



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

# ECONOMICS, ECOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

**Working Paper No. 75**

**Ecotourism/Wildlife-based Tourism as  
Contributor to Nature Conservation with  
Reference to Vanni, Sri Lanka**

by

**Clem Tisdell**

**March 2003**



**THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND**

ISSN 1327-8231  
**WORKING PAPERS ON  
ECONOMICS, ECOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Working Paper No. 75**

**Ecotourism/Wildlife-based Tourism as Contributor to Nature  
Conservation with Reference to Vanni, Sri Lanka<sup>†</sup>**

**by**

**Clem Tisdell\***

**March 2003**

© All rights reserved

---

<sup>†</sup> A revised version of a paper presented at Jaffna University (Vavuniya Campus), Sri Lanka, on Wednesday 12 February 2003, at a Seminar on “Wildlife Conservation and the Economics of Wildlife-Based Tourism in Vanni, Sri Lanka” organised by the Vavuniya Campus Teachers’ Association

\* School of Economics, The University of Queensland, Brisbane 4072 Australia.  
Email: [c.tisdell@economics.uq.edu.au](mailto:c.tisdell@economics.uq.edu.au)

WORKING PAPERS IN THE SERIES, *Economics, Ecology and the Environment* are published by the School of Economics, University of Queensland, 4072, Australia, as follow up to the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research Project 40 of which Professor Clem Tisdell was the Project Leader. Views expressed in these working papers are those of their authors and not necessarily of any of the organisations associated with the Project. They should not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of the Project Leader. It is planned to publish contributions to this series over the next few years.

Research for ACIAR project 40, *Economic impact and rural adjustments to nature conservation (biodiversity) programmes: A case study of Xishuangbanna Dai Autonomous Prefecture, Yunnan, China* was sponsored by the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), GPO Box 1571, Canberra, ACT, 2601, Australia.

The research for ACIAR project 40 has led in part, to the research being carried out in this current series.

For more information write to Professor Clem Tisdell, School of Economics, University of Queensland, Brisbane 4072, Australia. Email [c.tisdell@economics.uq.edu.au](mailto:c.tisdell@economics.uq.edu.au)

## **Ecotourism/Wildlife-based Tourism as Contributor to Nature Conservation with Reference to Vanni, Sri Lanka**

### **Abstract**

After discussing definitions of ecotourism, outlines possible economic and conservational benefits from developing ecotourism or wildlife-based tourism. Identifies possible economic benefits for local communities but also outlines possible economic costs to such communities. Observations are made on the potential of developing ecotourism in the Giant's Tank/Mannar area. A sufficient market does not always exist for wildlife-based tourism to make it economically viable. Therefore, market analysis should be undertaken before promoting the development of wildlife-based tourism in a locality. A checklist is provided to give some guidance in market appraisal. It is observed that even non-consumptive wildlife-based tourism can have adverse environmental consequences and these are listed. Care is needed to avoid these negative consequences and to ensure that local communities do in fact obtain adequate economic benefits from the development of wildlife-based tourism

**Keywords:** economics, ecotourism, local communities, nature conservation, Sri Lanka, wildlife-based tourism.

# **Ecotourism/Wildlife-based Tourism as Contributor to Nature Conservation with Reference to Vanni, Sri Lanka**

## **1. Introduction**

Ecotourism, usually a form of nature-based tourism, is often claimed to be one of the fastest growing segments to the tourism market globally. In the last couple of decades, many individuals and bodies e.g. IUCN, have come to see ecotourism as a kind of economic key for supporting nature conservation. This form of tourism is generally nature-based and to qualify as ecotourism, it should be careful of the environment. Being careful of the environment, it should help to conserve nature and thereby contribute to the sustainability of tourism reliant on wildlife. Many proponents of ecotourism also argue that an important ingredient of it is the provision of environmental education or knowledge for tourists who participate in it<sup>1</sup> (Wight, 1993). Such knowledge can make tourists more aware of nature and more supportive of its conservation via changes in their personal behaviour, greater political support and larger financial contributions for such conservation (cf. Tisdell and Wilson, 2002a)).

It is also believed that ecotourism can provide direct financial support for nature conservation as well as for local communities where it occurs. Indeed, the International Ecotourism Society's definition of ecotourism makes local benefits a requirement for tourism to be classified as ecotourism. It defines ecotourism as "responsible travel to natural areas that conserve the environment and improve the well-being of local people" (Honey, 1999). Sekerciogll (2002, p.282) states that ideally, ecotourism creates a local incentive for conserving natural areas by generating income through operations that are sustainable, low-impact (environmental and social), low-investment, and locally-owned". The local communities involved are often remote from the main centres of economic activity in most nations, and frequently have limited economic opportunities. While many benefits from the development of ecotourism are possible, it should also be recognized that not all proposed ecotourism projects are likely to be profitable, that they can result in little or no economic benefit to local communities, may become a drain on finance that could otherwise be used for nature conservation and can distort the range of species conserved. This paper considers both the benefits and limitations of ecotourism (and more generally wildlife-based tourism) as a means for conserving nature.

Before discussing such aspects, it is appropriate to consider whether the term ‘ecotourism’ is a useful one to use in analysing wildlife-based tourism. One problem is that the term has become emotionally laden. In the popular mind, ‘ecotourism’ is considered to be good. It has a normative connotation. This, combined with a variety and some imprecision in definitions of ecotourism can result in vagueness and claims that nature-based tourist projects are ecotourism projects when in fact they are a threat to nature conservation (cf. Honey, 1999). In scientific work, it may, therefore, be more appropriate to revert to the term wildlife-based tourism and classify this by its different characteristics.

Wildlife-based tourism may be classified in several ways. It may be non-consumptive (as in the case of viewing or watching wildlife, photographing it and so on) or it may be consumptive (as in the case of hunting and fishing). In general, ecotourism has been associated with the non-consumptive passive form of wildlife-based tourism. It needs, however, to be recognized that either form of tourism can be a negative or positive force for nature conservation. Even consumptive wildlife-based tourism can be sustainable if catch is appropriately controlled and it can also be supportive of wildlife conservation. For example, hunting organizations, such as Ducks Unlimited in the US, protect ponds and provide food for migrating ducks and geese.

## **2. Benefits from Ecotourism/Wildlife-based Tourism**

Table 1 lists some possible positive and negative impacts of ecotourism/wildlife-based tourism on local communities in terms of its economic impacts. The table makes it clear that special care may need to be taken to make sure that local communities do in fact benefit from a profitable ecotourism development. If, for example, Giant’s Tank, near Mannar, is redeveloped and further developed for bird-based tourism care needs to be taken to ensure that local villagers, especially fishers, are able to earn some additional income e.g. by acting as guides for visitors, providing access to areas by boat for visitors and so on. In particular, care should be taken to avoid excluding locals from natural areas to provide unhampered access for tourists. Local fisherman in this area can potentially assist tourists in the late afternoon and early morning when opportunities for birdwatching are greatest. Especially in the late afternoon, fishing is at a low ebb. Furthermore, when water levels in the Tank are high, fishing catches are low and this is likely to be a time when fishers would welcome extra

income and employment from tourists. Similar tourism possibilities exist in the shallow marine area as one approaches Mannar.

**Table 1**  
Possible Economic Benefits and Economic Costs to Local Communities  
of Development of Ecotourism

---

<b>Economic Benefits Possible</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• increased local employment and income</li><li>• more regular employment and income throughout year</li><li>• greater diversification of economic activities, thereby reducing economic risks</li><li>• opportunities for locally controlled ecotourist-related businesses</li></ul>
<b>Economic Costs Possible</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Exclusion of locals from ecotourist areas with reduction in income, employment and resource availability to locals</li><li>• Loss of control of ecotourist businesses and resources to outsiders</li><li>• Consequent disruption of the social fabric of the local community</li></ul>

---

Development or redevelopment of these sites for tourism will naturally depend on lasting peace. Possibly in the beginning, it will be specialist birdwatchers who will first return. General tourists will probably need to be enticed with a wider range of attractions e.g. availability of cultural attractions such as local dances, historical features – the fort at Mannar which is badly in need of preservation may be an attraction, historical aspects of recent conflicts and so on. The tourist market including the ecotourist market for Vanni will need to be carefully assessed and cautiously developed.

One of the possible benefits of the development of ecotourism or wildlife-based tourism is that the economic returns from engaging in it can exceed the costs involved. This is only possible, however, for a wildlife site if exclusion from the site is easy and not too costly. In such a case, wildlife use for tourism can be directly marketed, and such marketing could be (but need not be) profitable. The level of profitability will depend to some extent on how well the ecotourism business venture is managed and on the nature of the development.

If the wildlife site is a state protected area, its income may come from the following sources: (a) entry fees, camping fees, and other charges levied on visitors and (b) the allocation of government revenues, c) sales of services and products at the site, (d) donations by visitors



and (e) sales of concessions to others to provide products or services at the site e.g. accommodation, food and tours. The funds available to the protected area will, however, depend on institutional arrangements. If income raised has to be paid into consolidated government revenue, no benefit may come directly to the protected area as a result of its income generation activities. On the other hand, if the protected area can retain the funds it collects as a result of charges, this will increase its finances for conservation in the protected area (if its marketing is profitable), and if its public funding is not reduced or reduced to such an extent as to offset its increased finance from marketing the protected area's assets to tourists. Different institutional arrangements will create different financial incentives (disincentives) to engage in ecotourism at the local level and influence whether increased funds as a result of financially successful wildlife-based tourism are likely to be available at the local level.

The institutional factors involved are complex and the actual distribution of funds can be significantly influenced by political factors. For example, while there is general public opposition to the charging of fees for entry to national parks and protected areas in Queensland, rights are sold to tour companies by the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (QPWS) to bring tourists to the Natural Bridge section of Springbrook National Park in the hinterland of the Gold Coast to view glow worms. Those not on organized tours may still enter free. Tour bus operators, because of their payments, have maintained political pressure on QPWS to upgrade paths, parking areas and so on at the site thereby ensuring that economic benefits from their contributions are spent at the site.

Note, however, that a wildlife site may be of economic benefit to a local community even if it operates at a loss and its operations are covered by the government. Even if visitors are not charged a fee to visit a protected area and it operates at a loss, the site is likely to bring positive economic spillover benefits in many cases to local communities, even though the extent of this benefit will differ. There may be increased local employment in the protected area and nearby businesses may benefit from increased trade as a result of tourists. These spillover economic benefits should favour the provision of or retention of the wildlife site. If the site plus all of its associated offsite economic activities could show an economic surplus, the provision of the site seems economically worthwhile. The site does not have to have an economic surplus to be economically justified.

From the point of view of maximising community benefit from a protected area being used for tourism, it should be borne in mind that determining the optimal fee structure is not straightforward. For instance, the fee that maximises total or net receipts from visitors is usually not optimal from a social point of view. Such a fee would amount to a monopoly-price. Such a price is difficult to justify on economic welfare grounds. Economists would favour a lower price as a rule that reflects the additional costs of catering for extra visitors, but might support a higher price if crowding at a site is a concern or the number of visitors is such as to threaten the conservation objectives of the protected area.

On the other hand, a case could also exist for charging an even lower price or making entry free because of the spillover economic benefits to local townships or communities as a result of increased trade from greater levels of tourism, or because procedures to collect the fee are too costly. Complex issues are clearly involved.

In many cases, wildlife-based tourism/ecotourism can foster community support for it and wider political support for nature conservation. It can do this, for instance, through local economic benefits and its education/knowledge impact. Furthermore, involvement of community volunteers in assisting with wildlife-based ecotourism can add to community support. Community volunteers assist with ecotourism, for example, at Mon Repos Conservation Park in Queensland. This Park has an important rookery for loggerhead turtles (Tisdell and Wilson, 2002a). Volunteers help with crowd control, selling items to tourists from the onsite shop and in helping with recording of details of turtles on the beach thereby providing scientific data used by natural scientists. This helps to generate community support for the project.

From a study of visitors to Mon Repos, we found that their experience and the additional knowledge gained about sea turtles made most more supportive of the conservation of sea turtles and increased their willingness to contribute to it (Tisdell and Wilson, 2002a). This seems to be especially the case when the visitors saw sea turtles rather than relied solely on the interpretative facilities about sea turtles at the site. Most visitors increased their economic valuation of sea turtles following their visit indicated that they would alter their behaviour to be more protective of sea turtles and were more willing to contribute funds to support conservation of sea turtles.

### **3. Limitations of Ecotourism as a Conservation Mechanism**

While ecotourism development can provide extra support for nature conservation, not all areas or sites where wildlife and natural areas occur are capable of supporting profitable ecotourism enterprises. This can even be so if the wildlife involved is spectacular and unique. Factors such as the accessibility of the area to visitors, the prospect of viewing wildlife, the availability of complementary attractions and the cost of visiting the site will influence the economic potential of a wildlife site for ecotourism. Nevertheless, even sites that are costly to visit can sometimes support commercial ecotourism, as witnessed by the development of ship-based ecotourism in Antarctica. Nevertheless, in assessing the economic potential of a site for the development of ecotourism, factors listed in Table 2 are likely to be relevant. This table highlights the fact that determination of potential gains from ecotourism involves considerable economic assessment. In addition, the actual financial advantage (or disadvantage) from engaging in ecotourism will depend on how well the tourism project is managed.

**Table 2**  
Potential Negative Effects of Tourism on the Environment in Protected Areas:  
Visitor Impacts that should be Controlled

Factor Involved	Impact on Natural Quality	Comment
Crowding by visitors	Loss of “wilderness experience, visitor disutility, changes in animals’ behaviour, stress on environment	Irritation, reduction in quality, need for carrying-capacity limits or better regulation
Development of tourist facilities	Excessive man-made structures	Unsightly urban-like development
Recreation		
Powerboats	Disturbance of wildlife, bank erosion	Vulnerability during nesting seasons, noise pollution
Fishing	Access tracks, jetties	Competition with natural predators
Foot safaris	Disturbance of wildlife	Overuse and trail erosion
Pollution		
Noise (radio etc.)	Disturbance of natural sounds Impairment of natural scene, habituation of wildlife to garbage	Irritation to wildlife and visitors Aesthetic and health hazard
Litter		
Vandalism	Mutilation and facility damage	Removal of natural features
Feeding of Wildlife	Behavioural changes with danger to tourists	Removal of habituated animals
Vehicles		
Speeding	Wildlife mortality	Ecological changes, dust
Off-road driving	Soil and vegetation damage	Disturbance to wildlife
Miscellaneous		
Souvenir collection	Removal of natural attractions, disruptions of natural processes	Shells, coral, horns, trophies, rare plants
Firewood	Habitat destruction	Interference with natural energy flow
Roads and excavations	Habitat loss, drainage	Aesthetic scars
Power line	Destruction of vegetation	Aesthetic impacts
Artificial water holes and salt provision	Unnatural wildlife concentrations, vegetation damage	Poaching may be facilitated
Introduction of exotic plants and animals	Competition with wild species	Damage to agriculture

Source: Adapted from McNeely, Thorsell, and Ceballos-Lascurain 1992, p.14

It is important to realize that ecotourism projects can make economic losses. When this happens they may actually reduce funds available for nature conservation (See Tisdell, 1995;

1999, Ch. 14). Consequently, ecotourism projects that ‘go wrong’ can become a threat to the conservation. They may, of course, also go wrong for technical rather than economic reasons. For instance, the presence of tourists may, even if they engage in non-consumptive tourism, can destroy native vegetation and disturb wildlife, adversely affecting their reproduction and availability. Even non-consumptive tourism has impacts on the surrounding natural environment. It is necessary to take these into account from a conservation point of view, but these impacts cannot always be perfectly predicted.

**Table 3**  
Checklist on Tourism Potential of Protected Area

<p>(1) Is the protected area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• close to an international airport or major tourist centre?</li> <li>• moderately close?</li> <li>• remote?</li> </ul>	<p>(7) Does the area have additional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• high cultural interest?</li> <li>• some cultural attractions?</li> <li>• few cultural attractions?</li> </ul>
<p>(2) Is the journey to the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• easy (short) and comfortable?</li> <li>• A bit of an effort?</li> <li>• Arduous or dangerous?</li> </ul>	<p>(8) Is the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unique in its appeal?</li> <li>• a little bit different?</li> <li>• similar to other visitor reserves?</li> </ul>
<p>(3) Does the area offer the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “star” species attractions?</li> <li>• Other interesting wildlife?</li> <li>• Representative wildlife?</li> <li>• Distinctive wildlife viewing (on feet, by boat, from hides)?</li> </ul>	<p>(9) Does the area have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a beach or lakeside recreation facilities?</li> <li>• river, falls, or swimming pools?</li> <li>• any other recreation possibilities?</li> </ul>
<p>(4) Is successful wildlife viewing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guaranteed?</li> <li>• Usual?</li> <li>• With luck or highly seasonal?</li> </ul>	<p>(10) Is the area close enough to other sites of tourist interest to be part of a tourist circuit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• yes, other attractive sites</li> <li>• moderate potential</li> <li>• low or no such potential</li> </ul>
<p>(5) Does the area offer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several distinct features of interest?</li> <li>• More than one feature of interest?</li> <li>• One main feature of interest?</li> </ul>	<p>(11) Is the surrounding area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• or high scenic beauty or intrinsic interest?</li> <li>• quite attractive?</li> <li>• rather ordinary?</li> </ul>
<p>(6) What standards of food and accommodation are offered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• high standards</li> <li>• adequate standards</li> <li>• rough standards</li> </ul>	<p>(12) Is the cost of the visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• high?</li> <li>• moderate?</li> <li>• low?</li> </ul>

Source: Adapted from McNeely, Thorsell, and Ceballos-Lascurain, 1992, p.17

A major question that arises in relation to most ecotourism or nature-based development is who benefits in economic terms. To what extent, for instance, are any economic benefits of nature-based tourism in an area shared with local people? What types of mechanisms can be put in place to ensure that locals obtain increased benefits from nature-based tourism and/or to ensure minimisation of their deprivation as a result of 'locking up' natural resources for tourism purposes? For instance, declaration of new protected areas often deprives locals of access to natural resources traditionally used by them and they may obtain no employment in the protected area or in any tourism connected with it. While there may always be some local losers from such a development, the availability of at least some local economic benefits is necessary to promote local support for a nature-based development project in an area. Without such support, the long-term success of a conservation project is likely to be in jeopardy. For example, in the absence of local benefits, locals may feel morally justified in continuing to exploit resources in the protected area illegally and enforcement of conservation regulations and laws then can be difficult. In addition, there is the matter of distributional justice or equity to consider. Such issues need to be addressed directly.

If it becomes widely accepted that wildlife-tourism can be commercially viable, there is a risk of politicians and the public believing that most, or even all, nature conservation should be reliant on this financial mechanism. Therefore, public funds for supporting nature conservation may be reduced and nature conservation overall could suffer. In addition, conservation efforts may become concentrated on, or mainly concentrated on, the protection of areas and wildlife able to provide positive financial benefits from tourism. Consequently, natural areas and wildlife that have low economic value for tourism but high non-use economic value may be neglected and not conserved. Even from an economic perspective, this is not optimal. Over-reliance on financial mechanisms can promote an inefficient bias in nature conservation given that the appropriate economic goal for resource is to promote total economic value.

Total economic value has been defined as consisting of economic use value plus non-use economic value (e.g. by Pearce et al., 1989). These use values may also be considered as direct and indirect values. In a natural area, use value is normally obtained onsite and non-use values are usually more intangible and obtained offsite. Onsite, economic use value of an area may come from ecotourism (widely regarded as a non-consumptive economic use) or from hunting and fishing (a consumptive use). Non-use economic values include existence value

(represented by the amount individuals would be willing to pay to know merely that an area or species continues to exist) and bequest value (an economic indication of the desire of individuals to conserve a natural area or species for future generations) and could also contain a further philanthropic element (a desire to keep the resource available to others, not necessarily future generations). Non-use values are discussed, for example, in Jakobsson and Dragun (1996, Ch. 5). Sometimes, also, option values are included in this category. The current classification could be improved but it at least brings attention to the fact that not all attributes of nature conservation can be marketed. The presence of non-marketable values leads to market failure, that is, failure of market or commercial mechanisms to promote a social economic optimum.

If funding for protected areas or species becomes more and more dependent on their use values or marketed values, there is a danger that this will encourage economic activities to be allowed in protected areas that are at increasing odds with conservation. Not only may tourism be encouraged but concessions may be given in some portions of the protected area for crop growing and the grazing of domestic livestock and so on likely to be in direct conflict with nature conservation goals. This is already the case in some developing countries and is exacerbated by the low incomes paid to park rangers and officials (cf. Tisdell, 1999, Ch. 14). While the development of ecotourism can contribute to wildlife conservation, it need not do so (cf. Isaacs, 2000).

#### **4. Concluding Comments**

The development of commercial ecotourism can increase public support and the total amount of funding available for nature conservation. It can be a positive contributor to the conservation of nature. However, this requires a number of assumptions or conditions to be satisfied and some of these have been outlined in this paper. If these are not satisfied, use of commercial values and ethics in relation to nature conservation can have negative consequences for nature conservation. For instance, the total economic value of nature conservation programs may be reduced by this type of emphasis. When over-emphasis on the commercial value occurs, the holistic picture of economic value is lost. Certainly funds obtained from ecotourism development should not be seen as a complete substitute for public funding of nature conservation. While some substitution might be acceptable, it should not be on a scale that reduces total public funding of nature conservation, nor be such as to cause substantial distortion in favour only of commercially valuable species and areas for

ecotourism. Ideally, the development of wildlife-based tourism should contribute positively to the total amount of funds available for nature conservation, add to overall efforts and results in this regard, and provide enhanced economic benefits to local communities.<sup>2,3</sup> To ensure this, however, requires some precautions to be taken.<sup>4</sup>

## **Endnotes**

1. As observed by the author in February, 2003, educational and interpretative facilities are absent at many of Sri Lanka's wildlife attractions. This was, for example so, or virtually so, at Pinnawala Elephant Orphanage, at many of the turtle hatcheries between Colombo and Galle and at Uda Walle National Park when visited by the author. Therefore, they do not satisfy this criterion for ecotourism.
2. Some further discussions of issues raised in this article may, for example, be found in Tisdell (1999, 2001). It might also be noted that economist's interest in these matters can be from many different angles. For instance, they may be interested in the consequences of nature conservation/management from the point of view of
  - (i) its contribution to the net economic satisfaction (economic welfare) of the community or
  - (ii) its impact on the level of income and employment locally or in a particular region.These are not necessarily the same (Tisdell and Wilson, 2002). Also techniques, such as the travel cost method, may be used to estimate demand for visits to a natural area. However they are not accurate if applied mechanically.
3. The importance placed on conservation by Tamils in the north and east of Sri Lanka is apparent from various reports on Tamil Net. See, for example, the report on "Prohibition on unauthorised felling of trees" published June 8, 2002, 09:29 GMT. The conflict in the north of Sri Lanka in recent decades has saved many natural areas from 'development'. Peace brings the risk that many such areas could be used for projects involving 'unsustainable development'. In particular, coastal areas in the north risk being utilized for prawn (shrimp) farming. In the South, many such projects have had disastrous economic consequences and have proved to be unsustainable. Hopefully, the North will learn from the South's experience. The development of environmentally friendly tourism seems to be a possible sustainable option. However, tourism development will require some appropriate regulation because not all tourism is environmentally friendly nor socially acceptable.



4. I wish to thank Ranjith Bandara and Clevo Wilson for useful suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper.

## References

- Honey, M. (1999) *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?* Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Isaacs, J. C. (2000) "The Limited Potential of Tourism to Contribute to Wildlife Conservation", *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, **28**, 61-69.
- Jacobsson, K. M. and Dragun, A. K. (1996) *Contingent Valuation of Endangered Species*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- McNeely, J. A., Thorsell, J. W. and Ceballos-Lascurain (1992) *Guidelines: Development of National Parks and Protected Areas for Tourism*, World Tourism Organization, Madrid and United Nations Environment Programme, Paris.
- Pearce, D., Markandya, A. and Barbier, E. G. (1989) *Blueprint for a Green Economy*, Earthscan Publications, London.
- Sekerciogll, C. H. (2002) "Impacts of Birdwatching on Human and Avian Communities", *Environmental Conservation*, **29**(3), 282-289.
- Tisdell, C. A. (1995) "Investment in Ecotourism: Assessing its Economics", *Tourism Economics* **1**(4), 375-387.
- Tisdell, C. A. (1999) *Biodiversity, Conservation and Sustainable Development: Principles and Practices with Asian Examples*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Tisdell, C. A. (2001) *Tourism Economics, the Environment and Development: Analysis and Policy*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Tisdell, C. A. and Wilson, C. (2002a) *Economic, Educational and Conservation Benefits of Sea Turtle Based Ecotourism: A Study Focused on Mon Repos*, CRC for Sustainable Tourism, Gold Coast Campus, Griffith University.
- Tisdell, C. A. and Wilson, C. (2002b) "World Heritage Listing of Australian Natural Sites: Tourism Stimulus and its Economic Value", *Economic Analysis and Policy*, **32**(2), 27-49.
- Wight, P. (1993) "Sustainable Ecotourism: Balancing Economics, Environmental and Social Goals within an Ethical Framework", *Journal of Tourism Studies* **4**(2), 54-66.

## **PREVIOUS WORKING PAPERS IN THE SERIES ECONOMICS, ECOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

1. Governance, Property Rights and Sustainable Resource Use: Analysis with Indian Ocean Rim Examples by Clem Tisdell and Kartik Roy, November 1996.
2. Protection of the Environment in Transitional Economies: Strategies and Practices by Clem Tisdell, November 1996.
3. Good Governance in Sustainable Development: The Impact of Institutions by K.C.Roy and C.A.Tisdell, November 1996.
4. Sustainability Issues and Socio-Economic Change in the Jingpo Communities of China: Governance, Culture and Land Rights by Ren Zhuge and Clem Tisdell, November 1996.
5. Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation: Major Regional Issues with Asian Illustrations by Clem Tisdell, November 1996.
6. Integrated Regional Environmental Studies: The Role of Environmental Economics by Clem Tisdell, December 1996.
7. Poverty and Its Alleviation in Yunnan Province China: Sources, Policies and Solutions by Ren Zhuge and Clem Tisdell, December 1996.
8. Deforestation and Capital Accumulation: Lessons from the Upper Kerinci Region, Indonesia by Dradjad H. Wibowo, Clement a. Tisdell and R. Neil Byron, January 1997.
9. Sectoral Change, Urbanisation and South Asia's Environment in Global Context by Clem Tisdell, April 1997.
10. China's Environmental Problems with Particular Attention to its Energy Supply and Air Quality by Clem Tisdell, April 1997.
11. Weak and Strong Conditions for Sustainable Development: Clarification of concepts and their Policy Application by Clem Tisdell, April 1997.
12. Economic Policy Instruments and Environmental Sustainability: A Second Look at Marketable or Tradeable Pollution or Environmental-Use Permits by Clem Tisdell, April 1997.
13. Agricultural Sustainability in Marginal Areas: Principles, Policies and Examples from Asia by Clem Tisdell, April 1997.
14. Impact on the Poor of Changing Rural Environments and Technologies: Evidence from India and Bangladesh by Clem Tisdell, May 1997.
15. Tourism Economics and its Application to Regional Development by Clem Tisdell, May 1997.
16. Brunei's Quest for Sustainable Development: Diversification and Other Strategies by Clem Tisdell, August 1997.
17. A Review of Reports on Optimal Australian Dugong Populations and Proposed Action/Conservation Plans: An Economic Perspective by Clem Tisdell, October 1997.
18. Compensation for the taking of Resources Interests: Practices in Relations to the Wet Tropics and Fraser Island, General Principles and their Relevance to the Extension of Dugong Protected Areas by Clem Tisdell, October 1997.
19. Deforestation Mechanisms: A Survey by D.H. Wibowo and R.N. Byron, November 1997.
20. Ecotourism: Aspects of its Sustainability and Compatibility by Clem Tisdell, November 1997.

21. A Report Prepared for the Queensland Commercial Fisherman's Organisation by Gavin Ramsay, Clem Tisdell and Steve Harrison (Dept of Economics); David Pullar and Samantha Sun (Dept of Geographical Sciences and Planning) in conjunction with Ian Tibbetts (The School of Marine Science), January 1998.
22. Co-Evolutions in Asia, Markets and Globalization by Clem Tisdell, January 1998.
23. Asia's Livestock Industries: Changes and Environmental Consequences by Clem Tisdell, January 1998.
24. Socio-Economics of Pearl Culture: Industry Changes and Comparisons Focussing on Australia and French Polynesia by Clem Tisdell and Bernard Poirine, August 1998.
25. Asia's (Especially China's) Livestock Industries: Changes and Environmental Consequences by Clem Tisdell, August 1998.
26. Ecotourism: Aspects of its Sustainability and Compatibility with Conservation, Social and Other Objectives, September 1998.
27. Wider Dimensions of Tourism Economics: A Review of Impact Analyses, International Aspects, Development Issues, Sustainability and Environmental Aspects of Tourism, October 1998.
28. Basic Economics of Tourism: An Overview, November 1998.
29. Protecting the Environment in Transitional Situations, November 1998.
30. Australian Environmental Issues: An Overview by Clem Tisdell, December 1998.
31. Trends and Developments in India's Livestock Industries by Clem Tisdell and Jyothi Gali, February 1999.
32. Sea Turtles as a Non-Consumptive Tourism Resource in Australia by Clevo Wilson and Clem Tisdell, August 1999.
33. Transitional Economics and Economics Globalization: Social and Environmental Consequences by Clem Tisdell, August 1999.
34. Co-evolution, Agricultural Practices and Sustainability: Some Major Social and Ecological Issues by Clem Tisdell, August, 1999.
35. Technology Transfer from Publicly Funded Research for improved Water Management: Analysis and Australian Examples by Clem Tisdell, August 1999.
36. Safety and Socio-Economic Issues Raised by Modern Biotechnology by Dayuan Xue and Clem Tisdell, August 1999.
37. Valuing Ecological Functions of Biodiversity in Changbaishan Mountain Biosphere Reserve in Northeast China by Dayuan Xue and Clem Tisdell, March 2000.
38. Neglected Features of the Safe Minimum Standard: Socio-economics and Institutional Dimension by Irmi Seidl and Clem Tisdell, March 2000.
39. Free Trade, Globalisation, the Environment and Sustainability: Major Issues and the Position of WTO by Clem Tisdell, March 2000.
40. Globalisation and the WTO: Attitudes Expressed by Pressure Groups and by Less Developed Countries by Clem Tisdell, May 2000.
41. Sustainability: The Economic Bottom Line by Clem Tisdell, May 2000.
42. Trade and Environment: Evidence from China's Manufacturing Sector by Joseph C. H. Chai, June 2000.
43. Trends and Development in India's Livestock Industry by Clem Tisdell and Jyothi Gali, August 2000.
44. Tourism and Conservation of Sea Turtles by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, August 2000.
45. Developing Ecotourism for the Survival of Sea Turtles by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, August 2000.
46. Globalisation, WTO and Sustainable Development by Clem Tisdell, August 2000.

47. Environmental Impact of China's Accession to WTO in the Manufacturing Sector by Joseph Chai, August 2000.
48. Effects of Cartagena Biosafety Protocol on Trade in GMOs, WTO Implications, and Consequences for China (English version) by Dayuan Xue and Clem Tisdell, August 2000.
49. Effects of Cartagena Biosafety Protocol on Trade in GMOs, WTO Implications, and Consequences for China (Chinese version) by Dayuan Xue and Clem Tisdell, August 2000.
50. The Winnipeg Principles, WTO and Sustainable Development: Proposed Policies for Reconciling Trade and the Environment by Clem Tisdell, September 2000.
51. Resources Management within Nature Reserves in China by Dayuan Xue, October 2000.
52. Economics, Educational and Conservation Benefits of Sea Turtle Based Ecotourism: A Study Focused on Mon Repos by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, October 2000.
53. Why Farmers Continue to use Pesticides despite Environmental, Health and Sustainability Costs by Clevo Wilson and Clem Tisdell, November 2000.
54. Wildlife-based Tourism and Increased Tourist Support for Nature Conservation Financially and Otherwise: Evidence from Sea Turtle Ecotourism at Mon Repos by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, November 2000.
55. A Study of the Impact of Ecotourism on Environmental Education and Conservation: The Case of Turtle Watching at an Australian Site by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, December 2000.
56. Environmental Regulations of Land-use and Public Compensation: Principles with Swiss and Australian Examples by Irmis Seidl, Clem Tisdell and Steve Harrison.
57. Analysis of Property Values, Local Government Finances and Reservation of Land for National Parks and Similar Purposes by Clem Tisdell and Leonie Pearson, March 2001.
58. Alternative Specifications and Extensions of the Economic Threshold Concept and the Control of Livestock Pests by Rex Davis and Clem Tisdell, May 2001.
59. Conserving Asian Elephants: Economic Issues Illustrated by Sri Lankan Concerns by Ranjith Bandara and Clem Tisdell, June 2001.
60. World Heritage Listing of Australian Natural Sites: Tourism Stimulus and its Economic Value by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, September 2001.
61. Aquaculture, Environmental Spillovers and Sustainable Development: Links and Policy Choices by Clem Tisdell, October 2001.
62. Competition, Evolution and Optimisation: Comparisons of Models in Economics and Ecology by Clem Tisdell, October 2001.
63. Aquaculture Economics and Marketing: An Overview by Clem Tisdell, October 2001.
64. Conservation and Economic Benefits of Wildlife-Based Marine tourism: Sea Turtles and Whales as Case Studies by Clevo Wilson and Clem Tisdell, February 2002.
65. Asian Elephants as Agricultural Pests: Damages, Economics of Control and Compensation in Sri Lanka by Ranjith Bandara and Clem Tisdell, February 2002.
66. Rural and Urban Attitudes to the Conservation of Asian Elephants in Sri Lanka: Empirical Evidence by Ranjith Bandara and Clem Tisdell, May 2002.
67. Willingness to Pay for Conservation of the Asian Elephant in Sri Lanka: A Contingent Valuation Study by Ranjith Bandara and Clem Tisdell, May 2002.
68. Bioeconomic Analysis of Aquaculture's Impact on Wild Stocks and Biodiversity by Clem Tisdell, May 2002.
69. Will Bangladesh's Economic Growth Solve its Environmental Problems? by Clem Tisdell, May 2002.

70. Socioeconomic Causes of loss of Genetic Diversity: Analysis and Assessment by Clem Tisdell, June 2002.
71. Empirical Evidence Showing The Relationships Between Three Approaches For Pollution Control by Clevo Wilson, August 2002.
72. Energy-Use, the Environment and Development: Observations with Reference to China and India by Clem Tisdell and Kartik Roy, September 2002.
73. Willingness of Sri Lankan Farmers to Pay for a Scheme to Conserve Elephants: An Empirical Analysis by Ranjith Bandara and Clem Tisdell, January 2003.
74. The Public's Knowledge of and Support for Conservation of Australia's Tree-kangaroos by Clem Tisdell and Clevo Wilson, February 2003.