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Abstract

The role of the tourism sector in poverty reduction in the South Pacific Island Countries (PICs) has received little attention by policy makers and researchers to date. The paper attempts to highlight the potential the tourism sector has in integrating poor in the main stream tourism activities and thereby contributing to poverty reduction. By taking the case study of Fiji, the paper suggests pro-poor tourism strategies both at the macro (policy) and micro (implementation) levels to achieve the goal of poverty reduction.
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Introduction

The tourism sector is increasingly being targeted as a major growth sector, with great potential for job creation and reductions in poverty. The sector has generally being regarded as a labor-intensive sector that can lead to sustainable growth and development in many poor developing countries and/or in the poor regions in the developing countries having limited growth options. It is argued that with adequate support from government in the form of infrastructure development and industry incentives, tourism development can reach the remote and poor regions of countries to provide income-generating opportunities to local communities. Such is the strong belief in the potential for the tourism sector to help the poor that in recent times pro-poor tourism growth strategies have been formulated and implemented in poor countries of sub-Saharan Africa trapped in a vicious cycle of poverty (Ashely et al, 2001, Gerosa, 2003; Roe et al, 2004, Spenceley and Seif, 2003).

It is worth noting that the tourism sector is among few sectors, which is common to most countries in playing a role in economic development, with various degrees of importance, including in the most developed, the most populous, and the remotest and smallest island countries such as Niue in the South Pacific. In other words, most countries have the potential to offer something to the tourists thereby generating an effective demand for its tourism products. What is it that makes the tourism product unique in that every country in the world has a competitive advantage?

The source of competitive comes from the fact that every country is unique (location, history, culture, language, natural environment, etc) and therefore the “supply” of each country (with respect to the tourism product) is infinitely elastic. This implies that there are monopoly (uniqueness) rents to be derived. However, it should be noted that the level of tourism activity in every country will
ultimately depend on the international demand and the relative costs of the tourism.

This competitive advantage gives hope to many developing countries, both large and small, in providing sustainable livelihoods to millions of its poor people. The following paragraph, written in the context of Africa, puts into perspective the uniqueness of the tourism sector and its potential to help the poor – but with a caveat.

As an industry it is labor-intensive; it is less vulnerable than traditional sectors; it is non-cyclical; it has a catalytic effect on the rest of the economy; it has lower barriers to entry and creates better and more gender concerned jobs than most sectors. More important: having built on natural and cultural assets and consumed onsite, it can reach the poor in rural areas where poverty is harsher. Nonetheless, tourism development is fraught with problems, and constraints that limit its progress in Africa are evident and not easy to overcome (Gerosa, 2003, p.2).

Though the paragraph is written in the context of Africa, it is equally applicable to other developing countries, including the small South Pacific Island Countries.

The unique natural (environment) and cultural (people and heritage) assets of each country are the source of the competitive advantage for each country and the challenge is to develop its tourism products and reduce the costs in order to build a viable industry. However, tourism is a fiercely competitive industry and a successful industry is dependent on many factors beyond the natural and cultural assets of the country. Since the tourism product is consumed onsite, factors such as the safety of the destination (the law and order situation, risk of natural disasters, threats of terrorism and infectious diseases such as malaria),
political stability, government policies towards tourism development and foreign investment, including barriers to entry, the industry cost structure, and the efficiency of the communication and transport systems to and from the source markets are some of the important factors that determine the long-term survival of the industry.

Against this background the paper analyzes the importance of tourism and its job creation potential in the South Pacific Islands states, with a special focus on the Fiji Islands. Labor intensity in the tourism sector and the extent to which government tourism policies address pro-poor tourism are analysed. Before embarking on this exercise, it is useful to briefly review the trends in world travel and tourism and the likely implications they may have for the South Pacific region.

**World Travel and Tourism Trends**

The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) in its report, *The 2004 Travel and Tourism Economic Research*, highlight the following impacts of travel and tourism on the world economy:

- **World Travel and Tourism Demand** is estimated to generate US$5,490.4bn of economic activity (total demand) in 2004, growing in (nominal terms) to US$9,557.5bn by 2014. Travel and Tourism Demand is expected to grow by 4.5% per annum, in real terms, between 2004 and 2014.

- **World Travel and Tourism Economy** is estimated at 214,697,000 jobs in 2004, 8.1% of total employment, or 1 in 12.3 jobs. By 2014, this should total 259,930,000 jobs, 8.6% of total employment or 1 in every 11.6 jobs. The 73,692,500 Travel and Tourism Industry jobs account for 2.8% of total employment in 2004 and are forecast at 87,450,300 jobs or 2.9% of the total by 2014.
• The World’s Travel and Tourism is estimated to contribute 3.8% to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2004 (US$1,542.1bn), rising in nominal terms to US$2,425.8bn (3.8% of total) by 2014. The Travel and Tourism Economy contribution should rise from 10.4% (US$4,217.7bn) to 10.9% (US$6,927.2bn) in 2014.

• World Travel and Tourism capital investment is estimated at US$802.3bn or 9.4% of total investment in 2004. By 2014, this should reach US$1,401.9bn or 9.9% of total.

• World Personal Travel and Tourism is estimated at US$2,537.8bn or 10.2% of total personal consumption in 2004. By 2014, this should reach US$4,206.5bn 10.9% of total consumption. World Business Travel is estimated at US$595.4bn in year 2004. By 2014, this should reach US$895.3bn.

• Visitor Exports play an important development role for the resident Travel and Tourism Economy. World Travel and Tourism is estimated to generate 12.2% of total exports (US$1,289.8bn) in 2004, growing (in nominal terms) to US$2,655.3bn (11.5% of total) in 2014.

(Source: WTTC, The 2004 Travel and Tourism Economic Research, Executive Summary, 2003, p10)

These statistics indicate that the travel and tourism industry is poised for relatively robust growth over the next ten years and the countries that are ready to take advantage of the expansion will be the winners. In poor countries, both large and small, the expanding world travel and tourism provides an opportunity to implement pro-poor tourism\(^1\) growth strategies for local communities.

While the expected expansion of travel and tourism in the coming decade offers potential for income generating activities for

\(^1\) Defined later in the paper.
developing countries, it is critical to recognize that tourism brings with it a mixed bag of “blessings” and “curses”. The challenge is to maximize the benefits and minimize the adverse impacts on local lifestyles, values, cultures and traditions (which local communities wish to preserve for future generations), and the natural environment. In other words, tourism development must be sustainable, while creating income opportunities for the poor.

As shown below, tourism plays a significant role in the South Pacific Island Countries (PICs) in terms of economic growth, job creation and foreign exchange earnings. Sustainable tourism growth in the island economies, the industry’s potential for job creation, and the extent to which tourism in the island states is pro-poor are the issues examined.

**Tourism in the South Pacific Island States**

It is widely understood that tourism is not a panacea for all development problems, but the critical role of the sector in job creation (ranging from relatively unskilled to skilled jobs), its capacity to reach the poor sections of a community, and to stimulate other sectors of the economy is increasingly being recognised.

Because of their isolation, limited resources and reliance to varying degrees on migrant and off-shore employment remittances and aid, governments of South Pacific Island countries (PICs) view tourism development with interest as a potential source of job creation and poverty reduction. The importance of the tourism sector in the PICs is discussed below.

---

2 Members of Forum Island Countries (FICs) are Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Pacific Forum Island Countries (PICs) include all island Member countries, but excluding Australia and New Zealand.
Table 1: Contribution of Tourism to Employment and GDP in the PICs (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tourism GDP (%)</th>
<th>Tourism Employment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: South Pacific Tourism Office (SPTO)³, 2003

Table 1 shows that tourism plays a dominant role in Cook Islands and a relatively significant role in most of the island states, with the exception of PNG, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu. No doubt, the law and order problems and the high incidence of malaria and infectious diseases in PNG and Solomon Islands are major reasons for the smallness of the tourism sector in these two countries. Cook Islands stands out with tourism contributing almost 50% of GDP. With the probable exception of Cook Islands, the PICs have the potential to expand the tourism sector’s contribution to GDP. The sector’s contribution to employment is disappointingly low for all countries, with Fiji and Samoa doing relatively better.

³ South Pacific Tourism Organization (SPTO), formerly the Tourism Council of the South Pacific (TCSP), has the following Member countries: American Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, New Caledonia, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.
A recent study titled, “The Economic Impact of Tourism in SPTO Member Countries” by Milne (2005)\(^4\) provides useful information on the economic impact of tourism in terms of visitor expenditure, economic linkages, employment and revenue generated from departure and company income taxes. The study recognizes serious limitations of data in most countries\(^5\) but nonetheless fills in useful information on the economic impact of tourism that was not available before in the region.

### Table 2: The Economic Impact of Tourism in SPTO Countries – Selected Indicators (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tourist Arrivals</th>
<th>Visitor Expenditure (US$M)</th>
<th>Total Departure Tax (US$M)</th>
<th>Total Company Tax (US$M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Is</td>
<td>83,333</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>907.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>507,000</td>
<td>413.2</td>
<td>815.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>211,893</td>
<td>501.3</td>
<td>2365.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>436.4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>99,515</td>
<td>229.2</td>
<td>2303.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>59,022</td>
<td>134.7</td>
<td>2281.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>98,024</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>585.9</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1980.3</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>41,208</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>544.6</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>60,611</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>1220.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,173,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,522.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1297.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.932</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) The study was prepared for South Pacific Trade Organisation (SPTO).

\(^5\) A web based survey was conducted to fill in the gaps in the data/statistics needed for the study.
The region as a whole was host to 1,173,260 visitors in 2004 who spent approximately $US1.5 billion dollar, averaging US$1297.90 per visitor (see table 2). In 2000 the total visitor arrivals in the region was 966,404 which increased to 1,173,260, an increase of 176,756 visitors. The total visitor expenditure increased by US$567.7 million in the same period, an increase of 59.4%. The expenditure per visitor rose from US$988.3 in 2000 to US$1297.90 in 2004, an increase of 31.3%.

Similarly the total departure tax in the region increased from US$12.8 million in 2000 to US$20.9 million in 2004. The company tax increased from US$285.3 million in 2000 to US$432.4m in 2004, an increase of 51.6%.

With regards to employment, the study also finds that there are no reliable secondary employment data available in the SPTO member countries to base estimates on. Table 3 shows the wide ranging estimates depending upon your source of data. It is possible that low estimates include direct employment in the tourism industry and high estimates include indirect employment as well.

Despite the limitations of data it is clear that the potential and capacity of the tourism industry to generate jobs in the individual countries is significant.

---

6 Region here refers to SPTO member countries.
7 For details of the economic impact in individual countries, see the Report: Milne (2005).
8 “A sense of the real problems with problems associated with the data comes when analysis is done of the number of jobs created per $US1 million expenditure. Thus the WTTC estimate for Kiribati shows 3,667 jobs created per US$1 million, while even low estimates appear to be exaggerated at 183” (Milne, p21, 2005).
9 The actual employment and the capacity of tourism receipts to generate jobs (jobs/US$1mn receipts) undoubtedly lies somewhere between the high and low estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Labour Force</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
<th>No. of jobs/US$1mn Tourism Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Is</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>61,400</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>39,912</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>58,188</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>3,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>3,250,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>10,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>76,370</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,216,667</td>
<td>36,171</td>
<td>213,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Milne (2005). Also see Milne (2005) for how the lower and higher estimates of employment were calculated and the sources of data used.

The study also analyses the business cost breakdown based on a web survey of selected countries in the region (see Tables 4 and 5). It finds that about 32% of the annual business costs are allocated to labour expense, 39% to material expenses and 30% to other expenses.
Table 4: Annual Business Cost Breakdowns by country (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Labour Expense</th>
<th>Material Expense</th>
<th>Other Expenses</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Milne (2005)

Of the 32% of the labour expense, 76.5% goes to local labour and 63.5% of 39% of material expense is sourced locally\(^\text{10}\), while 60% of the 30% of other expense is sourced locally.

Table 5: Proportion of Total Annual Costs Spent Locally by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Labour Expense</th>
<th>Material Expense</th>
<th>Other Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Milne (2005)

\(^\text{10}\) It should be noted that the purchase of an imported good from a local wholesaler is treated as first round local purchase. It undoubtedly will show greater local content when in fact is not the case.
The study found that not a single respondent of the survey indicated that they have significantly increased local purchases, while a quarter of the respondents stated that they have significantly decreased local purchase with an additional 7% stating that has been a small decrease. This indicates that the tourism industry’s linkages with the local economy is weakening and should be a concern to the policy makers in the countries in the region.

All in all the study shows the economic impact of tourism in the region in terms of visitor expenditure, government revenue from tourism, employment generation and economic linkages. There is generally a positive trend in all the indicators (with the possible exception of economic linkages) showing the increasing importance of tourism in terms of its economic impact in the region.

However, it can also be concluded that the economic linkages of the tourism industry has been weakening overtime and therefore the potential for local job creation in backward linked sectors are weakening as well. This obviously has implications on job creation and income generating tourism activities in rural and village based sectors of the economy where the poor and the vulnerable reside. How could rural sector be more permanently integrated with the mainstream tourism sector? How could tourism directly and indirectly contribute towards reducing urban poverty as well?

**Labour Intensity of the Tourism Sector**

If the governments’ priority tourism policy objective is job creation that reaches the poor and assists in absorbing new entrants to the labour force, it is useful to examine how labor intensive the tourism sector is compared to the other economic sectors. Knowledge of the labour intensity of various sectors of the
economy should assist policy makers in the development of growth-oriented policies. However, labor intensity in a sector is not fixed and may change in response to government policies, real wages, technology, and the domestic and international business environment, among other factors. Moreover, labour intensity may vary across tourism activities within a country, and within the same activity across countries.

A labour-intensive industry is generally thought of as one that relies heavily on inputs of labour relative to capital—but sometimes also relative to human capital or skilled labour—as compared to other industries or sectors. Defined in terms of Employment Output Ratios (EOR), a labour-intensive industry is one that contributes more to total employment than to total output in a particular country (i.e., with an above-average number of jobs per unit of output). The EOR is the ratio of the sector’s percentage contribution to employment and its percentage contribution to output or GDP. A labour-intensive industry is defined as one where the EOR is greater than one. In Table 3 a comparison of the labour intensity of tourism and other sectors is provided for several developing countries and one developed country, New Zealand.

Table 6: Employment Output Ratios (EORs), selected countries and sectors, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>PNG</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-agricultural</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6, the EOR of tourism for all countries is close to unity except for Indonesia and the Republic of South Africa (RSA)\(^{11}\). In addition, tourism is more labour intensive than manufacturing and other non-agricultural sectors in all countries. The agricultural sector is the most labour intensive, with RSA having EOR of 9.7 followed by Thailand at 3.67\(^{12}\).

From a policy point of view, if the government’s priority is job creation rather than GDP growth per se, policy makers in the short to medium term may concentrate on those sectors which are more labour intensive. However, in the long run, it would be imperative to raise productivity in the labour intensive sectors (such as agriculture) having large underemployed and unproductive workers. This will result in labour moving out of agricultural sector but opportunities need to be created in the manufacturing and service sectors to absorb this excess labour.

Turning to Pacific Island countries, how labour intensive is tourism in the PICs and what are the kinds of policies adopted by the PICs towards the tourism sector?

**Labor Intensity of Tourism in the PICs**

A major problem in almost all island states is the unavailability of systematic economic and statistical data to allow thorough empirical analysis. The unavailability of data on sectoral employment and sectoral GDP makes it impossible to compute

\(^{11}\) However, it should also be noted that in many developing countries the agricultural sector (which also employs a large proportion of the population) productivity is much lower than in other sectors, and therefore its contribution to GDP is relatively low. Therefore, the EOR for agriculture will always likely be very high. The larger the employment in agriculture and the lower will be its productivity, the higher its EOR. This is not the kind labour intensive industry one would like to encourage. The higher agriculture’s EOR, the more it will raise the average EOR and make other industries look less labour intensive.

\(^{12}\) EORs in the respective sectors across countries must be interpreted with caution because productivities in the comparable sectors across countries are likely to differ. However, it also likely that productivity in small developing island states with similar economic structures may not differ significantly, it is nonetheless prudent to treat labour intensities across countries with caution. A better approach, however is to use sectoral input-output ratios for cross country sectoral comparisons.
sectoral labour intensities for the PICs. Table 7 provides the EORs for the tourism sector for those PICs in which the required data is available.

Table 7: Economic Importance of Tourism in selected PICs (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tourism GDP (%)</th>
<th>Tourism Employment (%)</th>
<th>EO R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The employment output ratios are relatively low with the exception of Samoa, with Fiji’s and Vanuatu’s tourism sector more labor intensive than the other island states. With the exception of Samoa, rest of the island states listed in Table 7 is less labor intensive than one might have expected.\(^\text{13}\)

This brings up the second question posed above: Are the island states treating or targeting tourism sector as a sector that can generate much needed jobs and reach the poorest sections of the communities? This question is discussed below.

\(^{13}\) Strictly speaking EORs are useful in comparing labour intensity among sectors within countries, rather than across countries. For cross country comparisons, a simple input-output ratios could be used. See footnote 11 as well.
Tourism Sector Policies: Growth or Job Creation?

It is important to analyse this question in some detail to ascertain how the island governments’ see the tourism sector – is the sector’s emphasis more on growth (i.e. contribution to GDP) or job creation?

Ideally, government should focus public investment on areas where the social returns are highest. However, such decisions can only be made with a great deal of uncertainty and governments therefore have to weigh up their imperfect understanding of how public investment and policies will contribute to growth in the various sectors, the extent and nature of the jobs created, and the regional distribution of jobs. In order to examine island governments’ tourism policies a good starting point would be their Development or Strategic Plans. For the purposes of this paper, however, only the South Pacific Tourism Organisation’s14 (SPTO’s) Regional Tourism Strategy for South and Central Pacific titled ‘Strategy for Growth’ is analyzed.

In discussing tourism’s contribution to the region, the Chief Executive Officer of SPTO, Mr. Lisiate ‘A.’Akolo, posed the following question: what is the ultimate contribution of tourism to the people of the region? The following is his response to his own question.

The answer is diverse and conceptually multifaceted but one that is pivotal to SPTO’s objective is tourism’s contribution to advancing the sustainable livelihood of the region’s indigenous people to a higher level. We would have to subscribe therefore more vigorously to poverty reduction, and improvement in basic education, healthcare, gender

---

14 See footnote 1 for SPTO member countries, which include most of the island states in the region.
issues, clean environment, good governance, and other socio-economic principles inscribed in recent regional and global conventions and interventions, including Cotonou Agreement, Millennium Development Goals, WSSD pro-poor initiatives, and of course the individual aid programmes of larger donor countries. It is upon this threshold that SPTO will continue to build its future tourism policy directive (SPTO, Annual Report, 2003).

The Chief Executive Officer’s vision and the capacity of SPTO to deliver that vision are indeed ambitious, and obviously a tall call on the tourism sector of each island state.

SPTO’s Tourism Strategy for South and Central Pacific (hereafter referred to as RTS) outlines a strategy for the region that “provides a blueprint for regional cooperation in tourism sector for the next 10 years” with the following vision:

*The economic benefits from tourism increase, as the region experiences a growing share of world tourism arrivals and increased expenditure, length of stay and income retained in the region.*

The region’s highly distinctive environment and culture are conserved and tourism is embraced as a means of achieving this. Visitors experience a safe environment and unique hospitality, with awareness on the part of resident populations of the opportunities that tourism presents and on part of visitors, an appreciation of the special characteristics of the region.

The first component of the vision emphasizes that the region must be ready to take advantage of the expected expansion in world travel and tourism. The second component notes the unique natural and cultural assets that need to be preserved. The last component emphasizes harmonious relationships between the visitors and
hosts with each recognizing and appreciating each others roles in contributing to a sustainable tourism industry. In order to achieve this vision the region must offer tourism products that are competitive internationally, marketed internationally, and are sustainable in impact (RTS, 2003, p.11).

The RTS focuses on three themes:

- Human resource development
- Tourism planning, investment and small and medium enterprise (SME) development
- Marketing and market research

First, growth is to be achieved through human resource development, which largely focuses on training to enhance the quality of tourism products in terms of services provided.

Second, contribution to growth will come through tourism planning, investment and SME development, in particular eco-tourism development with greater local participation in terms of planning and ownership. This is in addition to tourism planning that creates an enabling business environment to attract both foreign and local investment. While eco-tourism and community based tourism have great potential for job creation, a number of the eco-tourism projects in the region have not been successful. According to the RTS, this poor performance has been due to the lack of community involvement and their poor understanding of eco-tourism, lack of ongoing support from the donors after the initial set-up costs, and the complete lack of marketing support.

Third, the RTS focus on regional marketing and marketing research is intended to capitalise on the “synergies to be gained from co-operative marketing activities.” In its most recent regional marketing strategy, the Regional Tourism Marketing Plan, SPTO reiterates its marketing strategy for member countries. That is to:
develop a systematic and integrated regional framework for marketing of the Pacific as a tourism destination for the period 2006-2010 (SPTO, 2005, p1).

While the RTS focuses on regional strategies for the expansion of the tourism sectors, it is incumbent upon each PIC to tap into the resources of the SPTO to realize their national tourism objectives.

However, given the increasing incidence of poverty\textsuperscript{15}, crime, and other associated social problems in the region, it is critical that the PICs re-examine the role tourism can play in job creation and poverty reduction within the framework of sustainable tourism development. Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) is being increasingly advocated as a means of job creation and for its capacity to reach the poorest. What is PPT and its relevance to the PICs?

**Pro-Poor Tourism and Sustainable Tourism Development.**

What is pro-poor tourism? According to DFID (1999):

\begin{quote}
Pro-poor tourism generates net benefits for the poor (i.e. benefits are greater than costs). Economic benefits are only one (very important) component – social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits also need to be taken into account. Pro-poor tourism strategies are concerned specifically with impacts on poor people, though non poor may also benefit. Strategies focus less on expanding the overall size of tourism, and more on unlocking opportunities for specific groups within it (on tilting the cake and not expanding it). However, these strategies need to be integrated with general tourism development for two reasons: main stream activities (such as tourism planning) need to be influenced by pro poor
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15} See ADB (2003).
perspectives; and pro poor tourism cannot succeed without the successful development of the whole tourism destination (DFID, 1999, p1).

It is evident that pro-poor tourism can be seen as a component of the overall tourism strategy and the success of pro-poor tourism will ultimately depend on a dynamic and sustainable domestic tourism industry. However, it is worth noting the essential difference between pro-poor tourism and sustainable tourism.

Calls for sustainable tourism often go beyond environmental measures, to include social, economic and cultural concerns. It is recognized that host communities must benefit if tourism is to be viable in the long term, however benefits to local people are generally of secondary importance as a means to achieve sustainability. The language of sustainable tourism often reveals a protectionist or defensive approach: ‘preserving local culture, minimizing local costs’. In contrast, pro poor tourism aims to expand opportunities. Net benefit to the poor is a goal in itself, to which environmental concerns should contribute (DFID, 1999, p2).

A review of the RTS shows that it largely focuses on the growth of the tourism and little emphasis is placed on pro-poor tourism strategies. This emphasis is understandable given the focus of the strategy is growth, as the title, Strategy for Growth, indicates. However, if the island states are serious in addressing the problems of poverty, and given that tourism can provide a means of doing so, then the governments must give some attention to pro-poor tourism. The prudent policy would be to harness the positive impacts and pro-actively engage the poor in opportunities tourism is offering. Moreover, the poor have the collective assets on which
successful tourism can be built: the culture, heritage and tradition, and the natural environment they live in\textsuperscript{16}.

**Labor Intensity, Job Creation and Pro-Poor Tourism.**

Evidence indicates that tourism is more labour intensive than manufacturing and employs a higher proportion of women as sub-Saharan African countries experience shows. For many small island economies with a small agricultural base and little possibility of manufacturing, tourism remains the only alternative (with possible exception of fisheries sector) for job creation.\textsuperscript{17}

The focus of national governments, donors, NGOs and international institutions has been on sustainable tourism - pro-poor tourism as a strategy is relatively new and remains a possible strategy to address the problem of poverty in the PICs.

The rest of the paper analyses the importance of the tourism sector in Fiji in terms of its employment generation potential, and its role in poverty reduction, that is, the potential for pro poor tourism development.

**The Importance of the Tourism Sector to Fiji**

At present the Government of Fiji sees the tourism sector as a key sector to lead Fiji’s economic growth. In its Strategic Development

\textsuperscript{16} It is also important to note that some observers believe due to the nature of communal land and the lack of individual property rights to the land is the major cause of poverty in Fiji and in other PICs. De Soto (2000) describes such lack of property rights to property as dead capital and the cause of poverty and under economic development in many countries.

\textsuperscript{17} However, countries that have developed and competitive telecommunications infrastructure can take advantage of time zones to develop ITC industries, particularly back office data processing. Fiji has already taken steps to attract back office data processing operations by putting in place generous incentive schemes. Few such firms are already operating in Fiji. The planned ITC Park by Telecom Fiji is expected to attract more ITC operations in Fiji. However, high telecommunications charges remain a concern and needs to be addressed possibly by providing concessionary rates to operations that in the Park. Other PICs could emulate Fiji experience.
Plan 2003-2005, the government states the growing importance of the tourism sector:

*The tourism industry has become one of Fiji’s largest sources of growth in comparison with other industries such as sugar, fisheries, garments and forestry (Strategic Development Plan 2003-2005, 2002).*

The Plan’s goal is to make the tourism sector “sustainable, growing and globally competitive industry”.

The tourism sector (directly and indirectly) contributes approximately 17% of GDP\(^\text{18}\) and provides employment to around 40,000 people. Fiji is the most developed country among the PICs, having a relatively well-developed private sector. Tourism is well integrated within the private sector from the retail/wholesale sectors to transportation and other services such as restaurants and financial services. Moreover, the sector is dominated by well-established foreign investors, both large and small. Fiji, therefore, has a strong foundation on which to build a competitive tourism industry.

The growing importance of the tourism sector is evident from the following statistics\(^\text{19}\). The visitor arrivals to Fiji amounted to 294,070 in 2000, rising to 507,000 in 2004, an increase of 74.2%. Similarly, total visitor expenditure amounted to US$413.2m, an increase of 151.2% from 2000 level, and departure tax increased from US$4.3m in 2000 to US$9.9m in 2004. In addition, company tax (related to tourism industry) increased from US$49.4m in 2000 to US$124m in 2004, an increase of 151%. However, the study by Milne (2005) notes that the backward linkages in the tourism sector in Fiji as in other PICs has somewhat weakened overtime.

\(^{18}\) Direct contribution of the tourism sector is estimated to be around 13%.

\(^{19}\) The statistics is summarized from Milne (2005).
Moreover, Narayan (2004) using a computable general equilibrium model found that a 10% increase in tourism expenditure will increase Fiji’s GDP by 0.5%, real consumption by 0.72% and real national welfare by 0.67%, in addition to contributing to an improvement in balance of payments and an increase in government revenues.

Despite a strong performance of the tourism sector in recent years, political instability created during and in the aftermath of the coups of 1987 and 2000 has adversely affected the tourism industry (as it would in any country) and undoubtedly compromised its long-term growth and competitiveness. Rao (2002), using Fiji Visitors Bureau’s (National NTA) projected visitor arrival figures, estimated that Fiji has lost at least six years of growth in visitor arrivals because of the coups of 1987 and 2000 and the resultant instability. There is likely to have been a similar impact on tourism product development and delivery. Narsey (2004), using trend analyses, had reached similar conclusions. Though the government of Fiji and the Fiji Visitors Bureau often claim that the tourism industry has recovered from the coups and the resultant instability (as the above statistics indicate), it is unlikely the industry will ever “make up” for the lost years. The industry definitely would have been on a higher growth path in the absence of the political crises.

In addition to having adverse effects on visitor arrivals and product development and delivery, political instability may also have adverse impacts on functions of the National Tourism Authorities (Teye, 1998). In times of political crisis, resources are often redirected to other areas, thereby making NTAs financially weaker. However, in case of Fiji the Fiji Visitors Bureau became financially stronger, for the military backed administrations (both in 1987 and 2000) provided it with more resources to assist the industry recover quickly. This support obviously served the political objective of the administrations of bringing about political
stability, given that arresting declines in visitor arrivals indicates to some extent a semblance of returning to normalcy (Rao, 2002).

From the experiences of 1987 and 2000, it is clear that in times of political crisis, tourism may be seen as even more crucial than otherwise in restoring damage to the economy. The administrations’ support for the tourism sector could also be interpreted as supporting the view that the sector benefits Fijians more than Indo-Fijians and that a recovery led by this sector fits in well with the Fijian nationalist sentiments from which post-coup administrations derive their support. The present government has great hopes for the tourism sector and intends to make it a billion dollar industry in terms of gross foreign exchange earnings by year 2007. How many jobs may be created and what may be the industry’s contribution to GDP and poverty reduction? Is there emphasis in government policies and actions on pro-poor tourism?

**Government and Fiji’s Tourism Sector**

The Government of Fiji sees the tourism sector as the sector that will lead Fiji’s future economic growth given the gradual decline in traditional growth sector of the economy, sugar\(^{20}\) which is now facing global competition\(^{21}\). Moreover, the growth will come from private sector investment and activities, with the government playing a facilitative role.

However, the Fiji Tourism Development Plan 1998-2005 (FTDP), prepared jointly by the Government of Fiji, consultant Deloitte and Touche, and the South Pacific Tourism Organisation (formerly South Pacific Tourism Council), raised concerns regarding the lack

---

\(^{20}\) Fiji Strategic Development Plan (FSDP) 2002-2005 notes that “the sugar industry faces a major restructure and a significant size reduction to adapt to the pending loss of preferential prices” (FSDP, 2002, p71).

\(^{21}\) Fiji historically exports sugar to EU under preferential arrangement under Cotonou Agreement (successor of various Lome Conventions). This preferential exports which attracted higher than world market price (up to three times), is gradually being faced out in compliance with WTO requirements.
of government commitment to the tourism sector, even in its facilitative role. It said that adequate investment in the tourism sector will not materialize,

......unless Government, the private sector and the donor community work together to achieve it. Above all it requires determination on part of the Government. Until now, tourism has been seen as an activity for the private sector. This needs to change. Government must not enter into business. What it does need to do is to facilitate investment by the private sector. Above all, it must do its utmost to make investment in Fiji an attractive proposition (FTDP, p5).

The Plan further points out that lack of government commitment in making Fiji an attractive tourism investment destination in an extremely competitive and dynamic tourism industry has cost Fiji its competitive advantages when compared to its competitors such as Bali, Bahamas, Martinique, Mauritius, Queensland, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and many more. “In many ways time has passed Fiji by” (FTDP, p5). McDonnell and Darcy (1998) conclude that the lack of Fiji government involvement in tourism infrastructural development, in particular the development of tourism precincts (Tourism Development Areas), led to the loss of half of the potential Australian visitors to Bali in the 1985-95 period.

The Plan underscores the importance of the close relationship between the government and the private sector for tourism development success, as in the case of Singapore, which with few natural resources has been able to develop a successful tourism industry and “this has been done by setting clear objectives and targets, as agreed between the public and private sectors and working towards these ends” (FTDP, p8).
Furthermore, the Plan sets out a strategy for the future development of tourism, foremost by requiring the government’s commitment to the Plan by focusing on the creation of Tourism Development Areas (TDAs) at identified locations across the country with infrastructural support from the government.

The Plan calls on government to be pro-active in the following areas:

- securing of investments in hotels and resorts
- streamlining investment approval procedures to create an investor friendly and enabling business environment
- abolition of withholding tax and extension of investment incentives schemes
- human resource development
- increased budget for the Fiji Visitors Bureau
- implementation of the legislation for downtown duty free shopping.

In addition, the development strategies are couched in the usual rhetoric of sustainable development – environment protection, eco-tourism and SME development, and community participation.

All in all, the Plan mainly focuses on growth and expansion of the tourism sector through the creation of TDAs with government’s infrastructural support (which has been lacking) and an investor friendly business environment.

Traditionally, Development and Strategic Plans have focused on private sector-led growth, with the government playing the crucial facilitative role. The Fiji Tourism Development Plan and the Regional Tourism Strategy (discussed earlier) have been formulated in this tradition, with growth being the priority. Pro-poor strategies receive secondary attention or are neglected.
Evidence for Fiji has shown that, despite recent increases in real GDP, more people have fallen below the poverty line and more are becoming vulnerable. The UNDP Human Development Report (2005) had the following to say about status of poverty in Fiji.

Fiji’s Poverty Task Force has estimated that poverty incidence increased\(^{22}\) to between 33 to 50 percent\(^{23}\) in 2002 and new pockets of poverty, such as urban squatter settlements, are emerging. The non-renewal of sugar leases held by Indo-Fijians has resulted in the eviction of several\(^{24}\) hundreds of farmers. At the same time, the stagnant labour market has not provided any alternative to the displaced families and several new squatter settlements have appeared around sugar-cane districts as a consequence (UNDP, 2005, p 48).

In all likelihood, the incidence of poverty has increased further as evidenced by the increasing urban squatter settlements and settlements created through \textit{vakavanua} (informal and non-legal) arrangements with Fijian landowners by evicted farmers whose cane farming leases were not renewed. Unemployment, increasing urban crime and a sluggish economy are further indicators of the nation’s increasing poverty levels.

This brings us to the questions of what role could the tourism sector play in poverty reduction and what scope pro-poor tourism strategies in targeting poverty reduction? Before attempting to

---

\(^{22}\) The Fiji Poverty Report (UNDP, 1997), noted that in 1991, 25% of the households in Fiji were below the poverty line and another 15% were vulnerable to poverty.

\(^{23}\) There is no conclusive figure on the incidence of poverty in Fiji is available (since no recent studies have been undertaken). In 2005, in a Parliamentary Debate the Opposition members claimed that the people below the poverty line in Fiji are 50% while the Government claimed it is around 25%.

\(^{24}\) Since the sugar-cane leases began expiring in 1997, an increasing number of cane farmers, largely Indo-Fijians are evicted as their leases expire. It is believed that a sizable number of evicted farmers have ended up in squatter settlements as the above quote indicates. A study by Reddy (2006) found that 66.4% of the people who migrated from rural to urban centers gave land problems (expiring land leases and lack of land) as the most important reason for migration and a further 29.8% indicated land problems as the second most important reason for migration.
answer this question, it would be useful to analyse the employment generation potential of the tourism sector. In other words, what is the labour intensity of tourism sector as compared to the other sectors of the economy?

Labour intensity of the tourism sector

The total economic impact of tourism can be disaggregated into three components: direct impact, indirect impact and induced impact. The direct impacts are the effects created directly in the tourism sector, such as increases in hotel occupancy, resulting in increases in hotel room sales and associated payments such as salaries, wages, taxes, supplies and services. In addition, direct impact also includes expenditure on all tourism related activities such as transportation, expenditure on meals entertainment, cultural activities, shopping and so forth, which may or may not take place within the tourist establishment.

It should be noted that the direct tourism expenditure (represented by final sales) includes both the indirect and induced impacts of tourism expenditure and therefore should not be counted again, which will result in double counting.

In terms of employment, direct employment results directly from visitor expenditure in tourism services. Indirect employment results not directly from the visitor expenditures but employment

---

25 It would also been useful to find labour intensities of different segments of the tourism sector, but this was impossible due to the unavailability of data on sub-sectors of the tourism sector.

26 Indirect impacts are effects created by re-spending of tourism industry’s receipts in other productive backward-linked sectors (i.e. sectors or industries which supplies goods and services to hotels). Changes in sales, employment, income and taxes of a farmer who supplies vegetables to the hotel will constitute indirect impacts. Another round of indirect impact will be changes in jobs, sales, taxes, incomes, etc of the fertilizer company which supplies fertilizer to the farmer, and the indirect impact continues in all sectors where production and associated changes can be traced to the initial increase in occupancy in the hotel.

27 Induced impacts are all the economic activities created as the result of household income earned directly and indirectly in the tourism sector. The incomes of hotel employees, farmer’s and fertilizer company’s employees, earned directly and indirectly through tourism spent on food, housing, transportation and so forth, and the resultant changes in the productive sectors in terms of increased sales, taxes, jobs and incomes are induced impacts. Induced impacts are a result of the effects of the tourism multiplier.
generated in the backward linked productive sectors. Induced employment results from the multiplier effects of the tourism expenditure. Unlike tourism expenditure where all direct expenditure is equal to total expenditure, total tourism employment is the sum of direct, indirect and induced employment.

Arriving at an accurate number of people employed in the tourism sector is very difficult because of the difficulty in defining which proportion of total economic activity can be attributed to tourism. In other words, what is the direct, indirect and induced employment as a result of tourism activity? This difficulty in defining total tourism employment is due to the fact that tourism constitutes a diversity of sectors from accommodation, transportation, restaurants, entertainment, finance, shopping, and so forth. What proportion of total consumption in all of these sectors is attributed to tourism is difficult to estimate accurately because these sectors also constitute value-added from non-tourism sectors as well. The use of Tourism Satellite Accounting (TSA) to capture the total consumption and impact of tourism on the economy will supposedly overcome this methodological difficulty to a large extent.

When calculating the labour intensity, only direct employment in the tourism sector is taken into account. This is because only direct employment in defined tourist establishments are considered and covered in official statistics. The other direct employment in non-tourism defined activities where tourists make expenditures such as transportation, shopping, entertainment and so forth is normally not covered in the official statistics.

The difficulty of accurately arriving at total value added of the tourism sector is amply demonstrated in Table 8 showing the structure of the Fiji economy. The classification Trade, Hotels,

---

28 Employment in the backward and forward linked sectors is normally reported as employment created in those respective sectors. Reporting same employment in tourism sector again would be double-counting.
Restaurants & Cafes is closest to the definition of the tourism sector but this classification also includes value adding from non-tourism activities. Needless to say, tourism also contributes to value-adding in virtually all other sectors of the economy. In short, given the available government published statistics it is impossible to arrive at an accurate figure of tourism’s contribution to GDP and employment. Moreover, as mentioned before the official statistics do not cover direct tourism expenditure in non-tourism defined activities such as expenditure on taxis, shopping outside tourist establishments – that is all tourism expenditure outside tourism defined activities. The Tourism Satellite Accounts which is in the process of being constructed for Fiji are expected to provide a much more accurate picture of tourism value added for the Fiji economy.

However, it would be reasonable to assume that the non-tourism value-adding in the Trade, Hotels, Restaurants & Cafes cancels out with value-adding of tourism activities in other sectors of the economy. Trade, Hotels, Restaurants & Cafes therefore provides a good approximation to the tourism sector and will be used in the rest of the paper as the representative of the tourism sector of the Fiji economy.

---

29 Direct communication with the Chief Executive Office of Ministry of Tourism by the author in February 2006.
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>GDP</th>
<th>Paid Empt</th>
<th>Sector as % of GDP</th>
<th>Empt as % of total empt</th>
<th>EOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
<td>438.2</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>448.9</td>
<td>31600</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas &amp; Water</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Hotels, Restaurant &amp; Cafes</td>
<td>473.2</td>
<td>21900</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Real Estate, Insurance and Business Services</td>
<td>325.8</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Social &amp; Personal Services</td>
<td>518.6</td>
<td>38200</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Imputed Service Charges</td>
<td>-85.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2803.4</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: GDP is in millions of Fiji dollars in 1995 prices.  
The tourism sector has an employment output ratio of 1.1, which shows the sector has capacity to generate above average jobs. The above table depicts only the formal sector employment and output, and excludes informal (and subsistence) sector employment and output. An economy such as Fiji’s where there is a large informal sector, informal including subsistence employment is expected would be large relative to paid employment, and therefore the sectoral EORs are expected to be higher, than if only the formal sector employment is taken into account.

Given that there are opportunities to create greater backward linkages in the tourism sector and the sector’s capacity to generate above jobs, the sector offers great potential to provide additional employment, as the sector expands. Can this employment be created where it is most needed and contribute to poverty alleviation? To this question, we now turn to.

Tourism and Poverty Reduction

Ratu Kotonivere, Roko Tui Maucata, a land (resource) owner outside the tourism belt\textsuperscript{30} posed the following question at the 2004 Fiji Tourism Forum with respect to the Fiji Tourism becoming a billion dollar industry in 2007.

\textit{Billion Dollar Industry – For Who?} (Fiji Tourism Forum, 2004)

He claimed that with the current strategy, the benefits of tourism growth would accrue to only 25% of the regions in Fiji in the tourism belt where the required infrastructure is in place. Moreover, the critical mass of tourism activities already existing in the belt will provide further impetus for the attraction of tourism activities.

\textsuperscript{30} The tourism belt is the area where all the major tourism activities are concentrated which is the western side of Fiji’s major island, Viti Levu, and islands off the western coast such as Yasawas and Mamanucas.
projects in the area. While the present beneficiaries will continue to benefit, the peripheral regions will receive “crumbs” and even get neglected.

The resource owner is raising the pertinent issue of the regional distribution of the benefits of the tourism growth and underscores the critical role of the government in providing the required infrastructure (provision of roads, electricity, water, telephone and the up-gradation air and seaports). The role of the government in providing infrastructure is a necessary pre-requisite and stimulus for tourism investment to be attracted to the economically depressed areas.

Providing generous incentives for businesses to locate in depressed areas without supporting infrastructure are unlikely to succeed. Moreover, the uncertainty surrounding property rights over land and other resources, which must be resolved first before the investors will find it profitable to invest.

The second pertinent issue implicit in the landowners concern is the extent to which the locals benefit from the tourism industry – the resource owners and the community at large.

The World Bank’s new rural development strategy, *Reaching the rural poor: A renewed strategy for reaching the poor* (World Bank, 2003) provides a useful framework to implement pro-poor

31 Vanua Levu the second largest island in the Fiji group has been adversely affected by the decline in sugar production due to the non-renewal of cane farming leases by the indigenous landowners. In order to revive the economy on this island the government in 2006 budget announced generous tax incentives which include 300% tax deduction on capital investment, 200% tax deduction for first time employees, 100% tax deduction on export income for any new investment over $40,000 and duty free access to raw materials.

32 Over 90% of the land in Fiji are owned by the indigenous landowners and cannot be bought and sold. This institutional rigidity and the disputes relating to terms and conditions of lease arrangements continue to be a major constraint in attracting investment to Fiji in sufficient numbers.
tourism strategies. The core\textsuperscript{33} of the new rural development strategy outlines a commitment to:

- focus on those that are most disadvantaged – the rural poor.
- address rural areas in its entirety and promote broad based rural growth and service provision.
- forge alliances with all stakeholders – with the rural poor, with governments, civil society, academics, international organizations and leaders, and with the business community, and

The above policy framework can be applied both at Macro and Micro levels for countries such as Fiji customized to suit their unique country specific characteristics. At the macro level, given the importance of tourism sector to Fiji’s overall economic growth,\textsuperscript{34} new strategies need to be formulated, in the context of pro-poor tourism, to progressively integrate tourism development with the rural sector. Several policy directions need to put in place to implement the above strategy.

First, backward linkages with the agricultural and fisheries sector need to be developed to secure reliable food supplies to the tourism sector. As noted earlier, Milne (2005) found that economic linkages in the tourism sector in PICs have weakened overtime. There is a great opportunity to strengthen these linkages by sustainable integration of tourism sector with the rural sector. In this regard the government policy must entail:

- long-term secure property rights to land and sea resources (lease arrangements) that eliminates uncertainty and encourages investment.

\textsuperscript{33} Listed are World Bank’s 3 of the 4 core strategies. The fourth one is, “refine the Banks approach to respond to changes in globalization and the impact that on the member countries – including changes in trade policies, climate, agricultural science, and technology”.

\textsuperscript{34} Given that the size of the traditional rural based export sector, sugar is expected to decline due to global competition. Also see footnote 19.
• infrastructure development – roads, provision of electricity and water, and connections from outer islands to main ports linking tourism areas.
• technical advice on the types of new agricultural crops that can be commercially grown and needed by the tourism industry. There is a range of crops and seafood already supplied to the tourism industry and this link needs to be further strengthened to increase reliability and quality of supplies.
• ongoing technical support on all aspects of crop development, quality control and packaging and marketing support.
• advice and access to micro-finance schemes, Development Bank loans targeting agriculture and rural sectors, commercial banks loans and financial schemes of the government supporting rural sector development.
• last but not the least is the Vocational Education and Technical Training (VET) on technical aspects of crop development and the business aspects of commercially operating rural based enterprises.

Second policy framework that the government needs to put in place to spread the benefits of the tourism industry to poor and vulnerable is the development of ecotourism. This is gain an attempt to integrate resort tourism with the rural sector village based tourism projects.

What is ecotourism and it’s relevance to pro-poor tourism strategies? While there are many definitions of ecotourism most of them covering the same central issues, the following definition of Honey (1999, p25) is useful for our analysis.

Ecotourism is travel to fragile, pristine, and usually protected areas that strive to be of low impact and (usually) small scale. It helps
educate the traveler, provides funds for conservation; directly benefits the economic development and political empowerment of the communities; and fosters respect for different cultures and for human rights.

As is evident the key principles of ecotourism:

- involves natural and cultural heritage of the destinations;
- creates cultural and environmental awareness, and seeks to minimize adverse impacts on them;
- provides direct financial benefits for conservation;
- provides financial benefits and empowerment of local communities; and
- articulates respect for local cultures and human values.

While there is no definitive figure on the demand for ecotourism in the South Pacific region, Twining-Ward (2005), analyzing figures from several sources estimates that “demand for ecotourism is likely to grow at a rate of between 10-20% a year”. With regards to Fiji, the author estimates that the gross tourism receipts from ecotourism for 2003 was around F$6.5million.

Given that tourism industry is relatively well developed in Fiji, and on a path of robust growth as it aims to become a billion dollar export industry in 2007, it is reasonable to assume that the demand for ecotourism is likely to grow closer to 20% figure in the medium term.

Recently, the Government of Fiji has recognized the growing importance of ecotourism and its potential for small-scale village based locally owned tourism activities. Moreover, in 2003, the government funded 44 ecotourism projects from a grant of

---

35 Ministry of tourism has formulated two documents, National Ecotourism Programme, and the Ecotourism and Village Based Tourism Strategy to guide ecotourism development in Fiji.
F$500,000, a further 12 projects from another programme, Integrated Human Resource Development Programme for Employment Promotion (IHRDPEP), which assists resource owners to establish ecotourism projects. In addition the government has set up a facility at the Fiji Development Bank (FDB), known as the Seed Capital Revolving Fund (SCARF), from which small indigenous ecotourism projects can be funded (Twining-Ward, 2005).36

It is critical that government initiated ecotourism projects be independently evaluated and reasons for successes and failures (on a relative scale) be identified. The success stories can be further strengthened and emulated, providing more opportunities for the wider cross-section of the local communities to productively participate in the tourism industry. Lessons learned from less than successful or failed projects could provide important insights for ongoing and future government assisted projects.

In addition to the government assisted programs, it important to skill and re-skill local communities to commercially operate ecotourism business. Undoubtedly Vocational Education and Training (VET) will be critical to skill people to commercially run the business and ongoing skill improvement will be necessary for long-term sustainability of the ecotourism projects.

The Fiji Institute of Technology recently (Fiji Times Online, 2006) announced it “is looking at introducing the study of Fijian cultural and tradition in its School of Culture, Arts and Design…….that would document, preserve, practice and promote the authenticity of Fijian culture”. Such an initiative could be expanded to integrate business components that would cover the commercial operation of ecotourism enterprises.

36 Author is citing SPTO (2005), which sourced information from Fiji Times 20/01/2005.
Third, at the macro or policy level, the government must consider providing incentives for tourism operators in terms of sourcing food supplies and developing ecotourism projects with the local communities. Joint projects involving tourism operators and resource owners in both of the above areas, at least in the initial stages of the projects will highly desirable for commercial success. Few large resorts in Fiji are successfully involving local communities in such projects, by providing technical, management and financial advice.

It is important to note that an increasing number of tourism projects both large and small are located on communal land, which means that tourism project developers and operators have only the lease rights to land. Therefore the resource owners are intricately involved (through contractual agreements covering lease payments, royalties, undertaking to employ people from landowning units and so forth), with the tourism operators. While this provides a natural setting for cooperation between the resource owners and tourism operators, conflicts often arise between the two groups – claims largely made by resource owners that contractual agreements not being honored or fair and just contracts are not negotiated on behalf of the landowners. For example in a recent dispute with the overseas investors who are developing a major tourism project, the Natadola Marine Resort, the landowning units on whose land the project is located charged the Native Land Trust Board (NLTB)\textsuperscript{37} of “working more with the project developers and either ignoring or sacrificing landowners’ interests”. Mr. Apisai Tora, landowners’ spokesman added, “Even though NLTB is our trustee, it seems that it is pushing the company’s interests” (Fiji Times Online, 2006).

\textsuperscript{37} NLTB is a statutory organisation set up in 1940s as the custodian or trustee of all native land mandated to manage native land in the best interests of the native resource owners, through contractual lease arrangements.
However, the point is that for the successful operation of the tourism projects, the project developers and operators, the landowners and the government (through NLTB) must cooperate. This imperative would undoubtedly provide opportunities to involve resource owners and their people in backward linked activities to the tourism sector by appropriate government policy and incentives.

At the micro or project approval level, the authorities responsible for approving projects and associated incentives such as the Fiji Trade and Investment Bureau must require tourism developers and operators to submit a realistic plan of employing local people (including a succession plan) in the main project and how they would encourage and set up smaller projects with the resource owners and local community which are linked with their main project. Special incentives such as tax breaks and concessionary loans can be targeted at projects where both the resource owners and tourism operators are jointly involved.

Linked to the above inevitable cooperation between the resource owners and tourism developers and operators is the idea of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)\(^38\), where the management recognizes the value in supporting local communities in ways that meaningfully give back to community they are involved with and attribute their success to. Undoubtedly CRS can be an integral part of any pro-poor tourism projects and initiatives. How CSR can contribute to poverty reduction is an important subject and needs to be further explored as part of pro-poor tourism strategies, but will ultimately depend on the initiatives taken by the tourism project developers and operators themselves.

Again at micro level, all stakeholders particularly the NGOs and government departments responsible for regional and rural sector

\(^38\) However, some believe the sole objective of corporations should be maximization of profits for its shareholders.
development must work with individual projects and provide ongoing support until the local partners in the ventures can run the operations commercially. Ongoing support must include accessing resources of the government and other donor funded programs (discussed in the macro policies above) and make them easily available to individual projects.

**Conclusion**

No major study on the role of the tourism sector in contributing to poverty reduction in the South Pacific Island countries have been undertaken to date. Donor funded studies have largely focused on issues of sustainable tourism development – impact on local (indigenous) tradition and cultures and on the environment.

The paper attempted to fill in the gap by discussing the issues and challenges facing the tourism sector in PICs in distributing the benefits of the tourism sector more evenly to a wider cross-section of the local communities, where poverty is becoming an issue due to lack of income generating activities.

The analysis finds the growing economic importance of the tourism sector in most PICs. However, it is also clear that policies and strategies are lacking to fully integrate the tourism sector with the rural sector, particularly those needing income generating activities. It in fact finds that backward linkages of the tourism sector in the PICs have weakened over time. In case of Fiji government strategic plans have focused largely on growth of the sector, while paying scant attention to the regional distribution of the tourism activities and the integration of the rural sector with the mainstream tourism activities.

The case study of Fiji islands shows that pro-poor tourism strategies could be formulated and implemented both at macro (policy) and micro (implementation) levels. At the macro level, the
government needs to create a policy framework, which integrates the agricultural and fisheries sectors with the tourism sector. Similarly, policy initiatives are needed for the development ecotourism activities where local (indigenous) people play a more central and productive role.

This will entail a comprehensive and integrated strategy, major components of which must include infrastructural development, technical, marketing and financial support for small scale operators, vocational and technical training, and framework within which all stakeholders, particularly the tourism developers and operators can cooperate mutually and commercially benefit.

At the micro level, at the stage of project submission and approval process, the commercial involvement of tourism developers and operators with resource owners in small scale supporting tourism projects and the backward linkages with the tourism sector can be “negotiated”. Any negotiation must be done with caution so as not to place additional costs on the investors that would discourage investment, which in turn can risk Fiji’s reputation as a viable location for tourism investment. Both the resource owners and tourism developers and operators must recognize the mutual commercial benefit in cooperating. Targeted government incentives will encourage and strengthen joint ventures. Investors who see value in the concept Corporate Social Responsibility (CRS) will themselves encourage greater participation of resource owners and locals in the benefits of the industry.

Indeed all stakeholders including the NGOs and government agencies responsible for regional and rural sector development must come together to assist individual local operators at all stages of the project – from the conceptual stage to final commercial success. It should be noted that most failures of tourism projects owned and managed by locals are attributed to lack of ongoing
support for the projects after assistance in the initial stages of the projects.

It is evident that tourism sector given its labour intensive nature and low barriers to entry can play a greater role in reaching the poor in the community, and thereby contributing to poverty reduction. In this regard it is also clear that the private sector alone cannot achieve this goal. The role of the government is indispensable. We have seen at least in case of Fiji islands, that historically there has been a lack of government commitment even in its facilitative role with regards to tourism development. Indeed we need a greater role and commitment on the part of the governments, if tourism benefits are to reach the wider cross-sections of the local communities and the poor.

The governments need to make poverty reduction its core objective and then clearly articulate how the tourism sector could contribute to that objective. This paper has attempted to suggest some policies, strategies and guidelines to address pro-poor tourism development in the South Pacific Island countries.
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