

CRITERIA FOR STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN TOURISM SECTOR

By Mr. Prakash A. Raj

Tourism in Nepal contributes 3.5% to GDP and 15% of total foreign exchange earnings of the country. It also gave direct or indirect employment to 257,000 people in 1998. The average length of stay was 10.8 days and average expenditure/tourist/day was US\$44.2 in 1998.

The Eighth Plan envisaged policies for using tourism for poverty alleviation, maximizing foreign exchange earnings and diversifying it to other parts of the country.

The Ninth Plan (1997-2002) states "tourism development and its expansion have been challenged by unmanaged urbanization, environmental degradation and pollution".

The Ninth Plan envisaged to establish Nepal as a premium destination on world tourism map, develop tourism as an important part of overall economic development and expand its benefits down to village level as its long term objectives. It also envisaged developing some domestic airports to regional airports having capacity to haul international flights. It also set a long-term target as follows:

| | <u>1997</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2015</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Tourist Arrival | 420,000 | 676,000 | 1,247,830 |
| 2. Duration of stay | 11.27 | 13 | 15 |
| 3. Expenditure/tourist Per day (US\$) | 45 | 60 | 133.3 |
| 4. Earnings (US\$ mill.) | 213 | 527.6 | 1,663.6 |
| Employment (Direct and Indirect) | 257,000 | 371,000 | 685.000 |

Actual figures for 1998 and 1999 were as follows:

| | <u>1998</u> | <u>1999</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Tourist Arrival | 463,684 | 491,504 |
| 2. Foreign Exchange Earnings (US \$ mill.) | 152.5 | 168.1 |

Tourism contributed 15% of total foreign exchange earnings and 36% of income received from exports of goods in 1998.

Table 1**TOURISM STATISTICS (1998)**

| | |
|---|---------|
| Total number of tourists visiting Nepal | 463,684 |
| Total number of tourists visiting Pokhara | 103,895 |
| Total number of tourists visiting Chitwan | 72,528 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Total number of trekkers | 112,644 |
| Annapurna | 65,587(58.25%) |
| Sagarmatha | 22,826 (20.3%) |
| Langtang | 10,952 (9.7%) |

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Kanchenjunga | 782 |
| Upper Mustang | 798 |
| Manaslu | 756 |
| Humla | 538 |
| Dolpa | 322 |

| | |
|--------------|-------|
| Bardia | 2,543 |
| Shuklaphata | 121 |
| Khaptad | 5 |
| Kosi Tappu | 318 |
| Makalu Barun | 876 |
| Rara | 142 |

Although the Ninth Plan had envisaged a growth rate of 10% in tourist arrivals and 20% for foreign exchange earnings, the progress reported in 1998 and 1999 indicate that the target for 10% growth rate in tourist arrivals has almost been met, the target for foreign exchange earnings has not been met. Analysis of data for first ten months in 2000 shows that the number of Indian tourists visiting Nepal has declined by almost a third compared to the same period in 1999 resulting in an overall drop of almost 13% in the number of tourists. Such factors as the hijacking of Indian Airlines plane in December 1999 and adverse publicity in the Indian newsmedia could have been responsible for the large decrease in the number of Indian tourists. On the other hand, the decrease in the number of tourists from third countries could be attributed to adverse publicity due to Maoist activity in the international media and warning given by many tourist-generating countries that parts of Nepal are not safe for tourists.

A Visit Nepal Year was celebrated in 1998 with mixed results. UNDP assisted Partnership for Quality Tourism was implemented between 1995 and 1998. The sites selected were Swayambhu and Changunarayan in Kathmandu valley and two villages, Syabru Besi and Thulo Syabru in Langtang National Park. National Tourism Board was also created as a follow up of Quality Tourist Project.

KEY PRINCIPLES FOR STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

1. Vulnerability of tourism in Nepal due to external factors and international media publicity of internal insurgency

Tourism is highly vulnerable to external factors. News about hijacking of Indian Airlines aircraft in December 1999 and insurgency in some parts of the country have adversely affected growth in number of tourists in 2000. As tourism in Nepal is highly seasonal and most of third country tourists visit the country in this period. On the other hand, 71% of Indian tourists visiting Nepal came in April, May and June in 1999. This had helped to compensate small number of low season tourists from third countries.

The web sites of embassies of several tourist-generating countries have posted warnings about Maoist insurgency in Nepal.

This has reduced the number of tourists visiting not only areas in western Nepal but also in Nepal as a whole. Both individual and group tourists have been affected. It is expected that the impact of such warnings on internet would be especially marked for countries like the US where tour operators might be subject to legal action if groups tourists visiting Nepal were to be harmed as a result of insurgency.

Inception Report of Asian Development Bank prepared in October 2000 (8) warns that Maoist terrorist activity is beginning to impact tourism. It recommends that the Bank should not commit all its ecotourism development emphasis to the west Himalaya area and attention will be given to ecotourism developments in east and elsewhere.

2. Tourism and poverty alleviation and linkages with other economic sectors

The Eighth Plan envisaged using tourism for poverty alleviation. The long-term objective of the Ninth Plan was to "expand benefits of tourism down to the village level". One of the objectives of the Ninth Plan included establishment of backward and forwards linkages with national economy to develop it as an important sector for the overall economic development.

3. Sustainable tourism is multi-faceted and should not be considered in isolation

The Ninth Plan states - "tourism development and its expansion have been challenged by unmanaged urbanization, environmental degradation and pollution". Sustainable tourism should not be considered in isolation. The policy and implementation strategy of the Ninth Plan states - "Local government bodies will be mobilised for zoning purpose and land use planning will be prepared".

4. Quality tourism

The Ninth Plan states "quality tourism has become extremely important for Nepal" and envisages to establish Nepal as a "premium destination on the world tourism map".

5. Tourism limited to certain areas of the country

In spite of attempts to develop tourism in different parts of the country, it remains confined largely to Kathmandu-Pokhara-Chitwan triangle.

6. Tourist revenue not being used for development of tourist areas

Part of tourist revenue should be used to develop area for which it was collected. This would enable self sustained growth of tourism in the area in building infrastructure and in preservation of cultural heritage. Tourism is one of the few resources which can be used to develop the northern area of the country.

7. Lack of institutional co-ordination

Nepal Environmental Policy Action Plan published in 1993(2) emphasizes the need for improved institutional arrangements to monitor the tourism sector. It states " At present, trekking permits are issued by Immigration Department, mountaineering permits are issued by the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation and the Nepal Mountaineering Association, and park entrance permits by the Department of Parks and Wildlife." While trekking permits to such conventional trekking areas as Annapurna, Everest and Langtang are no longer needed some of these problems still exist. No study of carrying capacity of these areas has yet been made.

8. Depletion of forests and tourism

Tourism has contributed in depletion of forest resources in Nepal. It was estimated in one report that per capita fuelwood consumption per individual tourist and group tourist was 5.5 kg and 18.5 kg respectively (3).

9. Waste Management in tourist areas

A classic example of failure of waste management adversely affecting tourism is in the city of Kathmandu as no durable solution on dumping site for its solid waste has yet been found and uncollected garbage could sometime be seen even during peak tourist season. A recent study of IUCN warns "If the image of "dirty Kathmandu continues to grown on the minds of the potential tourists the lucrative tourism industry may suffer a big setback. The loss will have a direct and adverse impact on Kathmandu's economy, reducing jobs and income for its residents (6). The policy and implementation strategy of the Ninth Plan states " Pollution control measures will be developed and specially monitored in eco-sensitive activities such as trekking and mountaineering".

10. Importance of Participatory approach

If tourism is to benefit people in the village level and gap between "haves" and "have nots" were to be reduced, there should be participation of the people of the touristy areas including villages who should have a say in development of tourism in their areas.

11. Retention of income from tourism in tourist areas

One of the problems observed during the implementation of the Eighth Plan was inadequate retention of tourism receipts. This is especially the case if there is high import content in the products consumed by tourists or if foreign based tour operators or Kathmandu based trekking operators were to apportion a high proportion of income from group tourists in Nepal.

SIRUBARI AND SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Sirubari is a village in Syangja District, which has followed an approach different than villages along the major trekking trails in Nepal. It is a Gurung village away from the major trekking trails but still easily accessible by vehicle and few hours walking from Pokhara. Quality tourism is emphasized and there are no lodges charging \$1/day as along the major trekking trails. A typical package costs US\$80 for three nights. There is less leakage and 50% of the tourist spending is estimated to remain in the village. There has been little adverse cultural impact in the area due to tourism according to some experts. It is a commercial enterprise. Do we need more Sirubari type of village tourism for sustainability?.

CURRENT PRACTICE

1. Range of existing country level frameworks

Nepal has attained considerable sophistication in existing framework. It has a network of tourist class hotels in Kathmandu, Pokhara and Royal Chitwan National Park. There are also a large number of budget hotels catering to those in the bottom end of the market, Communication network is developed and many of the businesses have their own websites and e-mail addresses. International telephone calls are easy to make. After the operation of privately owned airlines, most of conventional tourist attractions are easily accessible. Conservation and tourism development in such areas as Annapurna have won international recognition.

2. Strengths of existing frameworks

Such institutions as Nepal Tourism Board, NATA, TAAN, NARA and HAN are quite active. Nepal has also managed to receive considerable assistance from both bilateral and multi-lateral sources in tourism development. These include UNDP, Asian Development Bank, SNV and DFID. Several INGOs and NGOs such as The Mountain Institute, IUCN, KMTNC and WWF have also been quite active.

3. Weaknesses of existing frameworks

The following is a list of problems facing sustainable tourism development and remedial action being done for mitigation.

i. POVERTY ALLEVIATION

In spite of some progress made by tourism in alleviating poverty, there are indications that gap between the rich and poor is increasing in some areas. A study made by IUCN on Tourism in Solu Khumbu area (1) concluded " tourism has enabled this area to become one of the wealthiest in Nepal". However, it cautioned " Distribution of these benefits has to some extent been restricted to the principal tourist locations. While there have been differences between communities in the area, it would appear that inequalities between them are widening". It felt that left to market forces income and community inequalities will widen. Ethnic groups living in southern part of Solu Khumbu area other than the Sherpas have benefitted little from the advent of tourism in the area (1). A study on Annapurna region on income distribution by ICIMOD (5) found" Many of the benefits from tourism go primarily to the small percentage of villagers who are lodge and restaurant owners. Porter guides and support staff often share in them, whereas the large percentage of subsistence farmers especially of the poor lower class do not directly benefit from tourism income. Due to lack of linkage between community and tourism development benefits from tourism are confined primarily to lodge owners...". A survey made by the author on the village of Sauraha just outside Royal Chitwan National Park found that none of 54 lodges in the village were managed by indigenous Tharu people who constitute about a third of the population of the area. The inflation in price of vegetables in Kathmandu may be partly because of the large number of restaurants which would be willing to pay higher price to serve tourists making it very expensive for the locals. It is not yet known definitely if tourism is widening the gap between the rich and the poor in all parts of Nepal which are visited by a large number of tourists. This is in spite of the fact that tourism has provided employment directly or indirectly to 257,000 people.

Many of the porters used by agencies are paid subsistence wages. There are some agencies which don't even provide warm clothing or shoes to porters on treks or expeditions. Government should ensure that all porters who are hired by agencies or by individual trekkers are paid adequate wages and are properly given warm clothing and shoes.

SNV/Nepal is due to introduce Poverty Alleviation through Rural Based Tourism Programme. It has planned tourism related activities in Humla, on the trail to Mount Kailash and Dolpa which contains Shey-Phoksundo National Park and Phoksundo Lake. It is envisaged to develop tourism related economic activities (camping sites, portering services, vegetable production etc) along the main trekking trails through social mobilization, enterprise development and marketing in both Humla and Dolpa Districts located in backward mid western part of Nepal.

SNV has also started Praja Community Development Programme north of Royal Chitwan National Park to benefit the backward Praja people. It includes a tourism component including a three day trekking route providing trekking experience to tourists visiting the National Park.

ii. MULTI FACETED NATURE OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN NEPAL

Tourism in Nepal is a classic case of lack of sustainability due to lack of attention paid to its multi-faceted nature.

A recently published document (7) on environmental planning in Kathmandu valley warns "unregulated urbanization, cultural deterioration and poor hygienic and sanitary conditions have discouraged many potential tourists. This has affected tourism not only in the Kathmandu valley but also in the country. Kathmandu's image as gateway to the "Himalayan Shangri-la" is eroding fast due to poor image of the city as polluted and mismanaged."

One of the major constraints facing tourist industry in Kathmandu valley was failure of the municipal government in disposing solid waste which blamed the central government for having failed to provide it with a dumping site. Such a failure in the peak tourist season could hurt arrival of tourists in the future and act as a potential health hazard to the locals. Similarly, failure of government in regulating pollution from vehicles and regulate traffic reduced the visibility of Himalayan peaks on one hand and increased pressure of vehicles including in core city area where world heritage sites are located. Uncontrolled urbanization in such places as lakeside in Pokhara have reduced visibility of Phewa Lake. On the other hand, the fact that sewage from some hotels and a drain continue to be drained in the lake has made it unfit for swimming. These could be considered to be problems faced by tourism sector because of lack of appropriate policies or action in other sectors i.e. local government, transport etc.

iii. QUALITY TOURISM

Although Nepal has strived to bring quality tourists to the country and several tourist class resorts have been built recently in the country. On the other hand, some of the measures taken recently have not been conducive to this end. The requirement for trekking permits to such popular trekking areas as Annapurna, Everest and Langtang was removed. Although National Park entry fees to these areas are still charged, Government has suffered loss in revenue as a result of this measure. This step may have adversely affected trekking agencies as many trekkers chose to trek independently. The stay of tourists in such areas as Pokhara was also reduced due to the fact that they could immediately proceed to the trekking area. The mushroom growth in lodges(both registered and unregistered) in such places as Pokhara and Sauraha, the gateway to Royal Chitwan National Park which compete with each other and charge as little as US\$2 for a double room has discouraged growth of quality tourism. The owners of lodges make little money from such an enterprise. A similar situation is also found along some popular

trekking routes as Annapurna where a room could be rented for less than a dollar per night. Although the lodge owners attempt to compensate for this by overcharging for food, income from lodge is often not sufficient to pay interest on loans taken for its construction from financial institutes. Although many of these lodges should go out of business as they are unable to make a decent profit, this does not seem to be happening.

iv. TOURISM LIMITED TO CERTAIN AREAS OF COUNTRY

Tourist infrastructure is limited only to a few geographic areas and the Ninth Plan suggests that domestic tourism would be promoted to achieve socio-economic balance among various development regions. However, almost all of tourists in Nepal stay in Kathmandu-Pokhara-Chitwan triangle. According to figures given by Nepal Tourism Statistics, less than one percent of tourists visit Nepal west of the above quadrangle. There were only 1157 tourists visiting Khaptad, Shey Phoksundo, Rara, Dhorpatan and Shukla Phanta. The major trekking areas are located north of Pokhara and Kathmandu. The only exception in this respect is Sagarmatha National Park in the east which received 25,000 tourists in 1998. Makalu-Barun National Park and Kanchenjunga National Park in the eastern hills and Kosi Tappu Wildlife Reserve in the east receive some tourists but their number is too small. Royal Bardia National Park in the western Terai is also accessible but the number of tourists visiting is quite small (3701 out of 463,684 in 1997). A limited number of tourists also visit Dolpo and Simikot in Humla on their way to Manasarovar in Tibet. Urgent efforts are needed to reduce regional imbalance in development of tourism. Some of suggested measures include giving subsidy to airfare to tourists to such places as Dolpo, Royal Bardia National Park or Shukla Phanta.

Sustainable tourism programmes being implemented by SNV in Dolpa and Humla are some of long overdue measures to benefit the most backward area of the country where few tourists visit. According to a study of indicators of development by ICIMOD/SNV it was found that Humla and Dolpa ranked 4th and 20th among 75 districts of Nepal in backwardness based on such indices as Poverty and Deprivation, Institutional and Infrastructural development, Women's empowerment and Natural Resources.

v. TOURIST REVENUES NOT BEING USED FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TOURIST AREAS

Upper Mustang and Manaslu areas are now open to tourists. In Upper Mustang, the tourists are required to pay US\$700 for a ten day package. Although 60% of the amount collected was to be given for Annapurna Conservation Area for implementation of projects in the area, the Government has only given 4% in 1998. Many development activities in the region could not be carried out due to shortage of funds. As a resource poor area of the country is being developed for tourism, funds collected for this purpose should be given for local projects. The tourists who pay such high fees would also feel content if their fees could be used in developing the area which they visited. This is an example of how funds collected from quality

tourists were not being used for the purpose for which these were collected.

As the requirement for a trekking permit for such conventional trekking areas as Annapurna, Everest and Langtang has been removed, the tourists visiting these areas pay only entrance fees for National Parks or Protected Areas. On the other hand, trekkers to restricted areas and other areas where trekking permits are required pay fees to the Government. Is the approach used in Annapurna, Langtang and Everest conducive to sustainable tourism development is a question that should be debated. While the income generated by entrance fees to Annapurna area is given to ACAP(except in upper Mustang) , only a small portion (2% according to a study on Sustainable Tourism in the Sagarmatha area) of income generated by entry fees to Sagarmatha National Park is spent in the area.

vi. THREAT TO CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES

Nepal contains two of UNESCO's World Cultural Heritage sites in Lumbini and Kathmandu valley, two Natural Heritage sites in Royal Chitwan National Park and Sagarmatha National Park. These constitute major tourist attractions of the country and a large proportion of tourists visit some of these sites. Fears were expressed that three out of seven sites in Kathmandu valley were being put in endangered list which could eventually lead to their de-recognition as heritage sites at a later date. This was primarily due to construction activity in areas adjacent to the sites some of which were unauthorized and others were found not to be compatible with the traditional style of architecture. However, the decision whether these sites in Bodhnath, Kathmandu and Patan Durbar Squares were to be put on the endangered list was postponed till the year 2002.

A recent Report prepared by IUCN (6) deals in detail about one locality Baneshwar situated near heritage sites at Pashupatinath and Bodhnath. It states "Nowhere are the negative effects of lack of planning better evident than in the sprawling landscape of the Kathmandu valley. Unregulated growth of town is rapidly ending the quality of the urban living that was once a showpiece of coherent urban planning form in South Asia. Baneshwar, a precinct in Kathmandu, with its uncontrolled housing and commercial development epitomizes this phenomenon. Road access is constrained, making it difficult even for emergency vehicles to serve all residents"

Some municipalities such as Bhaktapur are utilizing funds generated by entry fee for tourists which was raised to US\$10 to undertake restoration work of World Heritage Site monuments. Lalitpur Municipality and Bodhnath have also started charging tourists for entry in the monument zone.

vii. LACK OF INSTITUTIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND REGULATIION

Trekking Permits for such areas as Annapurna, Everest and Langtang are no longer needed. Permits for other areas are given by Immigration Department. Mountaineering Permits are given by Ministry of Tourism and Permits for trekking peaks are given by Nepal Mountaineering Association. It is in the context of rafting

that lack of institutional co-ordination and regulation is lacking.

Nepal has gained recognition as having some rivers which are suitable for rafting. There are actually ten rivers which are open to rafting in the country including sections of Arun, Bheri, Karnali, Kaligandaki, Seti, Sunkosi, Tamakosi, Trisuli, Marsyangdi and Bhote Kosi. The number of tourists interested in rafting is quite significant. All foreign tourists going for rafting were required to get a rafting permit from Ministry of Tourism till 1999 and pay nominal fees (which was Rs 80 at the time). However, no permit is now required for rafting. There are now 64 rafting operators in the country. Ministry of Tourism has no knowledge about the total number of tourists who are taking rafting trips in the country as no data about rafters is given in Tourist Statistics published by it. Some revenue could also be collected by the Government by requiring rafting permit, in the same way as trekking permit. Above all, rafting is relatively riskier than trekking. There have been cases where tourists on rafting trip have disappeared. Not all rafting operators have all the necessary equipments required for a safe rafting trip. The association of rafting operator, NARA (Nepal Association of Rafting Agents) has no record about the number of rafters. Some rafting operators are not even members of NARA. Government should require rafting permit for all tourists on a rafting trip and could also realize revenue by imposing a reasonable fee. Although Local Administration Regulation gives some authority to local governments in this respect, permits should be issued in Kathmandu to ensure quality of operators and for better monitoring of this adventure tourist industry.

viii. DEPLETION OF FOREST RESOURCES

Some trekking areas now require that only kerosene be used in lodges and have set up kerosene depots in several locations along the trekking trail. Many Annapurna area lodges also use energy efficient stoves and solar heaters. It is estimated that there are 482 back boilers, 569 solar heaters, and 708 improved stoves installed in private lodges and households of the area. There are also 36 kerosene and LPG depots and 14 micro hydro projects in Annapurna Conservation Area. It has retarded depletion of forest resources in the most popular trekking area of Nepal visited by more than 67,000 tourists in 1999 (4). All group trekkers in Sagarmatha National Park are required to use kerosene. Thame Hydroelectric Plant (650kw) has electrified almost all households in Thame valley, Namche, Kunde and Khumjung. According to surveys conducted between 1993 and 1996 it was reported that fuelwood consumption reduced by 50 percent and by 66 percent in lodges and households respectively (1).

ix. ISSUE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT NOT PROPERLY ADDRESSED

Some progress has been made in this respect although much remains to be done as in the case of city of Kathmandu. Although reputed to be the dirtiest city in Nepal till the 1970's the city of Bhaktapur has managed this issued quite well. Some sewage continues to be emptied in the Phewa Lake, the prime tourist attraction in Pokhara valley. A study of sustainable tourism in Sagarmatha Region states "There can be little doubt that the Sagarmatha Pollution Control Committee has

been highly effective in improving waste management throughout Pharak and Khumbu" (1). It was estimated that one trekking group of 15 people in Annapurna Trekking Area produces 15 kg of non-biodegradable waste in 10 trekking days (4).

x. IMPORTANCE OF PARTICIPATION IN SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Few touristy areas of Nepal or projects for sustainable tourism development of Nepal have taken in to account participation of the people of the areas affected. Commenting on tourism planning and management in Kathmandu valley, a recent document of Ministry of Population and Environment states - "There is little or no involvement of communities in resource management by the community and by tourists. In the case of Kathmandu valley retaining its cultural heritage, preserving its traditional crafts and folklore and conserving the natural environment greatly depends on community involvement. So far, the local communities have been neglected"(7) Steps taken in Annapurna Conservation Area such as creation of Lodge Management Committee, Conservation and Development Committees could be considered to be examples of such participatory bodies. Community Tourism owned and operated by rural population is being implemented as an income generating activity in Gorkha District. A paper presented recently in a seminar organized by University of Mainz and Tribhuvan University argued that community tourism can indeed be a sustainable option if such preconditions as community participation and low volume of visitors were met (9).

A study of Solu Khumbu District (1) stated "Inn regard to local participation and involvement in the promotion of tourism, decision-making within the various communities is powerfully dominated by local businessmen and educated elites, with vested economic interests. Meanwhile the prospects for advancement and engagement are limited for certain sections of society; notably women and families from marginalised villages with low education levels or low involvement in the tourism industry"

An independent evaluation (11) of UNDP assisted Partnership for Quality Tourism found in one of the two villages of Langtang National Park there was little evidence of Partnership for Quality Tourism Project and the situation was slightly better in the other. It concluded that there was lack of sustainable development in one and the problems were due to limited community involvement. The Report concluded "It is suggested that without a carefully planned integrated community development approach, tourism development of itself cannot lead to poverty alleviation, environmental regeneration and empowerment of local communities, three of the most crucial development concerns in Nepal".

xi. INADEQUATE RETENTION OF INCOME FROM TOURISM IN TOURIST AREAS

It appears that there is a high volume of leakage and non-retention of income from tourism in Nepal. According to one estimate (11), less than 10 percent of income

from trekking tourists is retained. This proportion is estimated to be even lower in remote districts. Attempts done by a private company and a NGO in this respect should be noticed. Nepal Village Resorts has been organizing visits to Sirubari south of Pokhara which envisages to minimize leakage and attempts to retain 50% of the earnings in the village. However, it has only taken 500 tourists in the past two years. Community Tourism Project implemented in some villages of Gorkha District is owned and operated by local people has a strategy to retain the earnings in the village. However, only 50 tourists have so far visited the area. Due to the fact that the district of Gorkha being Maoist affected, Several websites of tourist generating countries have warned that it's not safe to visit Gorkha which is affected by Maoist insurgency.

1. Rogers, Paul, Aitchison, John, TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE TOURISM
2. IN THE EVEREST REGION OF NEPAL, IUCN, Nepal, 1998
3. Environment Protection Council, NEPAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACTION PLAN, 1993
4. Environmental Resources Ltd, NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. A STUDY OF FEASIBLE POLICIES, INSTITUTIONS AND INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES IN NEPAL WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE HILLS, 1989
5. KING MAHENDRA TRUST FOR NATURE CONSERVATION (brochure)
6. ICIMOD, TOURISM FOR MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, CASE STUDY REPORT ON THE ANNAPURNA AND GORKHA REGIONS OF NEPAL, 1995
7. Adhikari, Ambika, URBAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING IN NEPAL, IUCN, 1998
8. Ministry of Population and Environment, ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF THE KATHMANDU VALLEY, 1999
9. His Majesty's Government of Nepal and Asian Development Bank, ECOTOURISM PROJECT, INCEPTION REPORT, 2000
10. International Conference on Sustainable Management of Natural and Human Resources for a Better Quality of Life in South Asia, October 2000 (organized by University of Mainz, Germany and Tribhuwan University)
11. Sofield and Bhandari, An independent evaluation of the Partnership for Quality Tourism Programme, UNDP, Nepal
12. Hummel, John SNV NEPAL and SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT,