



Tourism Revenue Sharing on Poverty Alleviation around National Parks of Rwanda: A Case of Volcanoes National Park

Tushabe Emmy

University of Tourism, Technology and Business Studies, Rwanda

Email: tushabemmy@gmail.com

Received December 15, 2019; Revised April 21, 2020; Accepted April 26, 2020

Abstract: *This study sought to examine the role of Tourism revenue sharing in reducing poverty around national parks of Rwanda using mixed research design of quantitative and qualitative techniques. The study found out that revenue sharing from tourism contributes to poverty reduction, income generating activities, provides employment opportunities, infrastructural development and environmental protection. However, it experiences some challenges such as insufficient funding, poor managerial skills of TRS beneficiaries, poor planning and lack of effective involvement of beneficiaries in decision making. The study concludes that the project of sharing revenue has played a very vital role in poverty alleviation. The study recommends that government of Rwanda should work hand in hand with the local people in formation of cooperatives, which will help in catering for their basic needs and engage also in small medium enterprises which will create employment opportunities for them and much more emphasis on vocational training to improve competences in skills, knowledge and attitude.*

Keywords: *Tourism, National Parks, Tourism Resource, Community Development, Rwanda*

1. Introduction

The Millennium Declaration of the United Nations identified poverty alleviation as one of the most compelling challenges the world is facing in the 21st Century and that tourism is already one of the most important sources of foreign exchange earnings and job creation in many poor and developing countries (UNWTO, 2019). The World Tourism Organization is convinced that the power of tourism is one of the most dynamic economic activities of our time can be more effectively harnessed to address the problem of poverty more directly (Wang, 2017).

Of the 100 or so poorest countries, tourism is significant in almost half of the low income countries and virtually all of the lower middle income countries. Tourism is a principal export features in the top 5 for 83% of developing countries and the principal export for one third of developing countries, 80% of the world's poorest, those living on less than one IUS\$ per day, live in 12 countries. In 11 of these countries, tourism is significant or growing by over 2% of GDP or 5% of exports (Susan, 2012).

Tourism can contribute to development and the reduction of poverty in a number of ways. Economic

benefits are generally the most important element, but there can be social, environmental and cultural benefits and costs (Ashley, 2000). Tourism contributes to poverty reduction by providing employment and diversifying livelihood opportunities. This in turn provides additional income or contributes to a reduction in vulnerability of the poor by increasing the range of economic opportunities available to individuals and households (Bush, 2010). Tourism also contributes to poverty alleviation through direct taxation and the generation of taxable economic growth; taxes can then be used to alleviate poverty through education, health and infrastructural development. It should not be forgotten that some tourism facilities also improve the recreational and leisure opportunities available for the poor themselves at the local level (Braman, 2001).

However, (Frederic, 2019) argues that even if tourism is number one export and source of foreign exchange earning in less developed countries, poverty levels have persistently increased. He furthermore argues that with better policies in these developing countries like the policy of revenue sharing with the adjacent communities around tourism attractions like national parks, game reserves, national reserves and aquatic resources, less developed countries have not curbed down the problem

of poverty and wonders whether tourism has done much in alleviating poverty.

In East African region in general, and in Rwanda in particular, the revenue sharing policy provides for ten percent (10%) of total tourism revenue to stir the development programs around national parks for local communities (Tushabe & Habyalimana, 2010). At VNP, 40% of this money is spent to support the construction of schools, health centres and water tanks (Nielsen et al., 2010). The revenue sharing budget in Rwanda was still not enough and estimated at around 113 million Rwandan Francs, an equivalence of USD 176,000. Community projects in areas near the three main national parks of Rwanda which are basically Volcanoes national park famous for Mountain Gorilla, Nyungwe national park famous for Canopy walk and Akagera National Parks famous for the big five animals receive 40%, 30% and 30%, gets the mentioned shares as per revenue sharing scheme (Kagarama et al, 2012).

The policy of tourism revenue sharing of Rwanda seeks to achieve three main objectives; reducing illegal activities in the park, improving livelihoods and poverty alleviation and building trust among the local communities that neighbour Rwanda's protected areas (Athana, 2018). However, a mismatch exists between funded projects and the objectives of the revenue sharing policy of tourism and its implementation. For example, majority of the revenue sharing-funded projects at VNP are social in nature, targeting infrastructure projects such as schools, clinics, water tanks and others but despite all the contribution of the policy, poverty levels continue to be consistent within the people staying around the national parks of Rwanda (Kagarama et al, 2012).

The VNP has significant impact on socio-economic wellbeing of local communities through revenues linked to touristic activities. The national park is a vital source for provision of job opportunities (employment) for part of the local population through different activities taking place both inside and outside the Park. Tourists, mainly attracted by the presence of mountain Gorillas in the Park, have been increasing in number every year during the last few years, leading to local and national economic improvement. Local people benefit through tourism and a range of activities and services offered to tourists (local hotels, transport facilities and other services). The recent restructuring of ORTPN encourages the sharing of revenues from tourism with the neighbouring districts through development of socio-economic infrastructures. However, some people in the ten districts are still not yet satisfied with the level of employment of locals and the sharing of revenues between them and ORTPN; this attributed to some locals not benefiting and the policy still far from reaching its desired objectives and one of them which is improving live hoods which can't be separated from poverty alleviation (Tushabe et al, 2010).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Terminology of Revenue Sharing

Most protected areas, especially national parks in Rwanda, provide opportunities and a range of benefits to host local communities in couple of ways like for example the local communities gain natural products like water from sources of water like rivers and lakes, food in terms of honey from bee hives, herbal medicine from flora, timber for fuel and wood, cultural/spiritual and traditional values, benefits from the environment like climatic conditions and its effect on rainfall, money or income from park and conservation based businesses but also provide a percentage of tourism revenue sharing benefits and profits (Athana, 2018). The key fact is that the policy of revenue sharing is among a few of the types of benefits and opportunities that are gained with both the host and local communities. A recent economic valuation study of the Virunga Volcanoes (and Bwindi forest in Uganda) demonstrated that the value of the continued conservation of these forests outweighs the costs overall, but that much of the value of these forests is realised at the national and international levels, while at the local level there is a net loss. Revenue sharing is meant to promote a more equitable sharing of the costs and benefits of conservation (Kalulu et al 2018).

2.2. The contribution of the policy Revenue sharing to Poverty Alleviation around National Parks

Most countries in the world, especially the developing countries, have put in place ways to maintain, manage and raise their involvement and participation in the world wide economy to foster economic development of inbound tourism and stir international tourism and domestic tourism. Tourism development is viewed as an important tool in promoting economic growth, alleviating poverty, and advancing food security (Bush, 2010). Several research studies have suggested that the tourism industry plays a vital role in bringing out sustainable tourism development and if maintained and sustained properly, tourism can foster or bring out economic growth and development of the local people (UNWTO, 2002). The tourism industry is a key export for almost 83% of developing countries in the world and it is among the most important source of foreign exchange to developing countries after petroleum and other exports. Most Developing countries profit from Domestic and international tourist arrivals and the estimation is to be more than doubled from 1973 to 2000 tourists per the projection (UNWTO, 2002). The tourism industry is composed of a significant several components and parts of the world's growing service sector both in sub-Saharan Africa and contributes 55% of service sector exports through foreign exchange and also the industry minus earning but also brings on job opportunities and creation and facilitates better standards of living of the people (Ann, 2012).

Several different international initiatives and studies have suggested that the development of tourism and other potential tourism resources contribute to economic growth, poverty reduction, environmental protection, cultural preservation, and employment opportunities. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) addresses poverty alleviation as one of its core objectives for tourism development. It also addresses sustainable conservation and preservation of Tourism eliminating Poverty (ST-EP) initiative in aligning the goals of sustainable tourism with activities that specifically reduce poverty.

According to recent studies, tourism and especially the Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership, is a collaborative research project of the International Centre for Eco and Responsible Tourism and thus the Institute for international Environment and Development plus Overseas Development Institute also address the issue of tourism and poverty reduction. To a greater extent the Partnership seems to have worked and an indicator to develop mechanism and strategies for tourism economic growth and development with management that results in increased net benefits for the citizens and the poor people at large. Core goals of these activities and other similar initiatives are aligned with rapid development and Economic Growth. Several Objectives of Eco tourism and sustainability include friendly tourism and community-based tourism with fair and equitable tourism management (Ashley et al, 2001). Potential tourism economic growth and development serves as a tool to generate economic growth and reduce poverty and this is all gained through several unique features of the tourism system (UNWTO, 2002). Tourism portrays an opportunity for greater economic growth and diversification, particularly in most important areas with alternative export options that would stir development and reduce poverty. Travellers from all over the world are mostly attracted to rural tourism areas with much tourism attractions and resources which provide high values of Flora and Fauna, Cultural products and to areas with rich cultural diversity and sightseeing coupled with landscape assets. Most developing countries have in abundance cultural tourism resources, tourism natural heritage resources. Tourism in these developing countries represents a great opportunity for income generation through the conservation, preservation of both cultural and heritage value. Thus, tourism allows the local communities to access material wealth and facilitate themselves to access money and reduce poverty levels (Mahoney et al, 2001). The tourism industry is the main export sector where the tourists (consumer) travel to the exporting country or the tourism destination, which attains or provides great benefits and opportunities for the local poor, thus becoming exporters through the sale of tourism goods and services to inbound tourists. The Tourism industry is labour-intensive, meaning that it employs manual labour which supports a wide and diverse labour market which enables the tourism industry to provide small-scale job opportunities and create income and entrepreneurship opportunities within tourism destinations. The industry also promotes number of both

direct and indirect benefits of tourism for the local poor people, which foster increased market access for rural areas since the development of both accommodation and transport infrastructure like roads and hotels and communication networks for easy accessibility. A number of strategies and measures for tourism development have been proven effective in providing jobs and income opportunities for host and poor groups and local communities (Kalulu et al 2020). Tourism development projects which are seen to be most effective in reducing poverty are those that - Promote job opportunities for the poor in tourism sectors and also focus on providing training for women to raise their levels of competencies and tourism projects that create the establishment of tourism small medium enterprises for the poor (SME's). Furthermore, the projects that supply tourism and non-tourism goods and services to tourism businesses by enterprises that are owned by or employed by the poor local people around tourism destinations. Projects that Promote the direct sale of goods and services to tourists by the poor thus providing market and projects that involve partnerships with local governments to cater and support fiscal strategies that are beneficial to the poor, which include revenues like taxes or levies that are used to construct road infrastructures, telecommunication and communication networks, village and remote schools, health or sanitation improvements and mostly importantly promote voluntary donations and support from tourism businesses and individual tourists, and portray the willingness to invest in some infrastructure and local capacity building among many others. (Babington, et al., 1999).

The benefits of tourism from the economic perspective are the creation and expansion of business and enterprise opportunities for the local poor living around the national parks, increment of jobs/employment and salaries or wages by providing to local jobs and often training of the host or local masses, and the channels of collective income development. Tourism non-economic benefits among many others involve increased capacity building, training to build competencies, there is improved access to services and infrastructure, especially transport and accommodation for example, medical and health care, communication and telecommunication, water supplies, security and transportation infrastructures, and ensuring that the mitigation of environmental impacts and natural resource conflicts are guaranteed (Ashley et al, 1999).

2.3. The Challenges tourism revenue sharing faces in its implementation

The core fundamental of tourism revenue sharing emphasises or centres on the principle of the win-win scenario that sums issues of environmental preservation and conservation and alleviating poverty with emphasis put on developing the local and host communities (Poultney, 2001). In regard to debates and arguments that have been raised for the 'pro-poor conservation and conservation (Renard, 2001) and the currently 'pro-poor tourism' (Yunis, 2000). The techniques and approaches

of pro-poor development and economic growth and the pro-poor tourism emphasis the capacity and ability to jointly promote preservation, conservation and poverty alleviation, with the two most core societal goals as portrayed in the millennium development goals (United Nations, 2009). The principle of sharing tourism benefits stands or lines with the local and host poor people staying close to national parks or parks is vital and pivotal, as it is not the sole basic potential to contributing the key core twin goals but also facilitates a perfect match with the 1992 Rio Agreement that advocates an integration of the concerns of environmental protection and economic development based on free market principles(Encountre,2001).

There is a challenge of inadequate access to information of some local communities, as a result they end up missing. The people staying around parks or the host residents miss face-to-face contact with representatives of the park and people in charge, together with high leaders, especially with authority and representatives at the local council committee that controls revenue sharing and ensures its division of the benefits. In general but in particular, households living close to the national parks have a problem with the inadequate access to representatives and especially key information in line with revenue sharing and its benefits. The revenue ends up in the hands of those who get the information first, they grab the first chance. Communication needs to be improved and all the involved people need to know in advance what is going to happen with the revenues so as to get share of the opportunities (Ahebwa, 2008).

Some local people believe that park decisions are the prerogative of their representatives; others are of the opinion that attendance at the meetings provides no meaningful influence on key decisions that play a vital role to the local people. One elderly village member commented: We lose trust because we realize that our pleas are not considered, and that we have no say, that whenever they inform UWA for the case of Uganda where the same policy of revenge sharing exists, the UWA officials given no reply and in most cases even the feedback delays. It's unfortunate enough that the local communities' views are always ignored and instead told their suggestions are impossible because there is no legal provision for it in terms of a policy for compensation in case of human and wildlife conflicts. In most cases they report back to the local people that the Uganda wildlife authority does not agree to their proposals or suggestions (Kalulu et al, 2018).

It appears that local people are not fully aware of their rights and/or duties. They don't know which aspects of management they can influence, and tend to view involvement in revenue sharing as a privilege and therefore successful representation is enhanced when the represented are able to organise, influence, or even call back their representatives (Tushabe R, et al 2010). In general, however, local people tend to have little opportunities to voice their concerns. For instance, one of the interviewee stated that: There is much corruption

and it's hard to curb it down in the distribution of resources the park management allocates to them. He further mentioned that the corruption within is hard to avoid. Tourism resources pass through a long process and that at every level local people lose almost 50% of the share and no solution so far. It is those in park management who should change the way things are done. Some officials keep silent yet the problem in distribution and division due to the fear of some losing their portion of revenge sharing or excluding them from the benefits others get. In addition, many local people take the irregularities to be so rooted in the social system that cannot easily be corrected and end up settling for the small amount or benefits they get from the policy. A case in point is for example in a few revenue sharing meeting attended, one leader encouraged the local people to not demand for accountability since the practice is not good and it may result into loss of benefits for those who ask questions (Archibald, 2001).

There is uncertainty in monitoring and evaluation Because of these unclear institutional arrangements, even if the institution continues to be used for channelling revenues to the local people monitoring and evaluation of the core activities is far from being effective. As a consequence, people staying around national parks find it hard and some are even unable to have their representatives to account. This has led to gaps for irregularities in the distribution of resources. After the creation of the CPI, it's goal was to foster a mechanism through which the leaders of the park management seeks to portray to the local masses with the economic contribution of conserving and protecting biodiversity and ensuring livelihoods, which intends to create the local people and park relations and reduce poverty levels though both the park management and the local government do monitoring or evaluation as intended for CPI activities. As one key informant from one of the UWA's partner institutions noted (Kalulu et al, 2018).

Multiple stakeholders and power distribution and the revenue sharing of tourism among couple of other elements involves various stakeholders who have different types and various strengths of authority and power. This has led to challenges like Foucault notes and in some of the stakeholders may not provide as a result of differential authority and powers (Goodwin, 1988). This was justified by one study in Bwindi national park, where many stakeholders agreed that extremely constrained margins of liberty in tourism revenue transactions. It's also important to note that the host communities or local residents nor their representatives or leaders have liberty to conclude on key decisions on how local tourism revenues should be shared and benefit the local people. Key to note was also that various decisions have to be agreed by the UWA based upon the requirements that every funded projects should be in line with eco tourism and environmentally friendly and in line and consistent with PA conservation goals and objectives (Ahebwa, 2012).

Note that it has been confirmed and proven that there are some challenges the local people still face in ensuring their share meets their targets and expectations and reaching the most targeted local communities, and/or people staying around and within a targeted community or communities. It is important to set aside adequate or enough resources/revenues for the people staying around national parks, and make legal and competent institutions that fairly include all local people to participate in decision-making process involving the structure and the process of distribution and utilization of the revenue sharing from tourism and other benefits. Furthermore, though that are adamant or not in favour, some government officials, bureaucrats, and some wildlife management leaders are sceptical in involving the host or local masses in the management of the park. This delay portrays some of the management cultures and behaviours, some which range from values, norms, attitudes, several practices, as well as present power relations which affect communities in one way or the other. The Local citizens, based on part or varsity or past experiences may not necessarily be convinced that even if they get involved, outcomes produced may be meaningful (Athán, 2018)

2.4. Modality of Revenue sharing

Tourism revenue sharing has become a popular strategy for integrated conservation and poverty alleviation programs in Africa (Archabald et al 2001). In some African countries, revenue sharing programs have been embraced as a mechanism through which sustainable conservation and poverty alleviation can be achieved in protected areas, which may be highly at danger or threatened (Athán, 2018).

3. Methodology

Given the nature of the study, the study used mixed research design employing both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Primary and secondary sources were employed to obtain data from respondents. Primary sources included two focus group discussions, interviews from key informants and self-administered

structured and semi-structured questionnaires. The secondary sources involved document review of the reports and other related documents from Rwanda Development Bank (RDB), tourism Associations and the chamber of tourism. The results of this exercise guided the subsequent phase which involved a series of key informant interviews of the management and staff of RDB and the Musanze district authorities. The study respondents were selected from the administrative district of Musanze in northern Rwanda and they comprised of the Local communities around the park, park managers and employees of RDB, tourists visiting VNP, and the surrounding park community leaders. The study adopted a purposive sampling method, especially from key informants to enable the study get vivid information from the field. The study population was 400 but the study sampled only 196 key respondents considered adequate to provide reliable data determined using (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The sample included; 12 park staff, 20 tour operators, 20 RDB headquarter staff, 104 community leaders, and 50 tourists. The study also employed a focus group discussion with community leaders and key stakeholder organizations. The researchers used excel as well as SPSS to analyze data into meaningful information. However, the data gathering faced hardships such as the terrain of the park with rugged landscape that made the data collection burdensome, communicating with the local communities was not easy due to the fact that they were spread along the park, did not understand English hence creating a language bottleneck.

4. Results and Discussion

The study was undertaken to answer a variety of questions which included what the contribution of revenue sharing to poverty alleviation around the national parks, the challenges the policy of revenue sharing faces in its implementation and the modality of revenue sharing and monitoring. Literature was reviewed, data was collected and analyzed and eventually presented in tables, figures and narrative.

Table 1: The contribution of revenue sharing to poverty alleviation

Contribution	Frequency	Percentage
Education	30	30.6
Environment protection	10	10.2
Income generating activities	10	10.2
Employment	34	34.7
Infrastructure(health centers, markets, roads)	14	14.2
Total	98	100

Findings reveal that 30.6% of respondents said that education is one of the benefits of tourism revenue sharing where ten schools were constructed, with 56 classrooms. And children access to school easily and according to respondents this has increased the number of children around tourism resources to attend school. This finding echoes the study by Akama (2007), which

confirmed that indeed tourism revenue sharing has contributed much to the education sector where by one of the priorities in terms of projects to be developed are educational infrastructures. 10.2% answered that tourism revenue sharing benefits environmental protection where tree planting, soil erosion control, and fencing in protected areas to limit access by poachers

and other mechanism put in place to curb down adverse effects of environmental degradation. This finding is in agreement with the study carried out by (Kalulu, 2020) which supports the assertion that due to the benefits the tourism industry provides to the communities staying around tourism resources, the residents observe environmental friendly practices like conservation and a forestation. 10.2% said income generating activities where ten community associations supported directly through the revenue sharing scheme and a number of other projects implemented, such as beekeeping and basket weaving. 34.7% of respondents revealed that employment opportunities was a benefit and that most residents were employed in different areas like being game rangers, cleaners, guides among other jobs and this enables them to access money and cater for their basic needs of life. This revelation is in line with several different international initiatives and studies that have suggested that the development of tourism and other potential tourism resources contributes to employment opportunities/jobs, economic growth, poverty reduction

and contributes to environmental protection and cultural preservation. (Tushabe et al, 2010). 14.2% of respondents said infrastructures developments were constructed through revenue sharing. Infrastructures like water tanks, roads, health centres, electricity supply among range of other infrastructures were put in place. These infrastructures according to respondents have eased their way of life since essential requirements of life like water, health centres are brought closer to them thus improving their standards of life. This finding is supported by the studies of (Walter et al 2008) who confirmed that the tourism industry promotes a number of both direct and indirect benefits of tourism for the local poor people, which foster increased infrastructural development of both accommodation and transport infrastructure like roads and hotels and communication networks for easy accessibility

Combination of all these contributions leads to poverty alleviation.

Table 2: Challenges tourism revenue sharing policy faces in its implementation around national parks of Rwanda

Challenges	Frequency	Percentage
Insufficient funds	20	20.4
Poor managerial skills of TRS beneficiaries	20	20.4
Poor planning	10	10.2
Lack of effective involvement of beneficiaries(poor people) in decision making	20	20.4
Lack of access to information	14	14.2
Lack of monitoring and evaluation	10	10.2
Multiple stakeholders and powers distribution	4	4.0
Total	98	100

Findings reveal that 20.4% of respondents said that insufficient funds is a challenge. Funds were still inadequate and this hindered the day to day operations of the activities supposed to be carried out. Respondents aired out that due to inadequacy of funds, some identified projects were not carried out and this affected the residents on accessing some key services from these projects. This finding can be supported by the study done by Njoka (2017), which confirmed that most local residents were either not in support of tourism conservation because they revealed that 10% of revenue sharing is inadequate compared to 90% revenue taken by the park management. When shared directly or indirectly, the funds were not sufficient. 20.4% of respondents revealed that there was embezzlement of funds. Respondents revealed that some income from revenue sharing docket was embezzled by some officials in charge of the fund. This hinders development projects that the fund is supposed to do. In agreement with the above finding, studies by Diaz (2001) assert that local people tend to have little opportunities to voice their concerns. For instance, there is much corruption and it's hard to curb it down in the distribution of resources the

park management allocates to them. He further mentioned that the corruption within is hard to avoid since tourism resources passes through a long process and that at every level, local people lose almost 50% of the share and no solution so far.

20.4% of respondents revealed that there is a challenge of lack of equal involvement of beneficiaries in decision making thus rendering some residents not to participate in important decisions and this affects them as some decisions taken favours the park management and hence their grievances are not considered. In relation to above mentioned challenge, Some local people believe that park decisions are the prerogative of their representatives, others are of the opinion that attendance at the meetings provides no meaningful influence on key decisions that play a vital role to the local people. Ahebwa (2012) states that in most cases they report back to the local people that the Uganda wildlife authority does not agree to their proposals or suggestions and instead they come with their own proposals and suggestions contrary to the local people. 28.6% of respondents revealed that inadequacy of monitoring and

evaluation was a challenge and according to some respondents, this created a gap and a way for the authority to misuse the revenue meant for project development. A similar study carried out (Walter et al, 2008) agrees that there is uncertainty in monitoring and evaluation because of these unclear institutional arrangements, even if the institution continues to be used

for channelling revenues to the local people monitoring and evaluation of the core activities is far from being effective. As a consequence, people staying around national parks find it hard and some are even unable to have their representatives to account and this has led to gaps for irregularities in the distribution of resources.

Table 3: Modality of revenue sharing and monitoring around national parks of Rwanda

Residents' perceptions	Frequency	Percentage
Writing proposals and selecting projects	98	100
Total	98	100

Table 3 portrays that 98 of respondents said that by writing proposals and by selecting projects was the main modality of revenue sharing. The respondents said that proposals are called by the Rwanda Development Board and a project selection process is made at sector and district levels. Sectors are the second major administrative entities which will be autonomous when the decentralization process is complete and are being coordinated by the districts. The park warden revealed that 10% of the revenue share attained from protected areas is put in the fund for community projects in administrative sectors that are close or adjacent to national parks for project developments. This finding is echoed by the study of (Kagarama, 2012) who confirms that the modality of revenue sharing in countries with the policy of revenue sharing found out that the modality of revenue sharing is especially done through writing proposals and selecting projects and the implementers sit to select which proposal is essential and beneficial and is considered first.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1: Conclusion

After data analysis and interpretation, the study came up with the following conclusions:

Revenue Sharing is consistent with a number of Rwandan strategic documents for example the Poverty Alleviation Strategy and the 2020 Vision. Tourism has been chosen and identified as a key driver of economy for the country and should benefit all the players starting from the poorest among communities. Revenue sharing is also in line with the Government Decentralization Policy in that it helps to equip the local communities for their self-development. The findings of the study revealed that the tourism revenue sharing implemented but challenges still occur. These include insufficient fund vis a vis the local community needs and poor managerial skills.

5.2 Recommendations

The implementation phase of the revenue sharing is the most important stage where linkage with the poverty reduction needs to be emphasized to maintain consistency. Government of Rwanda should help local

residents in formation and support of cooperatives societies which will lead to creation of employment in rural areas putting more emphasis on vocational training so as to come up with entrepreneurial skills and start small scale businesses.

The study also recommends to RDB that a schedule of regular supervision and consultation meetings be planned by community in charge of wellbeing to uncover and address limitations for effective modality of the scheme.

References

- Ashley, C., Boyd, C., and Goodwin, H., (2000) Pro-Poor Tourism: Putting Poverty at the Heart of the Tourism Agenda Natural Resource Perspectives No 51, ODI, London.
- Anna Spenceley & Dorothea Meyer (2012) Tourism and poverty reduction: theory and practice in less economically developed countries, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20:3, 297-317, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2012.668909.
- Akama, J. S., & Kieti, D. (2007). Tourism and socio-economic development in developing countries: a case study of Mombasa Resort in Kenya. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15 (6), 735-748.
- Ahebwa, W.M., van der Duim, R., & Nyakaana, J. (2008). Tourism, communities and conservation: An analysis of the tourism revenue sharing programme at Lake Mauro conservation area in Uganda. In R. van der Duim & M. E. Kloek (Eds.).
- Ahebwa, W.M., van der Duim, R., & Sand brook, C. (2012). Tourism revenue sharing policy at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda: A policy arrangements approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 377394.
- Athan Tashobya, (2018) Local communities to receive share of revenues from tourism, New Times Rwanda

- Archibald, K., & Naughton-Treves, L. (2001). Tourism revenue sharing around national parks in Western Uganda: Early efforts to identify and reward local communities. *Environmental Conservation*, 28(02), 135-149.
- Ashley, C., & Carney, D. (1999). Sustainable livelihoods: Lessons from early experience (Vol. 7, No. 1). London: Department for International Development.
- Babington, A. (1999). Capitals and capabilities: A framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Development*, 27(12), 2021-2044.
- Braman, S and Fundación Action Amazonia (2001) Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Tropic Ecological Adventures – Ecuador. PPT Discussion Paper No 6. London: ODI, IIED and CRT.
- Bush, G.K., Ikirezi, M., Daconto, G., Gray, M., & Fawcett, K. (2010). Assessing impacts from community conservation interventions around Parc National des Volcano, Rwanda. Kigali: Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA).
- Diaz, D. (2001). The Sustainability of International Tourism in Developing Countries in WTO & UNCTAD (2001) Tourism in the Least Developed Countries.
- Encontre, P. (2001) Tourism Development and the Perspective of Graduation from the LDC Category in WTO & UNCTAD (2001) Tourism in the Least Developed Countries.
- Frederic Bouchon & Bruce Prideaux (2019). Leadership and Tourism Development in Rural South-East Asia: Analysis of a Capacity-building Project in a Rural Community in Timor-Leste. *Advances in Hospitality and Leisure*, pages 1- 21.
- Goodwin H J, Kent, I J, Parker K T, Walpole M J (1997) Tourism, Conservation and Sustainable Development. Volume IV Southeast Lowveld, Zimbabwe, Department for International Development, London.
- Goodwin H (1998) Sustainable Tourism and Poverty Elimination, A Discussion Paper for the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions and the Department for International Development pp7 London.
- Goudie A and Ladd P (1999) Economic growth, Poverty and inequality. *Journal of International Development*, 11: 177-195.
- Kagarama, J, Bizoza, A., & Kayigamba, C. (2012). Assessment of performance of the revenue sharing implementation during 2005-2010. Kigali: Rwanda Development Board.
- Kalulu, R., & Tushabe, E. (2018). Broadening of Uganda's Tourism Products and Its Impact on the Tourism Industry: A Case of The Batwa Trail in Uganda. *Journal of Research Innovations and Implications in education*. ISSN 2520-7504 (Online) Vol.2, Iss.1, 2018 (pp. 15-24).
- Kalulu, R., Kabera, C., & Tushabe, E. (2020). Rwanda's Innovative Marketing Strategies and Influence on Tourism Development: Case of Northern Tourist Destinations in Rwanda. *Journal of Research Innovations and Implications in education*. ISSN 2520-7504 (Online) Vol.4, Iss.2, 2020 (pp. 70-83).
- Mahoney, K. & van Zyl, J (2001) Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Case studies of Makuleke and Manyeleti tourism initiatives: South Africa. PPT Discussion Paper No 2. London: ODI, IIED and CRT.
- Poultney, C. & Spenceley, A. (2001) Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism, Wilderness Safaris South Africa: Rocktail Bay and Ndumu Lodge. PPT Discussion Paper No 1. London: ODI, IIED and CRT.
- Renard, Y. (2001) Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism: a case study of the St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme. PPT Discussion Paper No 7. London: ODI, IIED and CRT.
- Susan Lynne Snyman (2012) The role of tourism employment in poverty reduction and community perceptions of conservation and tourism in southern Africa, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20:3, 395-416, DOI :10.1080/09669582.2012.657202.
- Tushabe, R. & S. Habyalimana (2010), "From Poachers to Park Wardens: Revenue Sharing Scheme as an incentive for environment protection in Rwanda," Mountain Forum Bulletin, January 2010.
- UNWTO (2002). Tourism and Poverty Alleviation. Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization.
- UNWTO (2019). Poverty Alleviation through Tourism: A Compilation of Good Practices. Madrid: *United Nations World Tourism Organization*.
- UNWTO (2000). Sustainable Development of

Tourism: A Compilation of Good Practices.
Madrid: United Nations World Tourism
Organization.

Walter Jamieson, Harold Goodwin , Christopher
Edmunds (2008). Contribution of tourism to
poverty alleviation pro-poor tourism and the
challenge of measuring impacts.

Wang, K., Hsieh, A., Yeh, Y., & Tsai, C. (2017).
Who is the decision-maker: The parents or the
child in group package tours? *Tourism
Management*, 25, 183–194.

Ynis E (2000) Tourism: A Fertile Field for
Development Cooperation, Speech, WTO
Commission for Africa, Thirty-eighth meeting
/ Seminar on Tourism: a catalyst for
sustainable development, Abuja, Nigeria,
April 2002.