004), whose research focuses on the shortfalls of ecotourism models for environmental protection and community benefit, did give an alternate example of how a CBET model in South Africa proved to be successful: the community-owned Mkambati nature reserve gives a percentage of every tourism dollar earned to the Mkambati Land Trust for conservation efforts, while at the same time uses their operational profits to assist the community in developing small businesses, schools and clinics (p. 235).

SE models in ecotourism have been implemented across the globe in different cultural contexts, seeking to address various social and environmental issues. Ashoka, the first and largest SE organization in the world has been electing SE ecotourism fellows since the 1990’s. This is of particular significance because Ashoka is extremely selective in who they deem to be “changemakers” for addressing the world’s stickiest problems. Specifically, an Ashoka fellow is only elected if they demonstrate: A new idea that changes the pattern in the field; Creativity; Entrepreneurial quality; Ethical fiber; and Social impact. Ashoka has elected SE ecotourism fellows in countries across Asia, Africa, South America, Central America, Middle East, and middle-income countries in central Europe. These ecotourism fellowships are heavily concentrated in Central and South America, but it’s interesting to note that SE ecotourism models have been recognized by Ashoka as “changemaking” across all continents except North America.

More than 80 Ashoka SE fellows’ organizations have ties to ecotourism, and as would be
expected, their models and theories of change vary widely, based on cultural context, community need, and available resources. The various SE ecotourism models implemented by Ashoka fellows are explored in more detail in the Method, Results, and Discussion portions of this study.

**Ecotourism in the Global North, the U.S. Context**

“As a large continental country with vast and diverse natural resources, the United States has a long tradition of ecotourism on public and private lands and waters from coast to coast.” The majority of the ecotourism industry is privately owned, but the U.S. government has a strong influence for regulation, land procurement, and industry promotion, with contributions from the National Park Service, National Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management and National Marine Fisheries Service. Aside from federal involvement, many ecotourism destinations are managed at the state and local level. For civil society, a National Private Landowners Survey indicated that “47% of rural land owners permit recreational use of their land by non-family members” (U.S. Department of State, 2003, n.p.).

**Public Sector: National Parks System**

The world’s first national park was signed into law in 1872 in the western U.S. to be “dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.” In 1906, The Antiquities Act, signed by Theodore Roosevelt authorized American Presidents to proclaim and reserve lands for low-impact recreation, particularly for protecting landscapes from private sector interests. Nearly 25% of land in the U.S. National Parks System originated from this Act. The system is incredibly expansive, currently made up of 411 sites, and stretching over 84 million acres in U.S.
states and territories, with the largest U.S. National Park being Wrangell-St. Elias covering 13.2 million acres in Alaska. In 2015, there were 307,247,252 visitors to U.S. National Parks (National Parks Service, 2016).

The size of protected land and the number of visitors to national parks in the U.S. is impressive, but what is most relevant to Sustainable Development has been the replication of this model for federally protected lands in other country contexts across the world. Since the U.S. model was implemented in 1872, countries in Africa, Asia, Central and South America, and Europe have since established national park systems to protect lands while attracting tourists.

**Private Sector: Various Roles Played**

The private sector plays a variety of roles in U.S. ecotourism. Effective funding tactics for protected area operations and management have involved public-private matching initiatives, such as Centennial Challenge, that leverage philanthropic support from corporate foundations and businesses (Kemphorne, 2006).

As a whole, the private sector’s presence in ecotourism is a complex and highly debated issue. There is a certain balancing act between conservation of natural areas and development of business, which has led to conflict in ecotourism areas across the country, recognizing that there exists a tipping point at which over-development jeopardizes the quality of the natural spaces. What is interesting is that, it is in businesses’ best interest to control the quality of the client experience, but the overzealous expansion and development characteristics of capitalism prove to be detrimental. An often noted case is that of Niagara Falls in upstate New York, where over-development and blocked natural views have made it so “a visitor to Niagara now
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carries away a vision not of the Falls but of the ravages of ill-planned industrialization and abandonment” (Newman & Sage, 1996, p. 75).

At the same time, the private sector is a necessary actor in the ecotourism industry, providing infrastructure and supporting services, such as restaurants, lodging, and transportation for tourists. The Stanford Social Innovation Review recently published an article, entitled “There is No Such Thing as a Green Product,” reinforcing the fact that any purchase of any item has an environmental impact, which can also be said of the ecotourism industry, that every vacation has a carbon footprint. This is not to say that we should abandon the ecotourism model altogether, but rather, there is a need for private businesses who operate in nature-based spaces to be held accountable to strict regulation on sustainable practices, being aware that “green washing” and sub-standard certification are not viable solutions (Font & Harris, 2004).

**Social Sector: Minimal Presence**

The U.S. Department of State identifies civil society involvement to be an integral piece of national ecotourism, claiming, “Community involvement is essential in all aspects of ecotourism. […] Because potential conflicts may arise, […] we] recognize the benefits of trying to promote a clear understanding of potential socioeconomic and environmental implications of proposed tourism operations among stakeholders” (2003, n.p.). The Bureau of Land Management specifically works with Native American populations, and the National Parks Service runs programs for outdoor recreation planning in communities. Universities like Texas A&M, Clemson, George Washington, and University of Idaho offer training programs and even undergraduate degrees in ecotourism entrepreneurship. However, there is limited curriculum focused on CBET
models, where these degrees and trainings are more business-focused or environmental-focused, showing a gap in community-focused and social reinvestment components.

**Purpose and Rational of Study**

Ecotourism in the Global South and ecotourism in the Global North have distinct characteristics. What is most notable is the popularity of CBET in developing countries in contrast to the scarcity of CBET in developed countries, particularly the U.S. In a country whose ecotourism is dominated by the public and private sectors, there is alarming evidence that the over-dependence on these two sectors alone is unsustainable. Specifically, national ecotourism is at risk due to lack of federal funding for the National Parks and unsustainable large-scale private sector hospitality industry practices, that are environmentally destructive while at the same time not truly empowering local economies.

Kiss (2004, p. 235) points out that, “the public sector must be prepared to carry most of the costs associated with supporting social development and conserving biodiversity beyond what is needed to attract socially conscious and nature-minded tourists.” While strong government regulation has done much for the U.S. ecotourism industry through the National Parks system (NPS), there is a need for complimentary cooperation among all three sectors: public, private, and social. As was noted earlier, NPS uses funding strategies with private sector partners, but there still remains an obvious void in civil society involvement. The current strategy for NPS longevity is clearly a failing one: today they are suffering from a $12 billion deferred maintenance backlog, construction and upkeep of facilities have decreased 60% from 15 years ago, and there are staff shortages for the increasing tourism arrivals at the parks (National
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Parks Conservation Association, 2016). This study sought to address how CBET models from the Global South could be implemented in the U.S. ecotourism context, using social entrepreneurship models as a vehicle for complimentary support to the public and private sectors.

Theory of Change

If U.S. social entrepreneurs replicate the Global South’s CBET models for ecotourism, then the gaps left by the public and private sectors for ecotourism will be resolved.

Method

Conceptual Framework

Materials and Procedures

The method for analysis of this study was qualitative, using a variety of sources of knowledge. For the Global South context, a comparison with the U.S. was analyzed using interviews and questionnaires with ecotourism social entrepreneurs from Ashoka (see Annex II-A through II-G for interview materials). For the Global North context,
interviews with Global North professionals in ecotourism and social entrepreneurship were also performed (see Annex II-H for interview materials).

**Sampling Design and Participants**

For interviews and questionnaires, the sampling design was based on voluntary response of participants. The author had previous professional relationships through Ashoka with the majority of participants. Ashoka ecotourism fellows who were interviewed and / or participated in questionnaires included: Dr. Gladys Kalema-Zikusoka from Uganda, Bambang Ismawan from Indonesia, Rajendra Suwal from Nepal, Nomito Kamdar (on behalf of SLN Swamy) from India, Luis Villa (on behalf of Alvaro Víquez) from Costa Rica, Francisco Vio Giacaman from Chile, and Felipe César from Brazil. Jay Friedlander, professor at College of the Atlantic in Bar Harbor, Maine, was also interviewed. He was chosen as an integral provider of information on Global North context from his experience as an ecotourism planner, and social entrepreneurship practitioner and professor.

**Results**

**Ashoka Fellow Profiles**

*Dr. Gladys Kalema Zikusoka, Conservation Through Public Health, Uganda*

CTPH’s work focuses on the effects of the booming tourism industry in the regions surrounding Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Queen Elizabeth National Park, areas known for their gorilla trekking tours. Increased tourism has also increased communicable diseases between people and animals, and has caused tensions in agricultural communities displaced by the implementation of protected areas for tourism. Dr. Gladys’s work focuses on mitigating these health, economic, and community risks.
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_Bambang Ismawan, Bina Swadaya, Indonesia_

Bina Swadaya was founded nearly 40 years ago to provide services, products, and education to rural farmers in Indonesia through citizen-led, revenue-generating companies. Since its original printing business that provided agricultural guides to farmers, Bina Swadaya has expanded into farming supply shops and ecotourism businesses. Local people start enterprises with the help of low interest loans and micro financing.

_Rajendra Suwal, Lumbini Crane Conservation, Nepal_

Lumbini, which is believed to be the birthplace of Buddha, has an enormous amount of tourists every year. This conservation sanctuary both protects the fragile wetlands surrounding Lumbini, and also teaches local people the value of community involvement in conservation, through projects that generate income. Local staff facilitate educational tours for both tourists and Nepalese villagers. Raj is no longer with Lumbini Crane Conservation, and now works at WWF Nepal.

_Nomito Kamdar (on behalf of SLN Swamy), The Adventurers, India_

SLN Swamy founded the Adventurers to protect the lands in the Western Ghats, while at the same time empowering the local forest population. The method involves organizing experiential outdoor activities for visitors, thereby providing economic incentives of the host community to protect the forest. The Adventurers has a diverse array of programs, including volunteer leadership trainings, an environmental school for children, trekking group guides, an environmental police force, vocational training, a variety of income-generating projects, tree planting, civil servant trainings, monument
restoration, and the list goes on. SLN Swamy’s wife, Nomito is an integral partner to the organization and was the point of contact for this study.

**Luis Villa (on behalf of Alvaro Víquez), Nectandra Institute, Costa Rica**

Alvaro Víquez founded the Nectandra Institute after working thirty years in the Costa Rica National Parks system. Although the country has an impressive park system and private conservation lands, the outlying regions not included in these protected areas are at risk. To address this issue, Nectandra trains local communities on restoration of polluted waters surrounding their agricultural lands. They operate a sister organization, the Nectandra Cloud Forest Garden and Reserve, whose tourism revenue helps support projects. Alvaro recently passed away, and now Nectandra is run by his partners, including Luis Villa, who was the point of contact for this study.

**Francisco Vio Giacaman, The Patagonia Guide School, Chile**

To help mitigate the migration of youth in search of jobs away from the Patagonia area, The Guide School was founded in 2002 to train local people with skills for the new tourism industry. The curriculum involves entrepreneurship courses, business training, guide skills, and first aid. An integral part of the guide services focuses on cultural tours that celebrate local customs. The school is currently run by Francisco’s former students, and he now works as a professor at Universidad Austral de Chile.

**Felipe César, Fertile Crescent, Brazil**

In 1994, Felipe founded Crescente Fértil in the mountain region of Serra da Mantiqueira in southeastern Brazil, in the areas located around Itatiaia National Park. He works with the local communities to create sustainable economic opportunities, while at the same time preserving natural resources and cultural traditions through raising
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awareness of local and international governments. Income-generating activities include small-scale sustainable agriculture and mining, as well as ecotourism. Within their many programs, there are guide trainings for youth, some of whom have gone on to become ecotourism professionals.

Similarities between U.S. and Global South for CBET

Africa: Uganda and the U.S.

Just as in the U.S., the study of the correlation between ecotourism, conservation, and human health is new, and so it is a challenge for widespread acceptance (Williams, 2016). For Dr. Gladys, the most challenging part of her job is “convincing people that integrated approaches to conservation and public health, animal and human health work.” Also, similar to the U.S., Uganda has a strong national park presence, and the local governments have been supportive of CTPH’s work, through letters of support and fundraising. Finally, there is a similarity to the U.S. in the strong presence of the private sector, and in particular tour operator businesses: “The private sector has been a great ally to CTPH’s work, where we have formed partnerships with about five tourist operators […] where we charge guiding fees for the educational tourism experiences.”

Asia: Indonesia and the U.S.

The economic-linked techniques for ecotourism in Indonesia are similar to those in the U.S., where there is an emphasis on “developing capacity in management of microfinance institution, entrepreneurship, and technical skills,” and where the tourist attractions of agriculture, fishery and animal husbandries are used as marketed products. The sales of “Bina Swadaya magazine and books have also successfully promoted public awareness […] especially through growing and loving flora and fauna.” Bambang has
skillfully engaged big names in the private sector, many of whom exist in the U.S., like Exxon, BP, Coca-Cola Foundation, and Chevron.

**Asia: Nepal and the U.S.**

There is a similarity in environmental conservation techniques, where both in Nepal and in the U.S., there is a significant market for bird watching, and in fact their largest clientele are from the U.S. Many American universities partake in academic field trips, and Lumbini uses their sanctuary to draw scientists: “ornithologists, botanists, GIS specialist, forestry, ecology and other experts.” Conservation tourism for Lumbini also involves providing logistics for American and European nature documentary film crews. Additionally, as in the U.S., there is a strong national park presence in Nepal, and Raj helped to create a management plan of Khaptad National Park for the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation.

**Asia: India and the U.S.**

As in the U.S., outdoor equipment products are popular among ecotourists in India. One of the Adventurers’ income-generating programs involves local people making Adventure Allied products like backpacks, sleeping bags, ground chairs and tents, which they sell. Nomito spoke of the success of this program, stating, “Adventure Allied products have won contracts from various government departments, organizations, police academies, [and] national cadet corps. The marketing has been taken up [by] Karnataka Consumer Cooperative Federation.”

India’s government is heavily involved in ecotourism, as in the U.S. The Adventurers works closely with many government organizations, from schools to tourism boards to police academies, and beyond. Nomito asserted, “In a country like India to
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reach […] large scale, it is very important to work with the public sector for large scale impact. Through the education department we have been able to reach out to students, teachers and heads of institutions. […] The support of the tourism department in Karnataka and government of India has resulted in establishing and operation of the unique outbound training center in the Western Ghats.”

India, like the U.S. has a strong presence of non-profit organizations. The Adventurers has partnered with Association for People with Disabilities, Dream a Dream, Ananya Trust (a program for children affected by drug abuse), and Makkala Jagriti (a program for juvenile offenders).

Central America: Costa Rica and the U.S.

Alvaro’s long-standing professional relationship with Costa Rica’s many national parks has enabled Nectandra to effectively carry out their conservation work in the surrounding lands, which is also a possibility for the hundreds of current and former National Park rangers in the U.S. Nectandra additionally harnesses the private tourism sector for project support, as Luis explained, “Costa Rica Expeditions, one of the country's most successful eco-tourism companies, is a big source of tourist referrals for our sister organization, the Nectandra Cloud Forest Garden and Reserve. The Reserve is one of Nectandra Institute's strongest allies, often making considerable donations to support our work. Additionally, local private business co-ops mostly from Zarcero have supported our educational and community outreach work.”

South America: Chile and the U.S.

The involvement of both the public and private sectors in ecotourism is similarly relevant in Chile as it is in the U.S. The Patagonia Guide School started as a government
ECOTOURISM SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

program in partnership with a foundation, where funding was 50-50. The private sector needed local guides in the Patagonia area, yet this was a project using government funding. For government involvement concerning protected lands, Chile is similar to the U.S. in prevalence: Chile has 100 protected areas total, which constitutes 20% of the entire country. In Patagonia, there are 19 protected areas, meaning 48% of the land there is protected by the government.

Additionally there are economic strategies similar to those in the U.S., especially in entrepreneurship and small business formation. After twelve years since the Guide School started, the most successful businesses in the area are owned and operated by the graduates from the program, including horseback riding companies, hiking companies, campgrounds, bike and kayak rental companies, boat tours, and ski services. Another striking similarity is the length of tourism season to many places in the U.S., as Francisco pointed out, “In this region, people talk about tourism for eight months and work tourism for four months. It should be the opposite.” U.S. National Parks in cold climates face similar barriers.

The Patagonia Guide School in Chile has many correlative characteristics to the U.S., as Francisco affirmed, “I’ve traveled to Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, to Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks. Everyone thinks the U.S. is huge and has a lot of money, but they face the same problems for work and resources, and for budget for education and for parks. It’s a different scale, but it’s the same problems.”

**South America: Brazil and the U.S.**

Felipe’s organization functions within close proximity to a national park, making Fertile Crescent’s work in Brazil similar to U.S. ecotourism context. There are also
similarity for private sector involvement: “We believe in the private sector as an important contributor to environmental conservation and especially as the financing of PES projects.” Just as in the U.S., the public and private sectors in ecotourism function in tandem, as Felipe cautioned, “However, private participation must rely on regulatory mechanisms [from] the public sector.” When relating the U.S. to the Brazilian context, Felipe explained, “in general [ecotourism] companies need to valorize the workers [and] local organizations, and their leaders need to have a history of collaboration with the [national] park.”

**Differences between U.S. and Global South for CBET**

*Africa: Uganda versus the U.S.*

The environmental conservation context in the U.S. is much different, as Dr. Gladys’ work is mainly concerned with protecting gorillas from contracting communicable diseases from tourists and human populations that have been forced into their territory. Her conservation efforts are for animals closely genetically related to humans, and so the protection of and interaction with grizzlies and wolves, for example, require different approaches in U.S. National Parks. Another difference is the economic impact approaches in contrast to the U.S., where the focus in Uganda is on Village Savings and Loan Associations, livestock enterprise projects, family planning, and malnutrition. And finally, Dr. Gladys’ work is based on the negative health impacts of tourism on animals, whereas U.S. ecotourism models tend to focus on the positive effects on human health (Williams, 2016).

*Asia: Indonesia versus the U.S.*
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The major difference in context in contrast to the U.S. is the role of government in Indonesia. Although today some local governments, national ministries and government bodies are partners of Bina Swadaya, Bambang stated that one of the biggest challenges in founding the organization was the difficulty dealing with government: “[We] started in the era when the government had tight control towards community and community organizations. Quite often Bina Swadaya’s activities […] were suspected as activities that endanger government security and were suspended by local government security officers.” Another interesting political difference between the U.S. and Indonesia is the presence of the World Bank. In one tourism project, Bina Swadaya hosted a new World Bank Director for one week “to live in rural Java to learn the life of Javanese society. After the program he wrote to the President of The World Bank [and] suggested every new World Bank Director has to live [with a] rural family before functioning as Director.”

Asia: Nepal versus the U.S.

In Nepal, as in Indonesia, the major contextual difference from the U.S. is the role of government. Although government involvement can be seen as a similarity with the U.S. due to national parks presence, it is important to note the effects of an unstable government in ecotourism areas. Lumbini was founded in 1996, “the same year that Maoist guerilla raged a People’s War in Nepal. It lasted a decade. This bird watching site came to a halt after the peace treaty [was] signed, as there were transport strikes.” Raj is no longer with Lumbini: “I feel lucky to join WWF Nepal in 2014, because Nepal experienced the horrific earthquake in 2015, and from September 2015 our borders were
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blocked for six months by the India biased political party. Tourism came to a dip following all these. It is still struggling to come its feet.”

Asia: India versus the U.S.

The major difference in ecotourism context in the U.S. is that there are few natural areas that have not already been by claimed by either the public or private sectors. By contrast, in India, there still exist untapped forests where local populations live and lay claim to. Nomito recalled the early beginnings of founding the Adventurers, “The activity in the western Ghats was almost nonexistent. The Adventurers’ biggest challenge was to make Western Ghats the destination.”

Central America: Costa Rica versus the U.S.

One key difference between Costa Rica and the U.S. is the establishment of non-profits, where often times, organizations are legally registered in the U.S., but operate in Costa Rica. Another difference is Nectandra’s use of eco-loans, where host community members are provided no-interest loans to purchase land pieces to conserve. Luis explained how there is no monetary interest, but rather, “community partners and eco-loan beneficiaries agree to pay ecological interest, which is all the time, money and other resources they put into restoring the land they've acquired and educating the general public on the importance of investing in watershed protection and forest conservation [and] restoration.”

South America: Chile versus the U.S.

Although the private sector was an original driver for founding the Patagonia Guide School because of their need for qualified guides, the role of large corporations is non-existent. This is in stark contrast to the U.S., whose economy is largely centered on
big businesses. The Guide School coordinates with small businesses instead. Francisco attested that these provide good models for the graduates from the school who will be starting small businesses of their own. “Big corporations don’t pay well and don’t treat employees well. […] And anyway in Patagonia there are no large corporations.”

**South America: Brazil versus the U.S.**

Felipe’s organization operates in close proximity to a national park, however it is important to note that “the organization does not have a formal position with respect to the various levels of government.” In fact, much of Fertile Crescent’s work involves advocating to governments for more inclusive conservation efforts: “[We] are always willing to contribute to the actions that are positive for the environmental protection and manifesting its critical position when contrary decisions are made to environmental causes or adversely affect traditional and indigenous populations.” For economic impact techniques, we see a difference in U.S. context, as Fertile Crescent uses “the principle of Payment for Environmental Services, contributing to improve the income of participating farmers,” and thus Felipe pointed out that “there may be significant local differences between the two countries.”

**Discussion**

The information presented in the Results section of this paper revealed the complexity in analyzing cross-cultural contexts for implementing CBET models in the U.S. From the results, the challenges and opportunities are more easily identifiable, and so are interpreted further in the following sections. This analysis is complimented with a case study in Bar Harbor, Maine, an island community surrounded by Acadia National Park.
Challenges of Implementing CBET in U.S.

Perceived Need as a Wealthy Country

CBET models have become popular in the Global South as a means to address poverty, in tandem with environmental conservation. In a wealthy country like the U.S., with the 19th highest GDP per capita in the world (CIA, 2015), the perceived need of such models are much less, as compared to the Global South. From the examples outlined in the Results section, much of the Ashoka fellows’ organizations’ success is thanks to innovative ways to addressing economic needs in host communities: Village Savings and Loan Associations, livestock enterprise projects, family planning, and malnutrition initiatives in Uganda; eco-loans for land purchase in Costa Rica; and Payment for Environmental Services for farmers’ incomes in Brazil. The involvement of the World Bank in the Global South has also contributed to success for CBET, as in Indonesia, where Bina Swadaya hosted a new World Bank Director for one week, and gained support from this global organization.

Competition of Hospitality Conglomerates

Another obstacle to implementing CBET in the U.S. is the competition of the existing and well-established hospitality industry. One of the keys to success of The Guide School in Chile, for example, was the absence of any competition or large corporations in Patagonia, allowing the graduates to create their own successful small businesses that offer a variety of tourism services. In the U.S., the concept of ecotourism dates back, at least, to the implementation of the first National Park in 1872. The private sector has been creating and expanding complimentary services since, from hotels, to restaurants, to tour companies. Breaking into a pre-established market can be difficult if
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supply is currently meeting demand, as Bambang from Indonesia advised, “like many ecotourism business, if you start ecotourism business in the U.S. it is good to identify the need of this kind of tourism from the demand side. Then identify the availabilities of existing opportunity to meet with the demand.”

Opportunities for Implementing CBET in U.S.

Stable Government for Business Operations

“Tourism service is a business that flourishes in a safe, secured and comfort[able]” environment, attested Raj from Lumbini Crane Conservation. As was seen in Nepal and Indonesia, and as in many countries across the Global South, a major obstacle to implementing and maintaining ecotourism social enterprises is political upheaval and corrupt governments. The U.S.’s long-standing democratic and stable government makes it a safe destination for tourists, and also provides a stable foundation for establishing businesses. Luis identified the biggest challenge to founding Nectandra to be “establishing legal status in order to be able to work in Costa Rica as a non-profit constituted in the U.S.”

Strong Presence of National Parks

Many of the successful CBET models in the Global South that were analyzed are located within close proximity to national parks. Especially for Nectandra, Alvaro was able to have expertise and professional connections from his 30 years of working within Costa Rica’s National Parks system. The U.S., with its 411 park sites of over 84 million acres, and more than 300 million visitors in 2015 (National Parks Service, 2016), provide a secure market for CBET clientele. Thanks to the variety of locations and types of national parks, state parks, and protected areas across the U.S. states and territories, this
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appeals to a variety of nature-based tourism enthusiasts: ACE tourists, Adventure tourists, Alternative tourists, Consumptive tourists, Hard ecotourists, Soft ecotourists, Restoration ecotourists, and 3S tourists (see Glossary of Terms in Annex I for market definitions).

**Well-Developed Private Sector**

Although the private sector can be seen as an obstacle to establishing CBET in the U.S., it also has the potential to play a supportive role to implementation and longevity. This can be accomplished through funding models, as was done in Indonesia with Exxon, BP, Coca-Cola, and Chevron, and in Brazil for PES projects. Another alternative is through operations partnerships, as in Uganda and Costa Rica with local tour companies.

**Freedom of Civil Society Organizations**

The U.S. has a long history of civil society engagement and protection, since the First Amendment in the Constitution allowed for the Right of Association several hundred years ago. This has created a country culture of citizens organizing and sometimes protesting to achieve social, economic, and environmental justice. In many developing countries, governments’ suspicions of civil society organizations have often thwarted attempts to implement CBET, as was the case in Indonesia with Bina Swadaya. Bambang identified the ideal context for CBET success to be “strong commitment and persistency to empower marginalized communities. Broad networking and capability to organize [the] network into powerful resources. […] And be] able to organize a team to internally manage [the] organization whilst the leader manages [the] external network and stakeholders.”
Rural Communities

Although the U.S. is ranked as one of the wealthiest countries in the world, there are several populations within the country who have limited access to economic opportunity. In particular to ecotourism areas, rural populations surrounding national parks could greatly benefit from CBET: “Economic globalization and the decline of the family farm […] have contributed to […] ‘America’s Rural Ghetto.’ Rural poverty has become as intense, if not more so, than that found in the United States’ inner cities, and it has stubbornly resisted a variety of attempts at mitigation through economic development policies” (Lyons, 2000). As Francisco, who ran a successful CBET model in Chile asserted, “Especially in places like Montana and Wyoming, there’s a lot of protected lands, but very few people. This is very similar to Patagonia.” Addressing rural poverty through entrepreneurial mechanisms has become popular over the past couple decades in the U.S., through the “development of business incubation programs, microenterprise programs, rural enterprise zones and empowerment communities, home-based business initiatives, and regional marketing cooperatives” (Lyons, 2000). Many of the existing enterprises are related to food production and manufacturing, but could be expanded into ecotourism services, particularly in the areas surrounding Appalachia, where these incubator networks already exist.

Native American Communities

The most marginalized population in the U.S. is inarguably the Native Americans, who in fact were even further marginalized during the foundation of the National Parks system, and so who are directly adversely affected by U.S. ecotourism. Today, where we do see an inkling of CBET presence in the U.S. is actually within Native American
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communities in the western states. The Native American Business Incubator Network (NABIN) is an organization in Arizona that provides direct services to Native American entrepreneurs, based on the principles of social entrepreneurship that address economic opportunity inequities for this target population. One of NABIN’s members, Shash Dine Eco-Retreat, is owned and operated by a Navajo couple. They are located off the grid on the reservation where they grew up, and where their ancestors were forcibly re-located, situated near the Grand Canyon and Zion National Parks. The CBET model of Shash Dine is two-fold: celebrating and preserving Navajo culture, while at the same time providing economic opportunity for reservation residents (Akoto, 2016; Native American Business Incubator Network, 2016; Shash Dine, 2016).

U.S. Ashoka Fellows

It was noted earlier in this study that there are currently no Ashoka ecotourism fellows in the U.S. However, there does exist an extensive Ashoka U.S. fellowship of social entrepreneurs across many sectors that address a variety of issues, from gun violence, to education, to health, among others. When asked what her advice would be to a CBET social entrepreneur in the U.S., Dr. Gladys from Uganda suggested, “It would […] help to seek a support network from Ashoka and other organizations that support social entrepreneurs.” SE presence in the U.S. is prevalent and widely accepted, and could be extended into ecotourism models, utilizing the cross-sectorial opportunities of affiliated social entrepreneur networks. Ashoka Changemakers regularly hosts social enterprise competitions to find and support new ideas in the field, so the opportunity exists for a CBET entrepreneur to gain access for recognition of their model and ongoing support through fellowship.
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Case Study: Bar Harbor, Maine

Bar Harbor is a small island community located on Mount Desert Island, situated off the southeastern coast of Maine. The author lived and worked in this community in concierge services at the only four-diamond hotel property on the island, and so has a vast familiarity of the region, culture, and local economy. The dominant income-generating industries are ecotourism, lobster harvesting, as well as a medical research lab. Acadia National Park comprises the majority of land coverage on the island, and so the local community is very dependent on and affected by seasonal ecotourism. The island has a strong presence of tourism services, including hotels, restaurants, boat tours, educational lobster fishing tours, horse and carriage rides, whale watching, and museums. What defines the “Mainer” culture, particularly on small islands, is accountability to the community, with an emphasis on small business and local ownership. The island community faces challenges of irregular economic opportunity and income, since most employment is highly seasonal – both ecotourism and lobster harvesting – with the winter often times isolating the island from the mainland completely.

Jay Friedlander is a professor of Social Entrepreneurship at the College of the Atlantic (COA) in Bar Harbor, whose work focuses on environmental sustainability. COA is an Ashoka Changemaker campus, and as such, their curriculum is heavily focused on social change. Jay founded Hatchery, a sustainable enterprise incubator that fosters growth of social ventures for academic credit at COA, where students are required to write social venture plans, similar to SIT’s Social Innovation track curriculum.

As a local resident and expert in the field, Jay offered some insight as to what might be the most viable social enterprise to support ecotourism on Mount Desert Island:
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“I think there could be two broad areas that would be especially helpful. One to reduce impact of tourists in terms of energy, waste, et cetera. The other would be to use Bar Harbor as a showcase for sustainable living practices and letting tourists bring those examples back with them. For example, Samsø, Denmark is carbon negative and they get quite a number of energy tourists who learn from their example.” As far as challenges to implementing CBET in Bar Harbor, Jay affirmed that there exist “all of the typical obstacles. Finding a business model that works, operations, community support, building a team to name a few. Also, with the crush of tourists in the summer it is very hard to get people’s attention. Whatever the enterprise was it would have to be additive to the economy versus making things more difficult for local operators.” As a board member for Maine Businesses for Sustainability and the Maine Tourism Association, Jay identified the legal and financial obstacles to be “access to capital and having a compelling enough story to attract investors or grants depending on the profit orientation of the venture.”

Mount Desert Island has the potential to be the ideal hatching ground for CBET. The island community surrounding Acadia National Park, as compared to rural communities surrounding Yosemite, Yellowstone, or Grand Canyon, has greater access to east coast support services and networks – take for example, the concentration of Ashoka SE fellows in Boston, New York, and Washington DC. Jay attested, “Our 2-4 million visitors and proximity to large northeastern cities make us the perfect place to demonstrate possibilities for other communities.” Jay offered a final piece of advice to potential CBET social entrepreneurs on Mount Desert Island, to “chart out their enterprise and competitive strengths and look at tactics others have used to be
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successful.”

**Practical Applicability**

Ecotourism social enterprise in the U.S. is a fairly untapped industry. This study provided the foundation for exploring the possibilities of implementing CBET for addressing social, economic, and environmental justice in the U.S. There are different organizations who could benefit from this study. Ashoka U.S. could recognize the importance and applicability of cross-country social enterprise CBET models, and use this as a basis for election of Changemaker competition applicants whose work focuses on the various aspects of ecotourism. The U.S. National Parks System could utilize this study for taking consideration of civil society involvement of communities located around National Parks. Finally, the local communities themselves should use this study as a starting point for identifying possibilities for local involvement and ownership of supporting tourism services provided to ecotourists in their surrounding areas. This would ideally lead to innovative solutions for social reinvestment into these communities that often times face barriers to economic access.

Francisco from the Patagonia Guide School in Chile has travelled to ecotourism destinations on different continents, and feels confident in the ability of CBET to address community and environmental needs, regardless of the country context: “People everywhere have a willingness to improve and they have a connection to nature. People fall in love with places. In national parks. You see it all over the world.”

**Limitations of Study**

Purely qualitative analysis has its limitations. For one, interviews can be subjective to both the interviewer and the interviewee. In the case of this study, the author
had previous professional connections with most of the social entrepreneurs, and so subjective selection of participants may have affected the questions formulated and the subsequent responses. The interviewees may have demonstrated subjective analysis, because they were asked to speak on behalf of the successes and challenges of their own organizations. Another component of qualitative analysis is that it is time consuming, and so only a few participants and topics could be explored, so this limits the amount of examples that can be drawn and compared. It is for this reason that not all countries on every continent were examined, even though there are obvious differences between Uganda and Togo, for example. Finally, the terms “Global North” and “Global South” are very limiting, and do not portray the complexities of cultural context among countries placed within these two polarized categories.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

This study served as a starting point for exploring CBET possibilities in the U.S. Since there exist a variety of models for CBET that seek to address a multitude of social and environmental issues, it would be helpful to further explore individual communities for individualized solutions to specific problems. For example, it may be the case that Bar Harbor could reduce the environmental impact of tourists on their small island through sustainability models, but for rural populations in Appalachia, their main concern may be access to education for residents that could lead to employment opportunities, or in ranching communities in the western states, their concern may be cultural preservation.

Another area to be researched is the applicability of microfinance and microloans in host communities in the U.S., using methodologies from Global South countries. The U.S. also suffers from a healthcare crisis, so it would be equally interesting to learn how
similar models from developing countries that address community health through ecotourism revenue could be replicated in host communities in the U.S.

**Reflection on Sustainable Development**

The heart of this study was bringing to the forefront that people and communities in the Global South should be recognized as important sources of information and solutions to sustainable development issues. Ashoka fellows from all over the world are innovative leaders in their fields, and can teach countries in the Global North much about community-led methodologies. As Nomito from India explained, “We are fighting a losing battle when it comes to conservation. Speaking and projecting issues and experiences depicting this has enlisted large scale support. […] Grassroots involvement is necessary for […] conservation.”

In regards to community-based ecotourism as a viable solution for addressing issues in conservation, resource management, local economic opportunity, human health, and beyond, Luis from Costa Rica put it best when he said, “If you consider that one of the results […] of restoring forest ecosystems on lands […] is improved protection for water resources, then there certainly is a positive economic impact, given that water makes just about every human activity possible, economic and otherwise.” Luis went on to reinforce the importance of community-based approaches, stating, “The friendship we have built as an organization with our community partners, […] characterized by trust and mutual respect, has had several positive outcomes, including […] responsible follow-through by our eco-loan beneficiaries, such as 100% principal repayment rate ever since we made our first loan to date nine years [ago], as well as following through with their commitments to protect and restore the ecology of the lands they’ve acquired.”
Sustainable Development is a concern for all countries, whether they are developed or developing. In a relatively wealthy country like the U.S., there still exist populations who lack economic opportunity and access, and the country also faces environmental degradation. It is for these reasons that community-based ecotourism may provide a viable solution in the U.S., and depending on host community needs, CBET models from different developing countries could be modified and implemented in the U.S. context. The public and private sectors in the U.S. have formed a solid foundation for national ecotourism, and so contributions from civil society and social entrepreneurs could offer innovations to perfecting this sustainable development approach. As Francisco from Chile rightly stated, “Tourism, conservation, and education are always changing. We always need to adapt.”
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Annex I: Glossary of Terms

ACE tourism: a hybrid form of tourism that combines Adventure, Cultural and Ecotourism; recognizes that many tourism products, such as trekking, combine a variety of experiences, attractions and motivations, and therefore cannot be neatly placed within a single category. 
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

Adventure tourism: usually a form of nature-based tourism that incorporates an element of risk, higher levels of physical exertion, and the need for specialized skills; often hybridizes with ecotourism and other forms of tourism, as in ACE tourism.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

Alternative tourism: tourism that is deliberately fostered as a more appropriate small-scale, community-controlled option to mass tourism in environmentally or socio-culturally sensitive destinations; ecotourism was originally conceived as an environmentally based form of alternative tourism.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

Community-Based Ecotourism (CBET): This term implies going beyond how most ecotourism operations claim to benefit local communities, either through employment or by contributing to community projects, and further involving communities actively. This has been interpreted as anything from regular consultations, to ensuring that at least some community members participate in tourism-related economic activities, to partial or full community ownership of whole ecotourism enterprises. The wide range of interpretation of the conservation and community development objectives of CBET is reflected in the reporting of results. A project that creates a bit of local employment or helps reduce poaching of a few species can be regarded as a success story or a disappointment, depending on what it set out to achieve.
(Definition adapted from Kiss, 2004)

Consumptive tourism: commonly refers to hunting and fishing, which extract or ‘consume’ resources from the natural environment; the term is contentious, since it can be argued that all forms of tourism have both a consumptive and non-consumptive element; the common tendency to equate consumptive with unsustainable is also unwarranted.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

Ecolodge: a specialized form of accommodation that caters specifically to ecotourists; usually a small, upmarket facility located in or near a protected area or wilderness setting; ecolodges are a high profile form of ecotourism accommodation, but account for only a small proportion of all ecotourist visitor-nights.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

Ecotourism: a form of tourism that is increasingly understood to be: based primarily on nature-based attractions; learning-centered; and conducted in a way that makes every
reasonable attempt to be environmentally, socio-culturally and economically sustainable. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Ecotourism organization:** a membership-based, non-government organization that is focused on the promotion and enhancement of ecotourism within a particular jurisdiction; these occur at a global (The International Ecotourism Society), national (e.g. Ecotourism Association of Australia) and sub-national scale. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Green washing:** disinformation disseminated by an organization so as to present an environmentally responsible public image *(Definition provided by Oxford Dictionary)*

**Hard ecotourism:** ecotourism that tends toward longer, specialized trips by small groups within a wilderness or semi-wilderness setting mediated by minimal services; also called active, deep or eco-specialist ecotourism, this constitutes only a very small portion of the total ecotourism sector. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Host community:** a group of people in a small-scale destination, usually permanent residents, who are thought to have a common interest and bond in maintaining a high quality of life for themselves; support by the host or local community is now widely considered crucial for tourism or ecotourism in particular to be successful, and this is often achieved through community control and involvement in tourism. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Iconic attraction:** an attraction that symbolizes and dominates a destination; iconic ecotourism attractions include the Great Barrier Reef of Australia and Kruger National Park of South Africa. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Mass tourism:** large-scale tourism, typically associated with 3S (sea, sand, sun) resorts and characteristics such as transnational ownership, high leakage effects, seasonality, and package tours. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**National park:** often used synonymously with protected area, and used by various jurisdictions as a formal designation to describe a range of protected area arrangements; the term is most effectively employed, however, as the name for an IUCN category II protected area, that is, a highly protected space that is managed to accommodate a sustainable level of visitation; this is the most important type of protected area from an ecotourism perspective. *(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Nature-based tourism:** any form of tourism that relies primarily on the natural environment for its attractions and/or settings; incorporates ecotourism as well as
substantial portions of adventure tourism and 3S tourism, neither of which are necessarily sustainable or learning-centered.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

**Protected area:** a designated portion of land or water (i.e. marine protected areas) to which regulations and restrictions have been applied, thereby affording a given degree of protection against on-site activities that threaten the environmental integrity of the area; protected areas are usually described as being either public or private, and are most commonly categorized according the IUCN classification system.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

**Qualitative paradigm:** a theoretical and methodological framework for research in ecotourism and other areas that builds a complex and holistic knowledge base through the analysis of words; sometimes said to derive detailed information about a small sample of subjects.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

**Quantitative paradigm:** a theoretical and methodological framework for research in ecotourism and other areas that measures phenomena with numbers, and analyses these with appropriate statistical techniques to derive predictive generalizations; sometimes said to derive limited information about a large number of informants.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

**Restoration ecotourism:** ecotourism that focuses on the rehabilitation or reconstruction of degraded environments; provides an incentive for such efforts, and offers opportunities for volunteer participation.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

**Soft ecotourism:** ecotourism that tends toward shorter, multi-purpose trips within well-serviced areas frequented by large numbers of soft ecotourists; also called passive, shallow, popular or eco-generalist ecotourism, this accounts for most ecotourism activity.
(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)

**Social Entrepreneur:** an individual who creates new models for social change, often drawing techniques from the business sector; a practitioner in the social entrepreneurship field (see below definition).
(Definition adapted from Forces for Good, Crutchfield & Grant)

**Social Entrepreneurship:** the application of the mindset, processes, tools, and techniques of business entrepreneurship to the pursuit of a social and/or environmental mission; focus on growth characteristic of business entrepreneurs on the work of meeting society’s most pressing challenges.
(Definition adapted from Understanding Social Entrepreneurship, Kickul & Lyons)

**Sustainability indicators:** variables that provide information about the extent to which a particular destination is environmentally, socio-culturally and/or economically
sustainable; the identification of appropriate indicators and their critical thresholds is a major challenge for operationalizing the concept of sustainable tourism, and ecotourism specifically.

*(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Sustainable development:** development carried out in such a way as to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs; an elusive and complex concept popularized in 1987 by the Brundtland Report, and since used as an underlying principle and objective within many sectors, including tourism and ecotourism.

*(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**Sustainable tourism:** tourism that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs; more commonly perceived as tourism that does not negatively impact the environment, economy, culture and society of a particular destination; ecotourism is a form of sustainable tourism.

*(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*

**3S tourism:** sea, sand and sun tourism, usually equated with mass tourism in a coastal resort setting; ecotourism complements 3S tourism in destinations such as Costa Rica, Kenya and Australia, and overlaps with 3S tourism in activities such as scuba-diving.

*(Definition provided by The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism, Marvell & Weaver, 2002)*
Annex II-A: Interview Materials

Interview with Dr. Gladys Kalema Zikusoka
Conservation Through Public Health
Africa: Uganda

Jessica Bailey: What has been the local environmental impact in your region of Uganda as a result of CTPH? Do you think this environmental impact has the potential to grow into a global impact?

Dr. Gladys Kalema Zikusoka: Reduced disease incidences in the mountain gorillas, reduced human and gorilla conflict, improved conservation attitudes and practices including increase in homes with sustainable agriculture, energy saving cook stoves, women and youth more engaged in conservation and natural resource management. This environment impact has potential to grow into a global impact and has already started where other organizations are interested to learn about the CTPH model and some have stated to adopt the model beyond Uganda.

Jessica: What has been the local economic impact in your region of Uganda as a result of CTPH?

Gladys: Increased households incomes for our Village Health and Conservation Team (VHCTs) through the group livestock enterprise projects, which they have reinvested into Village Saving and Loan Association (VSLAs). Family planning has enabled them to balance the family budget better, and save more money to improve the standard of living.

Jessica: What has been the local social impact in your region of Uganda as a result of CTPH?

Gladys: Improved health care measured by 20% to 60% increase in new users to family planning above the national average of 30%, 50% increase in hand washing facilities, anal cleansing material, drying racks, clean water storage containers and drinking of boiled water, 11 fold increase in referrals of TB suspects, and increased referrals of children with malnutrition.

Jessica: What do you see as CTPH’s greatest success?

Gladys: Changing people’s attitudes to conservation. Increased acceptance of One Health among different sectors.

Jessica: What are the main factors that helped in the successes of CTPH?

Gladys: Being focused, our vision and mission has not really changed since being founded in 2003. Getting buy in from key stakeholders. Remaining creative and open to new ways of solving problems.
Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of Uganda’s government and/or local government with CTPH? Has the government been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to CTPH’s work?

Gladys: The government has been a strong ally because we invited them to launch the NGO in 2003, and communicate with them regularly. They have given letters of support whenever we need to raise funds. I was appointed to serve on the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) Board in 2012, nine years after founding CTPH, and became the first member from the NGO sector to serve on this government board because of our innovative community conservation approach. This paved the way for other NGOs who have now started serving on the UWA Board. UWA adopted our gorilla health monitoring approach of regular gorilla fecal sampling in their annual operational plan. I was asked to be a resource person to develop the regional government, East African Community (EAC) integrated population, health and environment (PHE) strategy based on the work we are doing at Bwindi. Local governments have supported our new One Health approach at the national parks, including Bwindi and Queen Elizabeth National Parks and Pian Upe Wildlife Reserve.

Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of private businesses with CTPH? Are any of the big name tourism players surrounding Uganda's protected areas foreign-owned? Has the private sector been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to CTPH’s work?

Gladys: Tour operators are the main private businesses interacting with CTPH where they send tourists to get a behind the scenes about how the gorillas are being taken care of. We have now made this program within CTPH promoting educational tourism and in turn contributing to the international advocacy goals. Most of the big name tourism players surrounding Uganda’s protected areas are foreign owned. The private sector has been a great ally to CTPH’s work, where we have formed partnerships with about five tourist operators for me or my staff to take tourist gorilla tracking and visit our work, where we charge guiding fees for the educational tourism experiences.

Jessica: What were the biggest challenges to starting CTPH?

Gladys: Convincing people that integrated approaches to conservation and public health, animal and human health work and assembling a team to take on this new way of working.

Jessica: What are some current challenges of operating CTPH?

Gladys: Raising funds for a non-traditional approach. Donors are used to funding single sector models and find it difficult to get fund an integrated model. We have overcome this by educating the donors through getting more engaged in advocacy. We are also strengthening monitoring and evaluation to show that health investments have resulted in conservation outcomes thus demonstrating the value of integrating health and environment.
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Jessica: If a social entrepreneur wanted to start a grassroots social enterprise in the United States in the surrounding areas of the country's protected lands, what advice would you give to them?

Gladys: Remain focused, don’t stop being creative, employ people to compliment your strengths and fill in the gaps, get your team to buy into your vision, and do not shy away from seeking legal advice. As soon as possible hire a team to manage the day-to-day operations so that you continue to be strategic and an innovative leader in your field. It would also help to seek a support network from Ashoka and other organizations that support social entrepreneurs.
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Interview with Bambang Ismawan
Bina Swadaya
Asia: Indonesia

Jessica Bailey: What has been the local economic impact in your region of Indonesia as a result of Bina Swadaya?

Bambang Ismawan: The poor community generally cannot improve their economic status because they do not have access to important resources included financial resources. Among Bina Swadaya impact in local economic is the development and services of micro finance which is access of financial resources for disadvantage people. With 3 community credit banks (micro bank) and 1 cooperative in 2015 Bina Swadaya serves 33,640 clients. Bina Swadaya also initiated Microfinance Services which had 8 branches cover 6,920 customers/groups. These services enable those thousands of groups improve their economic activities by saving and using credit from micro banks and microfinance services which owned by themselves.

Bambang (continues): Base on direct services in microfinance through Banking, cooperatives and non-bank and non-cooperative approaches, Bina Swadaya develop linking Bank and Self Help Groups model (1987 – 2000) participated by more than 1000 Bank offices, 300 NGOs in 24 Provinces (out of 27 Provinces) and serving more than 1 million micro entrepreneurs.

Bambang (continues): Moreover, Bina Swadaya initiated (2000 till now), Indonesian Movement on Microfinance Development (Gema PKM Indonesia), a stakeholder forum on microfinance development participated by Banks, NGOs, Government offices, Real Sectors, Research organizations, etc., conducted 4 national meetings and 1 Asia Pacific Regional Microcredit Summit.

Bambang (continues): As an agriculture country Indonesia did not have its own magazine or book that provided information about farming. Bina Swadaya initiated a magazine called Trubus mean sprout for disseminating information on good farming. Trubus magazine and many of Bina Swadaya agricultural books have become trend setter for various floras, fishery and animal husbandry. It is also trend setter for production of many life skills books. In total more than 5000 book titles have been published by Bina Swadaya. The magazine has impacted more than 300 thousand yearly of flora and fauna farmers gain economic benefits from growing quality products. It also has driven layman/unemployed persons to start farming and enter agribusiness.

Jessica: What has been the local social impact in your region of Indonesia as a result of Bina Swadaya?

Bambang: One of Bina Swadaya’s core competencies is community empowerment. Bina Swadaya has initiated and managed partnership with various parties included national
government, local governments, international agencies and private companies to empower marginalized community through developing and building capacity of self-help groups. It has reached about one million self-help groups consists of approximately 30 million disadvantaged families all over Indonesia. Capacity building included developing capacity in management of microfinance institution, entrepreneurship, and technical skills in agriculture, fishery and animal husbandries.

**Bambang (continues):** Bina Swadaya magazine and books have also successfully promoted public awareness to concern to their environment especially through growing and loving floras and fauna. Trubus magazine has trained more than 13 thousands persons in growing various productive crop and animals, while training on Self Help Group facilitators has trained more than 40,000 persons.

**Jessica:** What do you see as Bina Swadaya’s greatest success?

**Bambang:** By next year Bina Swadaya will reach 50 years of ages cover the following: Ability to sustain its work for the deprived community by capability to transform into a self-reliant social organization (social enterprise); Capability to advocate the government so that it positions NGO as government partner in fighting poverty; Capability to educate public on quality farming and agribusiness; Capability to write and develop network, in collaboration among NGOs, Private and Government institution to empower marginalized population

**Jessica:** What are the main factors that helped in the successes of Bina Swadaya?

**Bambang:** Strong commitment and persistency to empower marginalized communities. Visionary and inspirational leadership. Broad networking and capability to organize network into powerful resources. Continuous innovation/new initiatives. Capability to manage fund for organization sustainability. Able to organize a team to internally manages organization whilst the leader manages external network and stakeholders.

**Jessica:** Could you describe the interactions of Indonesia’s government and / or local government with Bina Swadaya? Has the government been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to Bina Swadaya’s work?

**Bambang:** The relationship of Indonesia’s government and local government currently can be said as neutral or tend to be an ally. Some local governments, national ministries and government bodies are partners of Bina Swadaya in capacitating the poor people to improve their own life.
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Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of private businesses with Bina Swadaya? Has the private sector been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to Bina Swadaya’s work?

Bambang: At present quite many private businesses seek out partnership with Bina Swadaya. These partnerships mostly may not be driven by businesses’ genuine intention to empower marginalized community but because of government regulations to share a portion of business profit to community through Corporate Social Responsibilities programs. However, such partnership can scale up Bina Swadaya programs and impact on marginalized community economic capability. For example, one partnership with private company had capacitated disadvantaged groups with life skills and organizing skills. These groups are now Bina Swadaya partner in a fashion business which is able to serve demand from customers in some countries outside Indonesia.


Jessica: What were the biggest challenges to starting Bina Swadaya?

Bambang: Bina Swadaya started in the era when the government had tight control towards community and community organizations. Quite often Bina Swadaya’s activities (initially as a non-governmental organization) with community groups were suspected as activities that endanger government security and were suspended by local government security officers. The non-governmental organizations at this time perceived as opponent of government. With human relations, network capability and strategic thinking of Bina Swadaya’s leader this situation could be managed. Even the community development work of Bina Swadaya later adopted by the national government by publishing a regulation that accommodate activities of such kind of organizations and called these organizations as Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat (Self-help Community Organizations) which work together with government in combating poverty.
**Jessica:** What are some current challenges of operating Bina Swadaya?

**Bambang:** Common business challenges such as the decline of printing industries (magazines and books) which change to digital information. This situation challenges Bina Swadaya to transform its printing businesses into electronic commerce. Some other challenges rotate to appearing opportunities like: encouraging Universities functioning as integrator for communities empowerment in their surroundings, applying their function as learning center, research institution and community development. Based on the newly established Village Law, how to develop 74,000 villages for self-reliance and prosperous.

**Jessica:** Among other companies, Bina Swadaya operates an ecotourism business that focuses on local and international destinations. If a social entrepreneur wanted to start an ecotourism social enterprise that focuses on community-led solutions with rural populations in the U.S., what advice would you give to them?

**Bambang:** In operating ecotourism, Bina Swadaya develops Cultural – Environment and Development Exposure Program (CEDEP). It is an educational business focuses on local and international destinations. This program conducted to facilitate learning of visitors domestically, from abroad and visitors from Indonesia to other countries. The subjects may be agriculture, plantation, fishery, animal husbandry, community empowerment, microfinance, etc. The participants can be students, community development activists, government officers, head of villages, etc. We are very proud when a new World Bank Director joined a special week live in rural Java to learn the life of Javanese society. After the program he wrote to the President of The World Bank suggested every new World Bank Director has to start live in the rural family before functioning as Director. Like many ecotourism business, if you start ecotourism business in the US it is good to identify the need of this kind of tourism from the demand side. Then identify the availabilities of existing opportunity to meet with the demand. In our experiences there are a lot of opportunities to match the supply and demand.
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Interview with Rajendra Suwal
Lumbini Crane Conservation
(Nepal Nature Travels, WWF Nepal)
Asia: Nepal

Jessica Bailey: Could you briefly describe the necessary steps to register a business in Nepal?

Rajendra Suwal: Registrar’s Office, Department of Commerce – General Registration with the operation and management plan; Registration with Department of Tourism for specific business in travel and tourism; Registration with Nepal Rastra Bank (Government Bank) for foreign Currency exchange permit; Registration with the tax office; Registration for the Personal Account Number (PAN); Registration for Value Added Tax (VAT)

Jessica: What are the differences in the registration process as a Nepalese citizen, versus if you are a foreigner?

Raj: Nepal is a foreign investment friendly country now. The extra process for a Foreigner is required to register with the Department of Immigration for work permit visa and are required to pay extra amount of visa fee. [www.lawcommission.gov.np](http://www.lawcommission.gov.np)

Jessica: Could you share a rough estimate of total start-up costs and the first few years operating expenses?

Raj: It is about 15,000 USD as a start-up capital on the first year. We shared among six partners. For six month we were housed at free of cost at our Chairmans Place, who is a renowned Forester turned tourism entrepreneur.

Jessica: What were the sizes of your businesses? What customer base was required to keep your businesses successful?

Raj: It is rather a medium size turn over with a gradient from US$ 20K to US$ 50 K in a year. Our business did not do well after 2006; it is due to civil unrest for over four years after the peace treaty with Maoist. At the end of 2012, I took over the business from other six partners. I feel lucky to join WWF Nepal on 2014 Nov, because Nepal experienced the horrific earthquake in 2015 April, and from September 2015 our borders were blocked for six months by the India biased political party. Tourism came to a dip following all these. It is still struggling to come its feet.

Raj (continues): We are a very specialized company providing support on nature based business. Bird watching, environmental issue expert (ornithologists, botanists, GIS specialist, forestry, ecology and other experts as and when required basis). We provided
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expertise to BBC Natural History Unit for filming Planet Earth Series filming the weather pattern of Himalaya and Mt. Everest using Helicopter for aerial shots and as well as from ground shots. Provided expertise and logistics support to film red panda, Demoiselle Crane Migration over the Himalaya. Provided expertise to publish Nepal Biodiversity Resource Book 2006 for UNEP/ICIMOD. Management Plan of Khaptad National Park for Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation. Most of our work was with BBC’s several branches (Manchester, London, Bristol). Provided logistic support for David Grubin Production for the The Buddha. Provided expertise for field trips and lecture to Future Generations, Principia College,

Jessica: What were unforeseen challenges of getting business off the ground?

Raj: Tourism service is a business that flourishes in a safe, secured and comfort. Above that it is the startup capital that will determine the ability to venture in a business. My first business venture was to establish a bird watching camp in Kosi Tappu a wetland site famous for bird watching in the year 1996. That is also in partnership with five friends. This is the same year that Maoist guerilla raged a People’s War in Nepal. It lasted a decade (1996 – 2006) and they came in to the power. This bird watching site came to a halt after the peace treaty signed as there were transport strike every now and then followed by the 2008 August flood in Koshi River by breaking the levee.

Raj (continues): We established Nepal Nature dot Com (P) in 2003 to cater to the nature and culture enthusiasts foreigners. We were six partner all who is who in the natural world. Our work was based in the wilderness of Nepalese mountains and the jungles of plain. Travelling was risky due to safety reason. And tourism was in the lowest. All the country has issued travel risk advisory for Nepal. Our first hit was filming the migration of Demoiselle crane in Jomsom, a trans-Himalayan region. The security consultants of BBC NHS somehow permitted filming just because that the ground situation was safe here.

Jessica: What impacts, positive and negative, has the business had on the community and environment?

Raj: Planet Earth a sequel produced by BBC in partnership with Discovery Channel and NHK became one the most popular sequel in the natural documentary. So the impact of Planet Earth was worldwide on information sharing and promoting “The Mountains” on the natural history of Nepal.

Jessica: Who are your customers? Chinese, Indian, American, Nepalese, other?

Raj: Mostly BBC based i.e. UK nationals, some US based companies and NHK of Japan. And United nations Environment Foundations (UNEP)/ International Centre for the Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) is a bilateral, multilateral organization. For bird watching and wild photography mostly US citizens and some from Denmark. And US based universities and colleges for lectures, field trips and logistics.
Jessica: Do you have partners in US that are part of the business and/or assist you in marketing the business?

Raj: Not really as partners but of course well wishers and referees

Jessica: What advice do you have for collaborating across countries?

Raj: More than willing to partner and back stopping for a better business outcomes to explore the nature and cultural history of Nepal.
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Interview with Nomito Kamdar
(On behalf of SLN Swamy)
The Adventurers
Asia: India

Jessica Bailey: Local people make Adventure Allied products like rucksacks, sleeping bags, ground level chair and tents, which they sell. In what ways has the private sector and other businesses partnered with the Adventurers?

Nomito Kamdar: Adventure allied products is a concern which make adventure equipment. All the people who make the products are local and people of the Western Ghats. Adventure Allied products have won contracts from various government departments, organizations, police academies, national cadet corps etc. The marketing has been taken up Karnataka consumer cooperative federation, business houses and cooperative societies.

Jessica: The Adventurers work often with the government of India. In what ways has the public sector played a vital role to the success of your organization?

Nomito: In a country like India to reach out large scale it is very important to work with the public sector for large scale impact. Through the education department we have been able to reach out to students, teachers and heads of institutions.

Nomito (continues): Forest department together with us have explored trekking corridor in the western Ghats, giving us an opportunity to share the forests with other cross sections while providing vital information about the forests to the department.

Nomito (continues): The support of the tourism department in Karntaka and government of India has resulted in establishing and operation of the unique outbound training center in the Western Ghats. Indian institute for adventure Applications, Karnataka Janapada and Yakshagana Academy is for the tribal people of the western Ghats working with the Academy. We have been able to revive the cultural identity of the people of the western Ghats. Kannada Culture Department. Youth Services Department. Youth services have involved urban and rural youth in the activities of The Adventurers who have then become involved in the conservation of the western Ghats.

Nomito (continues): While sharing the issues involving related to pollution the Karnataka pollution control board have involved children from urban and rural areas in camps enhancing environmental awareness. While honing their skills at training programs various police personnel of the Karnataka State police have heightened their sense of environmental consciousness. Department of Environment and Forests. Department of Information and Publicity. Involving media persons in training program to put the Western Ghats on the agenda media at national and international level.

Nomito (continues): Worked with 400 government and private schools, both from urban and rural areas, public and international schools. Karnataka State Physical Education Teachers Association. Karnataka state Head Masters teachers association – environmental awareness programs for heads of institutions. Navachetana organization for people with disabilities. Raichur developed adventure therapy based programs for children with mental challenges. People’s Trust, Doddaballapur worked with children of rural areas for rock climbing, trekking and watersport activities. Anatha Shishu Nivasa, Shishu Mandir - created opportunities for orphaned children to participate in camp including fun and learning. Trainer’s forum, Bangalore Little Theatre. Shared experiential training methodology with various other trainers. World Vision, Sama foundation developed therapy and awareness programs for persons with disabilities. Bosco vocational training for destitute children from Bosco centers resulting in them taking up ecotourism as profession resulting in Reversal of giving.

Jessica: Your organization is very large: 40 state level branches, 35 international liaisons and 35,000 members. What has been the most effective way for achieving this scale? Do you think large scale is necessary for the success of a social enterprise?

Nomito: We are fighting a losing battle when it comes to conservation. Speaking and projecting issues and experiences depicting this has enlisted large scale support. Providing outbound experiences in the western Ghats generating love for it, translates into conservation mind set. Grassroots involvement is necessary for the conservation.

Jessica: What were the biggest challenges to starting the Adventurers?

Nomito: The activity in the western Ghats was almost nonexistent. The budding activity was mostly for practices before the ventured into the Himalayas. The Adventurers biggest challenge was to make Western Ghats the destination. Its work created a field that has now many players.

Jessica: Venky told me a little bit about the GO GHATS biking awareness raising campaign. Can you tell me more about how you came up with this idea? What outcomes and impact do you hope to have after October?

Nomito: Go Ghats, a participatory action, is promoted by The Adventurers, A wilderness School. In October 2016, Go ghats is planning a 22 day experience of the Western Ghats including international, national and state wide participants. Commencing in Belgaum
and concluding in Bangalore, the experience will take on as a celebration for the expected 1,000 participants.

**Nomito (continues):** In each of the halting places, over 5,000 people will gather each evening for seminar, photo exhibition, folk art presentation, showcasing grass roots action by local persons. Culminating in a public hearing in Bangalore including all the stake holders of the Western Ghats, eminent persons will lead the interaction and distil a action plan that will then reach the grass roots of the western Ghats. About 15,000 people are expected to be a part of the Public hearing. This event is expected to reach out to 1,500,000 directly. The impact will snowball and reach out to a very large population living in the western Ghats of Karnataka.

**Nomito (continues):** The example will be precedence for Karnataka which will then be emulated across the country. Print and electronic media will be come involved at national and international level. The ripple will affect all regions where the participants will be from, nationally and internationally.
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Interview with Luis Villa
(On behalf of Alvaro Víquez)
Nectandra Institute
Central America: Costa Rica

Jessica Bailey: What has been the local environmental impact in your region of Costa Rica as a result of Nectandra?

Luis Villa: Thanks to our Eco-Loan Program, which provides interest-free land acquisition financing to local community water management associations and other community-based organizations, around 560 acres of land within and around Costa Rica's upper Balsa River watershed have been protected. The protection of this land means conserving the existing forest on it, restoring it where it has been cut down, and bolstering protection for the sources of drinking water for several communities with a total population of approximately 16,000 people.

Jessica: Do you think this environmental impact has the potential to grow into a global impact?

Luis: Yes, I believe it does have this growth potential. However, it depends on global society accepting the basic philosophy behind "eco-loans", which is that humans must start to make substantial investments in the protection and restoration of our planet's natural capital in order to reverse its erosion resulting from our highly extractive actions and activity. Nectandra Institute puts this philosophy into practice with our Eco-Loan Program by not charging monetary interest on these loans. Instead our community partners and eco-loan beneficiaries agree to pay ecological interest, which is all the time, money and other resources they put into restoring the land they've acquired and educating the general public on the importance of investing in watershed protection and forest conservation/restoration.

Jessica: What has been the local economic impact in your region of Costa Rica as a result of Nectandra?

Luis: It's difficult to measure, but if you consider that one of the results (mid to long term) of restoring forest ecosystems on lands purchased by our partner communities is improved protection for water resources, then there certainly is a positive economic impact, given that water makes just about every human activity possible, economic and otherwise.

Jessica: What has been the local social impact in your region of Costa Rica as a result of Nectandra?

Luis: Perhaps the most obvious social impact as a result of Nectandra Institute's
watershed protection and forest conservation work has been an increase in solidarity between several community water management associations in and around the upper Balsa River watershed. A concrete example of this is the consortium of these associations that was formally created thanks in large part to Nectandra's guidance and support. This consortium, known as Liga CUENCA (an acronym that translates to League of Communities United for the Protection of Water) has successfully secured seed capital for its own Eco-Loan Program and has engaged a hydrogeological study of the region in order to identify high priority conservation/restoration areas based on where groundwater recharge zones are located.

Jessica: What do you see as Nectandra’s greatest success?

Luis: The friendship we have built as an organization with our community partners. This relationship, characterized by trust and mutual respect, has had several positive outcomes, including the creation of Liga CUENCA mentioned earlier and responsible follow-through by our eco-loan beneficiaries, such as 100% principal repayment rate ever since we made our first loan to date (9 years) as well as following through with their commitments to protect and restore the ecology of the lands they’ve acquired.

Jessica: What are the main factors that helped in the successes of Nectandra?

Luis: Doing our best to avoid being a paternalistic organization, while at the same time trying to strike a good balance between using in-house strategies and local/community partner input to achieve our mission and organizational goals.

Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of Costa Rica’s government and / or local government with Nectandra? Has the government been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to Nectandra’s work?

Luis: Our main governmental support has come from the Municipality of Zarcero, which largely coincides with the limits of the upper Balsa River watershed. The Municipality has provided logistical and financial support for some of our educational initiatives as well as the Liga CUENCA's hydrogeological study.

Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of private businesses with Nectandra? Are any of the big name ecotourism players in Costa Rica foreign-owned? Has the private sector been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to Nectandra’s work?

Luis: Costa Rica Expeditions, one of the country's most successful eco-tourism companies, is a big source of tourist referrals for our sister organization, the Nectandra Cloud Forest Garden and Reserve. The Reserve is one of Nectandra Institute's strongest allies, often making considerable donations to support our work. Additionally, local private business co-ops mostly from Zarcero have supported our educational and community outreach work.

Jessica: What were the biggest challenges to starting Nectandra?
Luis: Establishing legal status in order to be able to work in Costa Rica as a non-profit constituted in the U.S. Winning the trust and friendship of our community partners. Getting these partners and others to understand the concept of and philosophy behind eco-loans, which is an ongoing challenge.

Jessica: What are some current challenges of operating Nectandra?

Luis: As a small non-profit without the name recognition of larger conservation organizations, maintaining and recruiting new donor support is a big challenge.

Jessica: If a social entrepreneur wanted to start a grassroots ecotourism social enterprise in the United States, which involved community outreach and education about the environment, what advice would you give to them?

Luis: Find a way to speak the same language as your target audience or community. For us this meant taking up the theme of protection of local water resources as a way to achieve our founding mission of cloud forest conservation. Knowing that as a small organization with limited resources, we needed to work together with other organizations and groups in order to make a real impact, we decided to team up with community water management associations. These groups, although not conservation organizations per se, are natural allies for Nectandra Institute because in order to protect their water resources, they need to also protect the highland forests that play a critical role in watershed hydrology and the water cycle.
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Interview with Francisco Vio Giacaman
Escuela de Guías de la Patagonia
(Universidad Austral de Chile)
South America: Chile

Jessica Bailey: What were the biggest challenges to starting the Patagonia Guide School?

Francisco Vio Giacaman: The school started as a government program in partnership with a foundation, where funding was 50-50. The private sector needed local guides in the Patagonia area, and this was a project using government funding. Each partner organization had their different goals: conservation, guide skills, etc. The private sector wanted trained people to work well, but they didn’t want to pay well! So it was difficult, because everyone had their own interests.

Francisco (continues): At the end, students had a mind-set to start their own business. Small businesses in the area started to see the graduates from the Guide School as competition. After twelve years since the Guide School started, the most successful businesses in the area are owned and operated by the graduates from the program. It’s difficult to know exactly how many alumni there are today, because there were a variety of trainings. There’s probably 150, but it can be up to 250. For example, one project included a two-month training for older rural women who had lodges for tourists and needed to learn how to cook vegan. Since the Chilean diet is very big on meat, the women needed to learn how to cook for their clients, who many times were vegetarian.

Jessica: The Patagonia Guide School collaborated with tourism-related entities such as national parks and citizen organizations. Can you describe these relationships?

Francisco: There are 19 protected areas in the Patagonia region. Chile has 100 protected areas total. These protected lands make up 20% of the country. In Patagonia, 48% of the land is protected by the government. Two students who graduated from the program now work as full-time park rangers. This employment is year-round and more stable than tourism services alone. The problem is that protected areas never have enough money. In Chile, the government spends less than $1 per square kilometer. Compare that to other countries: in Argentina they spend $8 per square kilometer, and in Costa Rica it’s $26! In Patagonia, there is a lot of protected land, but not a lot of people.

Jessica: In the Patagonia region of Chile, tourist season takes place over a short summer. How did the Patagonia Guide School successfully overcome this challenge?

Francisco: In this region, people talk about tourism for 8 months and work tourism for 4 months. It should be the opposite. During low season, there are more trainings, and we also train our students to offer different prices for services during low season so that they can attract clients year-round. Global warming has made it so there’s less snow, which
has made the tourism season longer, since people don’t want to travel in the winter. The effects of global warming in the Patagonia region in Chile are very obvious.

**Jessica:** In what ways, if any, did large tour companies cooperate with Patagonia Guide School? Or were they always just seen as competition?

**Francisco:** Big corporations, no. We have a lot more cooperation with small businesses. This is better for a lot of reasons. First, the graduates from the school will be starting small businesses, so this provides a good model. Also, big corporations don’t pay well and don’t treat employees well. And anyway, in this region of Chile, there are few if any large corporations.

**Jessica:** Patagonia Guide School developed students’ business skills and connected them to a larger network so that they can successfully run their own eco-tourism enterprises. How many graduates successfully started their own enterprises?

**Francisco:** Small businesses that graduates have started include horseback riding companies, hiking companies, campgrounds, bike rental companies, kayak rental companies, boat tours, and ski services. Most clientele of our graduates are young tourists, 25 – 45 years old, and very active.

**Jessica:** You have reached out to organizations throughout Latin America, in Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, and Costa Rica. How do these country contexts differ from Chile?

**Francisco:** The way I’ve partnered with these countries is by sharing methodologies of working with people in the outdoors. How to take others into the outdoors in a safe way. Once I was invited to Saudi Arabia to teach a course. They asked me to come back to work there. I said no because they needed to learn their own system. Every place is different and needs different methods.

**Francisco (continues):** All countries I’ve worked in are similar in that people everywhere have a willingness to improve and they have a connection to nature. People fall in love with places. In national parks. You see it all over the world.

**Jessica:** The Patagonia Guide School model is easily replicated and adjusted to other environmental and social contexts. If a social entrepreneur in the U.S. wanted to start an ecotourism organization similar to Patagonia Guide School, what advice would you give them?

**Francisco:** I’ve traveled to Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, to Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks. I totally think this could be done in the U.S. Everyone thinks the U.S. is huge and has a lot of money, but they face the same problems for work and resources, and for budget for education and for parks. It’s a different scale, but it’s the same problems. Especially in places like Montana and Wyoming, there’s a lot of protected lands, but very few people. This is very similar to Patagonia.
Jessica: How has your previous work at the Patagonia Guide School led you to your current work at Universidad Austral de Chile? Do you continue to collaborate in any way with the Patagonia Guide School?

Francisco: I don’t like tourism at all. I’m a teacher! I like to climb mountains! This experience [at the Patagonia Guide School] showed me a way to understand tourism. It made me an entrepreneur. But I feel I can also contribute in other ways.

Francisco (continues): Some of my former students are running the school now. The realities have changed since 2002 when the school began. My students need to change too, to adapt the way the programs need to adapt to society. Tourism, conservation, and education are always changing. We always need to adapt.
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Interview with Felipe César
Fertile Crescent
South America: Brazil

Jessica Bailey: What has been the local environmental impact in your region of Brazil as a result of Crescense Fértil? Do you think this environmental impact has the potential to grow into a global impact?

Felipe César: The main project in progress is called "Sesmaria River Project - PSA Hydrous" and enables the restoration of 20 hectares of native forest and conservation of 40 hectares. Its main environmental impact comes from the Atlantic forest protection activities and forest restoration in private areas, particularly in key mountainous locations for water supply in urban and rural populations. Although our scale action is small, the protection/recovery of the Atlantic Forest, being the second most endangered forest ecosystems worldwide, contributes to global environmental improvement.

Felipe (continues): Another important environmental impact relates to our ongoing campaign to protect the Brazilian mountain ecosystems.

Jessica: What has been the local economic impact in your region of Brazil as a result of Crescense Fértil?

Felipe: The project generates temporary jobs, consumption of material goods and local services totaling 370,000 US$, and apply, demonstratively, the principle of Payment for Environmental Services (PSA), contributing to improve the income of participating farmers.

Jessica: What has been the local social impact in your region of Brazil as a result of Crescense Fértil?

Felipe: The social impact is increasing information on environmental issues, particularly the relationship between land management, forest and water.

Jessica: What do you see as Crescense Fértil’s greatest success?

Felipe: The main element of success has been the continuity of the projects, in particular: Rio Sesmaria Project 1 (diagnosis) and Project Rio Sesmaria 2 (PSA Hydride).

Jessica: What are the main factors that helped in the successes of Crescense Fértil?

Felipe: Crescense Fertil seeks to fulfill its independent mission of financial resources, participating voluntarily in environmental events, giving talks to interested groups, participating in collegiate to support the Protected Areas, spreading the importance of
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mountain ecosystems and supporting , with information and guidance to other stakeholders .

Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of Brazil’s government and / or local government with Crescente Fértil? Has the government been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to Crescente Fértil’s work?

Felipe: The organization does not have a formal position with respect to the various levels of government and are always willing to contribute to the actions that are positive for the environmental protection and manifesting its critical position when contrary decisions are made to environmental causes or adversely affect traditional and indigenous populations.

Jessica: Could you describe the interactions of private businesses with Crescente Fértil? Are any of the big name ecotourism players in Brazil foreign-owned. Has the private sector been an ally, an opponent, or neutral to Crescente Fértil’s work?

Felipe: We believe in the private sector as an important contributor to environmental conservation and especially as the financing of PES projects. However, private participation must rely on regulatory mechanisms for the public sector.

Jessica: What were the biggest challenges to starting Crescente Fértil?

Felipe: The main challenges were to win credibility in the society including performing voluntary actions , and guarantee funds for the development of the institution and its projects in a professional manner

Jessica: What are some current challenges of operating Crescente Fértil?

Felipe: Keep the cash flow needed for the functioning of the institution and have the ability to raise new funds while it manages ongoing projects

Jessica: Crescente Fertil operates near Itatiaia National Park. If a social entrepreneur wanted to start a grassroots social enterprise in the United States near one of our national parks, what advice would you give to them?

Felipe: There may be significant local differences between the two countries, but in general such companies need to valorize the workers / local organizations and their leaders need to have a history of collaboration with the park, as well as extensive knowledge of their reality.
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Interview with Jay Friedlander
Professor of Social Entrepreneurship at College of the Atlantic
North America: Maine, USA

Jessica Bailey: You’ve written an ecotourism business plan for a college in Costa Rica. The focus of my thesis is how ecotourism social enterprises in the Global South could be replicated in the Global North. What similarities do you see in implementing ecotourism models in Costa Rica and the U.S.? What do you see as the most significant differences between these country contexts in ecotourism planning and implementation?

Jay Friedlander: I’m afraid my research into this is too old to draw any significant conclusion. I really think it does depend on the community and country. There have been large companies as well as small companies interfacing. From a policy, immediate economic development point of view - large scale tourism (cruise ships, buses, etc.) is very tempting because of the money and numbers involved. However the quality of those money in terms of local economic impact is questionable.

Jessica: The local businesses in Bar Harbor offers tourists many products and services – from educational lobster boat tours, horse-drawn carriage rides, retail shops, restaurants, etc. What do you think would be the most viable social enterprise to support ecotourism on Mount Desert Island?

Jay: I think there could be two broad areas that would be especially helpful. One to reduce impact of tourists in terms of energy, waste, etc. The other would be to use Bar Harbor as a showcase for sustainable living practices and letting tourists bring those examples back with them. For example, Samsø, Denmark is carbon negative and they get quite a number of energy tourists who learn from their example.

Jessica: Hatchery, COA’s sustainable enterprise incubator fosters growth of social ventures for academic credit. Have any students written social venture plans for ecotourism models on Mount Desert Island?

Jay: No

Jessica: In an article in Entrepreneur Magazine about the traits of entrepreneurs, you’re quoted saying, “There’s an excitement and belief in what they're doing that gets them through the hard times.” What obstacles would an ecotourism social entrepreneur encounter on Mount Desert Island?

Jay: All of the typical obstacles. Finding a business model that works, operations, community support, building a team to name a few. Also, with the crush of tourists in the summer it is very hard to get people's attention. Whatever the enterprise was it would have to be additive to the economy versus making things more difficult for local operators.
**Jessica:** As a board member for Maine Businesses for Sustainability and the Maine Tourism Association, what legal and financial obstacles might an ecotourism social entrepreneur encounter on Mount Desert Island?

**Jay:** I think the biggest obstacle would be access to capital and having a compelling enough story to attract investors or grants depending on the profit orientation of the venture.

**Jessica:** In growing the ecotourism social enterprise presence, what are the competitive advantages that Mount Desert island might have in comparison to other surrounding areas of other U.S. National Parks? For example, compared to Yosemite, Grand Canyon, etc. What might make Acadia and Mount Desert island the perfect hatching ground for ecotourism social enterprise?

**Jay:** Our 2-4 million visitors and proximity to large northeastern cities make us the perfect place to demonstrate possibilities for other communities.

**Jessica:** How would you envision the frameworks of the Abundance Cycle being implemented into community-based ecotourism social enterprises on Mount Desert Island?

**Jay:** The AC could be used to help them both chart out their enterprise and competitive strengths and look at tactics others have used to be successful.

**Jessica:** Your biography on COA’s website says you’re an outdoor enthusiast and that you’ve lived and traveled throughout the world. In your travels, have you ever encountered an ecotourism model that was particularly impressive? What made it stand out?

**Jay:** I think the Energy Academy and the people they attract to Samsø may be one of the most impressive entities I’ve encountered.
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